



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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 14 November 2018

| Subject | Page |
|---|-------------|
| SPEAKER'S RULING | 3469 |
| Question on Notice, Out of Order | 3469 |
| SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS | 3469 |
| Visitors to Public Gallery | 3469 |
| Portrait of Former Speaker | 3469 |
| PETITIONS | 3469 |
| TABLED PAPERS | 3470 |
| MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS | 3470 |
| Skills and Industry Summit | 3470 |
| Skills and Industry Summit | 3470 |
| Skills and Industry Summit; Manufacturing | 3471 |
| Jobs | 3471 |
| Manufacturing | 3471 |
| Advance Queensland, Jobs..... | 3472 |
| Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund..... | 3472 |
| Health Services, Legionella | 3473 |
| Merrimac State High School, World Robot Summit | 3474 |
| Building and Asset Services; Dollars and Sense Program | 3474 |
| Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance; Agricultural Workforce Network..... | 3475 |
| RoadTek, Skills and Training..... | 3475 |
| Fire and Emergency Services, Skills | 3476 |
| Migrants and Refugees, Skills..... | 3477 |
| MOTION | 3477 |
| Referral to Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee | 3477 |

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 14 November 2018

| | |
|--|-------------|
| HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE | 3478 |
| Report | 3478 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 16, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 22 August and 4 September 2018..... | 3478 |
| TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE | 3478 |
| Report | 3478 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 14, 56th Parliament—Review of Auditor-General's Report No. 4: 2017-18—Integrated Transport Planning..... | 3478 |
| NOTICE OF MOTION | 3478 |
| Shark Control Program, Inquiry | 3478 |
| QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE | 3479 |
| Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike | 3479 |
| Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike | 3480 |
| Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order | 3480 |
| State Schools, Skills | 3481 |
| Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike | 3482 |
| Defence Industries, Jobs | 3483 |
| Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike | 3483 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 19 July 2018, titled 'Unionists educate Queensland school students on workplace rights'..... | 3483 |
| Distribution of GST | 3484 |
| Schoolies, Meningococcal B Vaccination Program | 3485 |
| Industry Development | 3485 |
| Transmax | 3486 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 26 September 2018, from an employee of Transmax Pty Ltd to the Premier and Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, regarding workplace concerns. | 3486 |
| Tourism Industry | 3486 |
| Police Service, Annual Statistical Review | 3487 |
| Regional Queensland, Health Services | 3487 |
| Waste Levy | 3488 |
| Trainees and Apprentices | 3489 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> LNP Costings Report—Saving and Reprioritisation Measures..... | 3489 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Photographs of the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, with workers..... | 3489 |
| Sexual and Reproductive Health | 3490 |
| Transition 2 Success | 3490 |
| MOTION | 3491 |
| Order of Business | 3491 |
| MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES (FINANCIAL PROVISIONING) BILL | 3491 |
| Second Reading | 3491 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 6, 56th Parliament—Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, government response. | 3495 |
| Consideration in Detail | 3527 |
| Clauses 1 to 62, as read, agreed to. | 3527 |
| Clause 63—..... | 3527 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Jackie Trad's amendments. | 3527 |
| Clause 63, as amended, agreed to. | 3527 |
| Clauses 64 to 78, as read, agreed to. | 3527 |
| Clause 79—..... | 3527 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 9 November 2018, from the Information Commissioner, Ms Rachael Rangihaeata, to the Acting Under Treasurer, Ms Mary-Anne Curtis, regarding the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. | 3528 |
| Clause 79, as amended, agreed to. | 3529 |
| Clauses 80 to 82, as read, agreed to. | 3529 |
| Clause 83, as read, agreed to..... | 3529 |
| Clauses 84 to 90, as read, agreed to. | 3529 |
| Clause 91—..... | 3529 |
| Clause 91, as amended, agreed to. | 3529 |
| Clauses 92 to 95, as read, agreed to. | 3529 |
| Clause 96, as read, agreed to. | 3530 |
| Insertion of new clauses—..... | 3530 |
| Amendment agreed to. | 3532 |
| Clauses 97 and 98, as read, agreed to. | 3532 |
| Clause 99—..... | 3532 |
| Clause 99, as amended, agreed to. | 3532 |
| Clauses 100 to 103, as read, agreed to. | 3532 |
| Clause 104—..... | 3532 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Michael Berkman's amendments..... | 3533 |
| Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to. | 3534 |
| Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10). | 3534 |
| Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negatived..... | 3534 |

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 14 November 2018

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to | 3534 |
| Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106(10) | 3534 |
| Clause 104, as amended, agreed to | 3534 |
| Clause 105, as read, agreed to | 3534 |
| Clauses 106 to 108, as read, agreed to | 3534 |
| Clause 109, as read, agreed to | 3535 |
| Insertion of new clause— | 3535 |
| Amendment agreed to | 3535 |
| Clauses 110 to 115, as read, agreed to | 3535 |
| Insertion of new clauses— | 3535 |
| Amendment agreed to | 3537 |
| Clauses 116 and 117, as read, agreed to | 3537 |
| Clause 118— | 3537 |
| Clause 118, as amended, agreed to | 3537 |
| Clauses 119 to 121, as read, agreed to | 3537 |
| Clause 122— | 3537 |
| Clause 122, as amended, agreed to | 3537 |
| Clauses 123 to 126, as read, agreed to | 3537 |
| Clause 127— | 3537 |
| Clause 127, as amended, agreed to | 3538 |
| Clauses 128 to 146, as read, agreed to | 3538 |
| Clause 147— | 3538 |
| Clause 147, as amended, agreed to | 3538 |
| Clause 148— | 3538 |
| Clause 148, as amended, agreed to | 3539 |
| Clauses 149 to 169, as read, agreed to | 3539 |
| Clause 170— | 3539 |
| Clause 170, as amended, agreed to | 3539 |
| Clauses 171 and 172, as read, agreed to | 3539 |
| Clause 173— | 3539 |
| Clause 173, as amended, agreed to | 3543 |
| Clauses 174 to 200, as read, agreed to | 3543 |
| Clause 201— | 3543 |
| Clause 201, as amended, agreed to | 3543 |
| Clause 202, as read, agreed to | 3543 |
| Clause 203— | 3544 |
| Clause 203, as amended, agreed to | 3549 |
| Clause 204— | 3549 |
| Clause 204, as amended, agreed to | 3549 |
| Clause 205— | 3549 |
| Clause 205, as amended, agreed to | 3550 |
| Clauses 206 to 215, as read, agreed to | 3550 |
| Clause 216, as read, agreed to | 3550 |
| Clause 217— | 3550 |
| Clause 217, as amended, agreed to | 3550 |
| Clause 218, as read, negatived | 3550 |
| Insertion of new clauses— | 3551 |
| Amendment agreed to | 3551 |
| Clauses 219 and 220, as read, negatived | 3552 |
| Schedule 1— | 3552 |
| Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to | 3552 |
| Third Reading | 3552 |
| Long Title | 3552 |
| Amendment agreed to | 3552 |
| Motion agreed to | 3552 |
| MOTION | 3552 |
| Shark Control Program, Inquiry | 3552 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 10 November 2018, titled 'Shark warnings ignored' | 3558 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, dated 6 November 2018, from the Facebook page of the member for Whitsunday, Mr Jason Costigan MP, in relation to Melbourne Cup meeting | 3562 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Liberal National Party map, undated, titled 'Queensland's Shark Control Program' | 3564 |
| Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to | 3566 |
| Resolved in the negative | 3566 |
| MINISTERIAL STATEMENT | 3566 |
| Further Answer to Question, Transmax | 3566 |
| MOTION | 3566 |
| Order of Business | 3566 |
| ADDRESS-IN-REPLY | 3566 |
| ADJOURNMENT | 3576 |
| Whitsunday Tourism Awards; Mackay Region Tourism Awards | 3576 |
| Redcliffe Electorate | 3577 |
| JPs in the Community; Ashmore Men's Shed | 3577 |
| Caboolture Hospital | 3578 |
| Lung Cancer Awareness Month | 3579 |

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 14 November 2018

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Task Group Taji; Armistice Day..... | 3579 |
| Coolum Local Animal Warriors | 3580 |
| Sunshine Coast, Transport Infrastructure | 3580 |
| Agriculture Industry | 3581 |
| Nudgee Electorate, Schools and Community Groups | 3582 |
| ATTENDANCE | 3582 |

WEDNESDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2018

 The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Curtis Pitt, Mulgrave) read prayers and took the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge that we are sitting today on the land of Aboriginal people and pay my respects to elders past and present. I thank them, as First Australians, for their careful custodianship of the land over countless generations. We are very fortunate in this country to have two of the world's oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we all now share.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Question on Notice, Out of Order

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, standing order 115(a) provides that questions on notice shall be brief and relate to one issue. I refer members to my ruling earlier this week with respect to this matter. On Tuesday, 16 October 2018 the member for Maiwar asked a question on notice of the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef and Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts. Question on notice 1336 relates to two issues: approved mining activities and noise exceedances. It therefore contravenes standing order 115(a), and I rule it out of order.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Visitors to Public Gallery

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the House this morning by students and teachers from Mount Ommaney Special School in the electorate of Mount Ommaney and Concordia College in the electorate of Toowoomba South. I wish to advise members that we will also be visited in the House this morning by a group from the University of the Sunshine Coast.

Portrait of Former Speaker

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have a quick advertisement. At 1 pm today the official unveiling of the portrait of former Speaker Peter Wellington will be held. Hopefully, members will be able to join Peter and his family to celebrate what will be a very important milestone for the former Speaker.

PETITIONS

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

Sunshine Coast District Water Police, Resources

Mr McArdle, from 947 petitioners, requesting the House to increase the police numbers of the Sunshine Coast District Water Police [[1880](#)].

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

Medicinal Cannabis

Mr Berkman, from 5,187 petitioners, requesting the House to support amending medicinal cannabis law reform [[1881](#), [1882](#)].

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

Local Government Association Queensland and Peak Services, Inquiry

From 439 petitioners, requesting the House to institute a review and inquiry into the activities of the Local Government Association Queensland and its company Peak Services [[1883](#)].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

MINISTERIAL PAPERS

The following ministerial papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Hon. D'Ath)—

[1886](#) Land Court of Queensland Annual Report 2017-18

[1887](#) Land Tribunal Court Queensland Annual Report 2017-18

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Oodgeroo (Dr Robinson)—

[1888](#) Nonconforming petition regarding saving Point Lookout headland on North Stradbroke Island.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Skills and Industry Summit

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.33 am): My government is working hard every day to create new jobs in a strong economy. Change is already happening to the way we work, and the pace of that change will only increase. We need to focus on not only growing jobs now, but ensuring Queenslanders are ready for the jobs of the future.

That is why last sitting I announced that my government will host the first Future of Work—Skills and Industry Summit in Brisbane at the end of this month, on Wednesday, 28 November. Along with the Deputy Premier, the Minister for State Development and the Minister for Training and Skills Development, I want to tap into the thinking of the leading companies in Queensland's traditional and emerging industries. We have had significant interest in the summit, with business leaders and community members contacting our offices wanting to take part.

The summit will begin with a skills and industry round table where leading CEOs and board chairs will share their views on how to provide the skills for the Queensland workforce of the future. This will be followed by a panel discussion and workshops involving around 200 delegates and key speakers to further discuss the future of work. The summit workshops will cover a range of topics all focused on the Future of Work. The workshops will also consider the skills development approaches that will be required to help industry keep up with new developments.

We will look at how best to get young people ready to participate in the economy and how we work together to ensure all Queenslanders are included in our future economic prosperity.

Skills and Industry Summit

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.35 am): With preparations well underway for the skills summit, I would like to update the House on what has been happening in the build-up. So far this month the Minister for Skills and Training has released a Jobs Queensland report, titled *Anticipating future skills*. At the same time, online tools were released to help businesses plan for their future, ensuring they have the skilled workforce to grow into the future. Then the Minister for Multicultural Affairs launched a report highlighting the economic benefits from utilising the skills of migrants. This landmark report found the Queensland economy could grow by up to \$250 million if the skills and experience of people who are migrants and refugees are recognised.

After that, on Monday I was at the University of Queensland, which has been given access to important industrial software from engineering firm Siemens. As I told the House yesterday, this partnership is an example of the cooperation between industry and educators we want the summit to stimulate. Today, along with the Minister for Training and Skills Development, I can announce the rollout of the Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund. More than \$3 million has been allocated to give 13 organisations up to \$350,000 to train and improve staff in digital skills. This achieves two things: it helps workers in existing jobs not to be left behind and it ensures that our workforce builds up the skills base we will need for the future. Minister Fentiman will have more to say about that later.

Skills and Industry Summit; Manufacturing

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 am): I now come to this evening, when the Minister for State Development and I will release an update of our Advanced Manufacturing roadmap and action plan. This latest edition builds on manufacturing achievements in the two years since the 10-year plan was released. It also includes my government's response to this year's findings of the Queensland Productivity Commission inquiry into manufacturing. The update contains new commitments. The revised plan recognises—as we all do—that manufacturing operates in a highly dynamic global environment, and the support we provide must be relevant to industry's current and emerging needs. Together, we will continue to deliver tailored initiatives, programs and services that will support Queensland manufacturers on the journey to advanced manufacturing. As I say in a foreword to the new edition, the pace of change affecting our manufacturing industry means we need to be agile in responding to the economic and technological changes.

All of this is building momentum for the Skills and Industry Summit. My government will not allow our economy to run short of the skills that Queensland needs. We are planning and working today for the jobs of tomorrow. The skills summit will be a crucial milestone in that journey.

Jobs

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.38 am): Jobs remain our government's No. 1 priority. We know that one of the most important parts of both creating new jobs and ensuring businesses can grow is making sure our workforce has the right skills. Whether it be through programs like Skilling Queenslanders for Work or the introduction of free TAFE for year 12 graduates, we are investing in the future of Queenslanders by helping them to skill up and get qualified.

Having the opportunity to learn on the job through an apprenticeship or traineeship is critical to growing our skilled workforce. That is why we are encouraging businesses to take on more apprentices and trainees through initiatives like the 50 per cent payroll tax rebate for businesses that hire apprentices. In this year's budget the Palaszczuk government committed an additional \$26 million to extend the payroll tax rebate. Apprentices' wages are already exempt from payroll tax, and this initiative provides an important additional incentive for businesses. Simply by hiring an apprentice or trainee and skilling them up, a business can reduce their overall payroll tax costs across the entire workforce.

This initiative is providing tax relief for businesses and supporting the employment of thousands of apprentices and trainees across the state this financial year, and it is working. Since its introduction more than 5,000 businesses across Queensland have taken advantage of this rebate, with a total rebate value of \$64 million. That equates to around 26,000 apprentices and trainees across our state—26,000 Queenslanders—who are getting the skills they need to set themselves up for the future.

This initiative has been particularly successful in regional areas, where it can be more difficult for young people to find opportunities to get an apprenticeship or traineeship. I saw this firsthand in Toowoomba, where we met with four apprentices from McNab Construction who are learning their trade on the job refurbishing the old Toowoomba South State School. McNab Construction is one of 172 businesses in Toowoomba taking advantage of the payroll tax rebate to skill up the next generation of tradies. Their apprentices represent the spectrum of our workforce, including school based apprentices, mature age apprentices and people skilling up and getting a second trade. As in Toowoomba, regional businesses across Queensland are taking advantage of the rebate, including: 236 in Cairns; 198 in Townsville; 263 in Mackay; 321 on the Sunshine Coast; 239 in Central Queensland; and more than 540 on the Gold Coast.

Our government is working together with schools, TAFEs, businesses and the community to make sure our workforce has the skills they need for the jobs and economy of the future.

Manufacturing

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.41 am): The Palaszczuk Labor government is focused on job creation and meeting changing workforce demands now and for years to come. Our goal as a government is to create a prosperous, thriving and inclusive Queensland. That is why building advanced manufacturing and strengthening the skills of Queenslanders to capitalise on this growing sector is firmly on our agenda. Queensland's \$20 billion manufacturing sector already employs 179,000 people, and our government is focused on keeping this figure trending upwards.

In 2016 our government launched the Advanced Manufacturing 10-Year Roadmap and Action Plan, which is a strategy to ensure Queensland manufacturers remain competitive and relevant on the global stage. Queensland has been reaping dividends ever since. Companies like Oji Fibre Solutions, BrewDog, Hanson Australia and Rheinmetall Defence Australia have all been supported by our government through this initiative to bring new advanced manufacturing jobs, skills, technology, innovation and supply chain opportunities to Queensland. Round 1 of our Made in Queensland program has resulted in 53 projects being approved for grants totalling \$18.2 million for projects covering the state from Goondiwindi to Cairns. These projects will support 2,850 existing jobs, create an estimated 532 new high-skill jobs and generate \$47.7 million in project value. More than 360 manufacturers across the state have also undertaken an industry benchmark assessment, measuring their performance against best practice domestically and internationally and providing recommendations for improvements which facilitate growth and innovation.

Our Queensland Hackerspaces Grant program has provided seven regional hackerspaces with up to \$20,000 funding each towards their establishment, and another three hackerspaces have received \$10,000 each to expand so that creative people can gather in a high-tech space to design and manufacture new products. These grants will help strengthen regional Queensland's advanced manufacturing skills base. Jobs Queensland's *Advancing manufacturing skills* report is directly informing the development and implementation of a manufacturing skills implementation plan.

We are also focused on supporting women to grow their skills through our Women in Manufacturing series, which is designed to support and promote women in manufacturing. This program encourages female students to consider a career in manufacturing. I am delighted to say that more than 370 women and students have already attended a breakfast session as part of this series. With the strong support of our government, Queenslanders will reap the success and jobs that will come from a reinvigorated and expanded manufacturing base in our state.

Advance Queensland, Jobs

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.44 am): Our Advance Queensland agenda is about ensuring Queenslanders have the jobs and skills they need for the future. Through our Advance Queensland program we have already helped to create more than 12,500 jobs. We are working with the big end of town and companies like Boeing and Qantas to secure new investment in jobs and grow our start-up ecosystem. We know that, for a state as big and diverse as Queensland, it is critical we work in each region across our state to develop localised solutions to grow jobs and skills for their future economies.

That is why today I am very proud to announce more than \$1 million in extra funding for regional start-up hubs right across our state. They are a one-stop shop for founders and businesses, offering training, mentoring, skills development and networking. Thanks to our Advance Queensland agenda we now have start-up hubs right across Queensland including the Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Moreton Bay, Redlands, Logan, Ipswich, Darling Downs, Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville, Cairns and even the Atherton Tablelands.

We are investing in Queensland companies with great ideas because we are committed to creating the jobs of the future in this state. It is the same reason we are investing in a new research centre for drone technology and a new virtual reality hub at the precinct, because we are giving Queensland entrepreneurs the skills they need for the jobs of the future.

Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (9.45 am): The Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund is another example of the many ways in which the Palaszczuk government is investing in the skills of the future. The Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund is an opportunity for Queensland industries to directly influence investment in skills and training by linking industries undergoing transition and upskilling existing workers who are impacted by digital disruption. The fund is providing \$4 million over two years to help existing workers upskill and workplaces to adopt new practices. It is really great to see that TAFE Queensland are a major training partner in most of these initial projects, reflecting their role as the state's premier vocational education and training provider.

By targeting those industries impacted by digital disruption we will assist industries ranging from tourism to transport, medical services to mining. The grants will help 11 organisations deliver 16 projects right across Queensland to train and upskill staff in digital and sustainable practices. The grants include:

\$65,000 to tackle digital disruption in the meat-processing industry; \$390,000 for TAFE Queensland to provide digital literacy skills and training for 60 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander small businesses in the south-east; \$300,000 to assist 125 existing workers in Brisbane and South-East Queensland undertake a data analytics for retailers training program; and \$250,000 for the Mareeba District Fruit and Vegetable Growers to partner with TAFE Queensland to conduct training workshops on farm business management, workforce planning and drone piloting skills. It is also good to see the Queensland Farmers' Federation receive \$250,000 to work with 100 farm owners and employees to address emerging skills needs.

This initiative is providing support and assistance to some of our most important industries as they transition through the digital world. It is important that the Palaszczuk government works through these transitions with industry and employers. We simply cannot let anyone be left behind during the digital transition. TAFE Queensland has been engaged by many of the successful applicants to provide training and workshops, and in some cases TAFE is developing a specific course to meet the needs of specific industries.

The Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund is another example of the Palaszczuk government getting on with protecting the future of Queenslanders, providing vocational education and training in priority skills areas and assistance in the integration of emerging technology and creating jobs.

Health Services, Legionella

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.48 am): More than 1,000 new nurses and midwives begin their careers in Queensland public hospitals every single year. The Palaszczuk government is training the health workforce of the future and making sure that our doctors, nurses and other health professionals have the right skills and training pathways. To address the challenges associated with a decentralised state we have developed a number of strategies to guide our efforts in building a sustainable health workforce. These initiatives include: a 10-year statewide health workforce strategy and targeted workforce plans for the rural and remote health workforce; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment participation; the medical practitioner workforce; and the mental health workforce.

The government hosted a medical specialist workforce summit in late 2017 with key stakeholders to prioritise initiatives aimed at addressing issues associated with access to medical specialist services. The first ministerial specialist summit was well received by industry, and we will hold a second summit to evaluate the progress of the initiatives developed and consider additional workforce issues that may affect access to specialist services.

One of the best examples of this government's commitment to the health of Queenslanders is the approach we have taken to manage issues such as legionella. While legionella bacteria can be found in soils and water systems just about anywhere, it is most serious in hospitals, aged-care and healthcare settings where there is a concentration of older people and people suffering suppressed immune systems. That is why it is very important that legionella bacteria are identified in these places quickly and management plans put in place to treat the source and protect patients.

In 2017 the Palaszczuk government introduced new testing and reporting requirements. Queensland now has some of the most stringent water risk management requirements for public and private health facilities in Australia, including mandatory scheduled testing for and reporting of legionella. All Queensland Health hospitals, as well as private health facilities, now have water risk management plans that identify the hazards associated with their water systems, assess the risks and show how these risks must be managed to ensure the safety of patients and staff within each facility. All facilities are required to report legionella water sample results to the Chief Health Officer, including what action they have taken and will take to manage it. Those measures have been incredibly effective.

Since those new laws there have been no hospital associated cases of either legionnaire's disease or Pontiac fever in Queensland. In 2017 and to date in 2018 there were 112 cases of legionella related diseases reported in Queensland. Fifty-eight were water associated while 52 were from soil or potting mix. I repeat: none were hospital associated. Since the commencement of the Palaszczuk government's tough new laws there have been 39 written advisory/warning letters sent to 17 facilities out of a total of approximately 270 regulated facilities. All related to minor infringements of reporting time frames and required no further action.

Merrimac State High School, World Robot Summit

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.51 am): The Palaszczuk government is determined to ensure our young people develop the skills they need to fill the jobs of the future. That is why the Premier will be holding the skills summit at the end of the month, to meet with industry leaders so we can ensure we have the skilled workers for a global economy.

Robotics and coding are industries of the future, and it gives me great pleasure to advise the House that Queensland state school students continue to shine brightly on the world stage. I make special mention of Merrimac State High School on the Gold Coast—

Mr Stevens: Hear, hear!

Ms GRACE:—and congratulate it on its recent success at the World Robot Summit in Japan. I hear the member for Mermaid Beach. Having visited the students at the school in August, I was not surprised to hear that they had done so well. Not content with winning the World Robot Summit junior trial competition for robotic programming in Tokyo last year, Merrimac State High sent two teams of coding whiz-kids to Japan again this year, with both teams doing their state and their country proud yet again.

Team 1 had the unenviable task of designing and building their own robot and putting it through an obstacle course. After five days of competition the team was awarded the prize for the best coded and documented solution. Not to be outdone, team 2 took on the schools challenge, where they had to design and develop code to program a humanoid robot to assist student learning. These talented students developed their own extremely lengthy and detailed code to improve literacy and numeracy in the early years. For their efforts they were also given the award for outstanding code and documentation.

Mr Stevens: Congratulations to Mr Tobin.

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach congratulating them.

I am told that their coding was so complex and impressive that their efforts were recognised with a special award from the Japanese Society for Artificial Intelligence. They were also the talk of the SoftBank Corporation, the inventors of Pepper robot, when I met with them recently in Tokyo. They were blown away by what those students had done. They are now working with us here in Queensland to develop coding for Pepper to be used more fully as an educational tool in schools not only here in Queensland but also in Japan. We are progressing that. The students' success is not only a tribute to everyone at Merrimac; it is also a testament—

Mr Stevens: And the local member.

Ms GRACE:—to the support this government provides to my department's STEM team through the provision of Pepper robots and expert technical advice. I am not taking all of the interjections from the member for Mermaid Beach!

Queensland state schools are the beneficiaries of this government's commitment to coding and robotics, improving digital literacy of students through our \$660,000 robotics for the future lending library, which has enabled 65 state schools across Queensland to provide opportunities for their students to code humanoid robots in their classroom. There was no better example of this on display than when the Premier and I attended the official opening of the new \$34 million Baringa State Primary School in Caloundra, where Pepper, coded by those young state school students, welcomed the Premier and me to the event.

Building and Asset Services; Dollars and Sense Program

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (9.55 am): Ensuring Queenslanders have the necessary skills and training to find meaningful work is a key driver of this government. It is also a key driver of the state government's in-house apprenticeship program, because we want to make sure we are investing in the right training for all Queenslanders to take advantage of jobs now and into the future. That is why we restored the Building and Asset Services apprenticeship program after the LNP ruthlessly scrapped the QBuild apprenticeship program. Our program is already creating jobs for young people right across Queensland. Off the back of this success, we are about to do it again.

Today we opened applications for a second tranche of Queenslanders who want to build careers with us as carpenters, plumbers, painters, electricians and refrigeration mechanics. In addition to that, 40 new tradespeople will be hired to keep on rebuilding Building and Asset Services. These 40 tradespeople will include a range of trades. Additionally, they will link in with the Premier's program to provide employment opportunities for our veterans. Places will be made available within our team for ex-service men and women, just like Invictus athlete and former Queensland government employee Tony Sten, who was sacked by the Newman government.

Ensuring Queenslanders are provided with outstanding skills and training is not just an issue for prospective employees. It is also important that Queenslanders who are seeking a home in the rental market are provided with the skills to be good tenants. That is why this morning I launched the \$8.2 million Dollars and Sense program. This very important program will be rolled out across the state. It will help more than 17,000 young Queenslanders who are finding it tough to secure or maintain a private rental property. Tenancy training will help us alleviate some of the key concerns property investors have expressed during our Open Doors to Renting Reform consultation process, which incidentally closes at the end of this month.

Mum-and-dad investors are playing a crucial role in Queensland, helping the rental market meet increasing demand for homes in our towns and cities. The competition for private rental homes unfortunately can often marginalise young people and other at-risk groups in our community. This program means one less thing for investors to worry about, if they know that they are handing the keys to their investment to people who are qualified to manage their own private tenancy. As the Premier always says, when Queenslanders work together we all do better.

Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance; Agricultural Workforce Network

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (9.57 am): I am pleased to report that regional employment will be further strengthened with the Queensland government locking in agreements with the Queensland Farmers' Federation and five other industry organisations to continue the Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance and the Queensland Agricultural Workforce Network. We have committed \$3 million in the state budget over the next three years to keep these programs active. They have already helped to facilitate hundreds of job and training outcomes.

The Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance and the Queensland Agricultural Workforce Network initiatives were developed in conjunction with Queensland's peak bodies to help agribusinesses attract, develop and retain skilled workers. Coordinated by the QFF, the Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance brings together multiple agricultural industry stakeholders to deliver a collective approach to workforce planning and development, skills and education. The Queensland Agricultural Workforce Network comprises six regionally based agricultural workforce officers employed by industry bodies. They work with farmers, industry groups and supply chain businesses to address recruitment and skilling needs. These workforce officers support producers and related businesses across all sectors—from beef to bananas, sugar to sheep, agronomy to irrigation. In the first two years of operation they have made contact with more than 8,000 farm business owners and employees and more than 6,000 potential new employees.

These workforce officers have also influenced more than 1,300 positive employment and training outcomes and the continuation of the RJSA and the QAWN will help agribusinesses to attract, develop and retain skilled workers. We are committed to driving employment in rural and regional Queensland. A healthy jobs market in the agricultural sector is essential for maintaining the vitality of the industry and local communities. Through programs such as the Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance and the Queensland Agriculture Workforce Network, we are ensuring employers have the best available information to help them attract and employ people with the right skills and experience for the task at hand.

RoadTek, Skills and Training

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.59 am): We on this side of the House take our responsibility very seriously to ensure the next generation of workers have the skills they need to provide the services Queenslanders deserve and have a right to expect. We also want to ensure that young people are given opportunities to participate and prosper in our growing economy and acquire the workplace knowledge that they will need to serve the public in the decades to come. I am proud to say that my department has a number of key initiatives which build on the skills and capability of our workforce. A wide range of apprentices, trainees, graduates, interns and cadets are currently engaged throughout Transport and Main Roads.

In RoadTek we currently have 16 apprentices, eight cadets, two graduates, two interns and 89 trainees. That is 117 young people across RoadTek operations actively engaged in training. Of these, 100 are gaining skills in civil construction, 15 are working in the electrical, mechanical and plant operator trades and two are in business operations. In addition, I am sure everyone in the House is pleased to support RoadTek's dedicated Indigenous trainee program. This program was established formally in April this year as part of a wider commitment to the Commonwealth Games Reconciliation Action Plan. Presently, we have nine Indigenous trainees who are completing their certificate II in construction.

In terms of building capability of our workforce, I am proud to acknowledge the Women in Construction initiative being delivered through my department. This initiative seeks to address the fact that women are underrepresented in the construction sector. To address the challenge, RoadTek consulted with the industry to work on a different approach to attracting female workers into the construction industry. The Women in Construction initiative consists of a four-week induction and training phase followed by a 10-month placement within RoadTek and is targeted at increasing the number of women working in entry-level construction roles. Run as a pilot program in September 2017, RoadTek now has five women currently in this program within our Brisbane operations team. A second program started in February this year with nine women. These training programs are providing career opportunities for young Queenslanders, broadening the diversity of the RoadTek workforce and ensuring a new generation of workers are ready to keep Queensland moving now and into the future.

Fire and Emergency Services, Skills

 **Hon. CD CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (10.02 am): In the last 12 months I have had the good fortune to visit more than 60 electorates across Queensland spending time in urban, remote and regional areas. From the New South Wales border to Mornington Island and of course my own Far North Queensland electorate of Barron River, I have had the opportunity to meet and greet and shake many hands and chat with hundreds of Queensland Fire and Emergency Services staff and volunteers, and there are a lot of them. The vast majority of them are full-time or part-time. They have families. They volunteer in a number of roles that involve study and various hobbies and I thank them very much for their commitment.

In talking with our staff and volunteers, the one thing that truly connects them is their desire to give back to their communities. Every individual brings their own set of skills to their volunteering. They might be an accountant or a schoolteacher. They might be a scientist who volunteers their time with the QFES scientific team to identify hazardous and biological materials, and every single person gets to add those skills through the experience and training they get. Practical skills range from learning how to perform CPR and apply first aid to four-wheel-driving operations, chainsaw operations, drone operations and the list goes on. Grant writing, water rescue, water safety, fundraising and medical transfers can also be thrown into the mix.

There are those other less specific skills that we pick up along the way like team building, leadership and the confidence that comes with being competent in all of these areas. There are skills and training that will feed into volunteers' everyday lives both at work and at home. It could lead to a new job, a promotion or maybe a career change. We are recognising the work of our volunteers and working with them currently to ensure that we are meeting their needs through the QFES Volunteerism Strategy launched in October this year, and already I have met with dozens of our personnel from the Brisbane North area at Redcliffe and the Toowoomba regions about this new strategy. In the coming weeks we will be visiting Rockhampton, Townsville, the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast, Ipswich and Wide Bay before heading up to Cairns to consult our volunteers and our staff about how we can continue to best serve them under this government strategy.

Before I finish speaking about skills, I received a brief this morning that overnight a crew from Camp Hill attended an incident at Morningside where a small Chihuahua puppy called Raven was stuck down the back of a recliner in the mechanism. I am informed that the Camp Hill crew, led by firefighter Keith Hansen, managed to remove the puppy from the back of the chair. Unfortunately, there were no signs of life and thinking that the puppy was deceased, using the skills that our crew had, they started a resus and they were successful. They used oxygen equipment as well as all of their best puppy resus skills, which is something we do not actually teach them at the academy! They brought Raven back to life. I am advised that they also transported Raven to a 24-hour vet in their Scania Pumper, which again is something that is not normally done. A big cheerio to our crews for a fantastic job well done.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, we need a puppy story every day to bring the parliament together.

Migrants and Refugees, Skills

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.06 am): I am so pleased to hear the good news about Raven. Queensland's migrant and refugee communities make a tremendous contribution to this great state, and not just in social and cultural terms but also economically. As multicultural affairs minister, I am working closely with all stakeholders to maximise the economic contribution Queenslanders make from a diverse background.

As mentioned by the Premier, a landmark report released by Deloitte Access Economics last week found the Queensland economy could benefit from a boost of \$250 million in the next decade if the skills and experience of migrants and refugees are recognised. This report, titled *Seizing the opportunity: making the most of the skills and experience of migrants and refugees*, is a call to action for government, industry and community. It will be one of the important issues discussed at the Skills and Industry Summit being convened by the Premier at the end of this month. Queensland is the land of opportunity and our opportunity is to realise the full potential of migrants and refugees by recognising their skills and educational qualifications. By doing this, we will not only help individuals to progress but we will boost the Queensland economy.

The report shows almost 50 per cent of all skilled migrants are not using their skills or experience that they gained before arriving in Australia. In Queensland alone, as I said, this could add \$250 million to the state's economy over the next decade. As my colleague the Minister for Training and Skills Development has said, the iconic Australian value of having a fair go starts at getting a job and being a part of the economy in this great state. The Deloitte report contains the firsthand evidence of the potential to cost the Queensland economy, including the more than 6,200 skilled migrants and refugees who have qualifications which align with current skills shortages. The Palaszczuk government will continue to build on the good work already happening to ensure migrants and refugees can access even better employment opportunities while helping to boost Queensland's economy. As I often say, we need to make sure that every part of Queensland is a place where Queenslanders belong and our economy needs to be no different.

MOTION

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

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.08 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee inquire into aged care, end-of-life and palliative care and report to the Legislative Assembly on:
 - (a) the delivery of aged care, end-of-life and palliative care in Queensland across the health and ageing service systems; and
 - (b) Queensland community and relevant health practitioners views on the desirability of supporting voluntary assisted dying, including provisions for it being legislated in Queensland and any necessary safeguards to protect vulnerable persons.
2. That in undertaking the inquiry, the committee should consider:
 - (a) in relation to aged care, the terms of reference and submissions made to the Australian Government's Royal Commission into the Quality and Safety of Aged Care and, in recognising the commission will occur in parallel, how to proactively work with the commission to ensure an appropriate exchange of information to inform the conduct of the inquiry;
 - (b) outcomes of recent reviews and work including Queensland Health's Palliative Care Services Review; and
 - (c) the current legal framework, relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories and overseas jurisdictions, including the Victorian government's Inquiry into end-of-life choices, Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017 (Vic) and implementation of the associated reforms.
3. That the committee report to the Legislative Assembly by 30 November 2019.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE

Report

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (10.10 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 16 of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee titled *Subordinate legislation tabled between 22 August and 4 September 2018*. This report examines two important pieces of subordinate legislation that will improve health services for the people of Queensland.

The Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2018 delays a number of uncommenced provisions of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2017. They include provisions for the registration of paramedics—something that I am very proud to see in this state—and for the recognition of nursing and midwifery as separate health professions. It was necessary to delay these provisions because the COAG Health Council had not made the necessary national law regulation.

However, the COAG Health Council has now made the regulation and the participation day for the state's very patient and hardworking paramedics to register with the new Paramedicine Board of Australia 1 December 2018 as planned. This will be an important day for recognition in this state of the professionalism of our paramedics, who provide critical and life-saving care to patients in emergencies.

The other regulation we examined in our report was the Public Health (Medicinal Cannabis) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2018. This regulation expands patient access to medicinal cannabis. The committee found no issues with these regulations and I commend our report to the House.

Tabled paper: Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 16, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 22 August and 4 September 2018 [[1884](#)].

TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Report

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (10.11 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 14 of the Transport and Public Works Committee titled *Review of Auditor-General's report No. 4: 2017-18—integrated transport planning*. The report details the committee's consideration of the Auditor-General's performance audit report into integrated transport planning. The Auditor-General's report was tabled in December 2017 and referred to the committee in March 2018.

The committee is satisfied that the Department of Transport and Main Roads is working towards the implementation of the audit recommendations and the committee will continue to monitor the issues raised in the report. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 14, 56th Parliament—Review of Auditor-General's Report No. 4: 2017-18—Integrated Transport Planning [[1885](#)].

NOTICE OF MOTION

Shark Control Program, Inquiry

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (10.13 am): I give notice that I will move—

1. That the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee inquire into the Queensland shark control program and report to the Legislative Assembly by 16 May 2019.
2. In conducting the inquiry, the committee should specifically consider:
 - (a) the effectiveness of the existing program, which has been in place since 1962, to protect community safety;
 - (b) existing locations that are monitored under the program and whether this should be expanded to other key tourism areas like the Whitsundays;
 - (c) the use of existing equipment, such as nets and drum lines, and consideration of alternative devices to protect human life and other marine life;
 - (d) research and expert advice into shark population growth and breeding patterns;

- (e) resourcing needed to enhance the existing program;
 - (f) the Palaszczuk government's response to initial shark attacks in Cid Harbour to install drum lines and the consequent failure to do so after a fatal attack; and
 - (g) the cause of the reduction in shark numbers caught between 2015-16 and 2018-19 and the impact of this reduction on shark numbers on the Queensland coast.
3. In conducting the inquiry, the committee should have regard to international best practice of mitigating the risk of shark attacks and any previous Queensland coronial investigations or inquiries into shark related fatalities.
 4. The committee should also consider the impact of shark attacks on Queensland's domestic and international tourism reputation, noting that the industry provides almost \$13 billion to Queensland's gross state product and sustains almost 220,000 local jobs.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, question time will conclude today at 11.14 am.

Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (10.14 am): My first question without notice is to the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations. I refer the minister to the planned Queensland Teachers' Union strike during class time that will inconvenience parents and reduce valuable learning time for our children. Will the minister put our children's education first and stop this politically motivated and illegal strike?

Ms GRACE: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Let me tell her that I am not surprised. I have a number of notes in relation to this issue. Once again, the *Courier-Mail* reports something, the backbenchers opposite say, 'It's in the *Courier-Mail*' and it is the first question. They have a lack of any questions at all to ask. They open the *Courier-Mail* and this issue becomes the first question. I honestly thank—

Opposition members interjected..

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Toowoomba South and member for Gympie, you were interjecting. I ask you to cease your interjections principally for the purpose that I cannot hear the minister's response.

Ms GRACE: I honestly thank the member for the question. I am currently advised—and I spoke to Kevin Bates, the president of the QTU, this morning—

Mrs Frecklington: I'm certain you did.

Ms GRACE: I talk to the QTU. I talk to the union movement. Unlike those opposite, as the department affected by possible action, I talk to the union involved in the matter. When you hear of a possible action taking place, it is the first thing you do—but then, of course, those opposite have no idea about industrial relations. Let us face it: they have the member for Kawana as the shadow industrial relations minister. I rest my case. I have heard that this is a matter that will affect only a handful of students—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members for Coomera, Ninderry, Moggill and Glass House, you are all warned under the standing orders. Your interjections are designed to disrupt. You may not like the answer that the minister is giving, but the minister is answering the question.

Ms GRACE: I think they are getting a bit nervous about a question asked about an issue in the *Courier-Mail*. Only a handful of schools are participating in the action. Although this government supports the cause, it would be our preference that any action is taken in teachers' own time.

From what I understand, this is the last week of year 12. This action is talked about occurring next week, so it is not going to affect those students. In relation to the action—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms GRACE: If the Leader of the Opposition cares to listen for one second, I can say that the action is programmed to take place at 2.30. Most of the schools finish at 2.30. Some of them may go to three. This action is affecting only high schools—if any. I guarantee the Leader of the Opposition that no student's learning is going to be affected by this action. I see the crocodile tears for the poor students. I guarantee the Leader of the Opposition 100 per cent that not one of those student's learning will be affected.

When it comes to education in this state, we will be the shining star. Talk about union bashing hysteria! Here is another question about union bashing in education. Well done!

Mr SPEAKER: Minister—and this goes for all ministers answering questions today—you will put your comments through the chair and not direct your comments directly to those opposite.

Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My next question is to the Premier.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I give a general warning also to members to my right that questions will be heard in silence. It is a courtesy that I have asked be afforded to all questioners during question time. Please start your question again.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My next question is to the Premier. Given the education minister's support of the Queensland Council of Unions' program to teach students about activism and holding snap rallies and now the education minister's refusal to stop the Queensland Teachers' Union—

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That question is misleading. It is not correct. I take offence and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, the minister has taken personal offence to the question being asked.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! This is not a schoolyard. I ask that you rephrase your question. I will allow you an opportunity to re-ask that question.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you. I will rephrase the question to the Premier. Given the education minister's support of the Queensland Council of Unions' program to teach students about activism—

Ms GRACE: I rise to a point of order.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I will hear the point of order.

Ms GRACE: The member is misleading the House. I have no support for activism. I take offence. I ask that it be withdrawn. Keep going and I will continue to do it.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, when I am receiving advice from the table I expect you to sit in silence and wait for that advice to be given so I can make a ruling. It is not an opportunity for cross-chamber attacks.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. The program to which the opposition leader refers was announced by the Queensland Council of Unions. That afternoon the minister publicly stated, 'This is a great program.' How can the minister now find offence—

Mr SPEAKER: That is not a matter of privilege suddenly arising; it is a statement. Member for Kawana, you are making a statement now. If you have a matter of privilege and you believe that there is a matter of privilege I need to consider, I would encourage you to write to me with that and not make a statement in the House. Leader of the Opposition, I have afforded you an opportunity to ask this question again. I think you are able to determine which parts may have been personally offensive to the minister. You can put your question without a preamble to the Premier. The minister has found that question personally offensive and I ask you to withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. My question is to the Premier. Given the education minister's support for the Queensland Council of Unions' program—

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I am ruling the question out of order. I have provided you guidance.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

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

Mr SPEAKER: Please resume your seat. I am making a ruling, member for Glass House. Leader of the Opposition, I have offered you an opportunity to rephrase your question and I asked you specifically to ask the question without the preamble.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: With respect, I had not got to the bit about teaching students about activism. I was going to take that out. If that is the bit that offends the minister I will withdraw that from my question and put the question to the Premier: will the Premier intervene to put kids' education before union activism in our schools?

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I have made a ruling and I believe it is quite clear, on repeating the question, allowing you to ask the question twice, which components the minister found personally offensive. You have withdrawn those and I thank you for that. However, I specifically asked that the question be asked without preamble and specifically asked of the Premier, which you chose not to do. I rule the question out of order.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I wonder if you could give us a clarification on standing order 115 where you have made rulings before about the entire question being heard before a point of order is raised as we just saw. I wonder if you would clarify that for the House, please.

Mr SPEAKER: The point of order that has been raised by the member for Surfers Paradise I am very happy to explain. I think it is a relevant point of order. My preference would be to hear the questions in their entirety so that we can all understand the full context of a question. However, that does not change a component of a question which a member finds personally offensive which they are able to rise and take offence to and ask to be withdrawn. All of those matters are allowable under the standing orders. I hope that provides clarity for members, going forward.

State Schools, Skills

Ms LINARD: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the minister update the House on the Palaszczuk government's commitment to delivering school infrastructure and skilling today's students for tomorrow's jobs?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Nudgee for that very important question. We know how important it is to continue to build the infrastructure that is needed for our students right across our state. We have an infrastructure fund of over \$800 million looking specifically at that. My government has been delivering the brand new schools that our students need, making sure that they are teaching modern issues like coding and robotics that are needed for the jobs of the future. I want to echo the Minister for Education's statement this morning about how well our students are doing on the global stage when it comes to world robotics and coding championships. They are getting these skills at such an early age under our Queensland education system which is not happening in many other education systems across the world, let alone across the nation.

Yesterday the Minister for Education and I were more than happy to go to the site of the old Fortitude Valley State Primary School. That site was earmarked by those opposite when they were in government to close. The 'for sale' sign was up at that school. They wanted to sell it off to the highest bidder, but my government decided, no, we were going to keep that land, utilise that existing school and for the first time in Queensland's history we will build an inner city vertical school linking with QUT.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are going to give those students the great opportunity to link with a world recognised university. They will be able to utilise the programs that the university offers at an early stage. This is a Queensland first.

Ms Jones: World class!

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is world class. I take that interjection. I want to make sure that we continue to partner with our universities across the state to give our students the best, brightest future possible.

I want to emphasise to the House why this future of work skills summit is important. We are facing global change. In Canberra they do not want to face up to global change. In Queensland we are prepared to provide the leadership to face up to the changes that the world economy is undergoing. That is why we will make sure that our children get those skills. It is absolutely important that they are

prepared for the workforce of tomorrow. We know that the workforce of tomorrow will be completely different to the workforce that we know of today. That is why we will continue to build skills utilising new technology. We will make sure that our children get the right knowledge and skills for the jobs. We will be talking with industry—

(Time expired)

Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. Given the education minister's refusal to stop the Queensland Teachers' Union planned illegal and politically motivated strike, will the Premier intervene to put kids' education before union activism in our schools?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Everton for that question. Obviously the member for Everton was not listening to the Minister for Education when she rose in this House and addressed this issue.

Ms Trad: They don't listen.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Of course they don't listen. The key point, as the minister has said, is that the preference is that the teachers undertake—

Mrs Frecklington: That is the preference. So what are you doing about it?

Ms PALASZCZUK: So rude.

Ms Simpson: Multiple choice?

Ms PALASZCZUK: They are so rude. It is not only the minister's view but also my strong view that classes are not disrupted. I believe that people in our state are entitled to their strong, passionate—

Mr Mander: It is entirely inappropriate.

Ms Jones interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you have asked a question and I expect to hear the answer. I believe that the Premier is being responsive. You are warned under the standing orders for a very loud and uncalled for interjection. Minister for Tourism, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Everton talks about inappropriate. I will tell the House what is inappropriate: when you have a go at a long-serving staff member in this House, when you attack a long-serving staff member who is retiring—

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—that is inappropriate.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, resume your seat.

Mr MANDER: I take that comment as personally offensive and I ask her to withdraw.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my right! Premier, the member has asked that you withdraw those comments.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I withdraw. Secondly, what is inappropriate is attacking the Deputy Premier of this state in this House with no apology. That is inappropriate. We are still waiting for that. They all laughed about that.

A government member: Swearing on the Bible when you are not telling the truth.

Ms PALASZCZUK: What is also inappropriate is swearing on the Bible and we you know what happened there. That is the member for Everton's track record. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition cannot be trusted in this House.

Getting back to the issue at hand in terms of students, as the minister said she spoke to the QTU, which is something that this government does. We speak to stakeholders. We engage with stakeholders. We listen to stakeholders.

Ms Grace interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; I take that interjection. They do not know from day one to day two if they support the QTU or they do not. As I said before and I will say again, people in this state are allowed to have strong views and passionate views. That is the sort of Queensland I want.

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; I take that interjection. We do not gag them or cut their funding, especially not to organisations such as Foodbank. The Minister for Education's strong view and my strong view is that this does not occur during school hours.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling for the next question, member for Maryborough and member for Theodore, you are both warned under the standing orders. It is not appropriate to have cross-chamber quarrels.

Defence Industries, Jobs

Mrs MULLEN: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on the Queensland government's investment in defence industries and the jobs and skills they bring to Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Jordan for the question. Of course, we know that through the hard work of my government in partnership with Rheinmetall, Rheinmetall has chosen to locate its headquarters here in Queensland. That presents Queenslanders with an enormous opportunity for long-term, secure and highly skilled jobs in this state.

Last night I had the honour of attending my local high school, Glenala State High School, for their awards night. During the Newman government when I went to that high school in Inala for their awards night, the children on stage would say that they just wanted a job. Now they know that under my government they can achieve and they can dream big. They can think about the types of jobs they want to get into and now they have plenty of opportunities, whether it is in tourism, defence, hospitality, aviation. In the whole precinct from the Ipswich corridor and down the south-west into the inner city in Brisbane, there will be huge opportunity for young students to get jobs in the defence industries.

Today in the House I am very pleased to announce that this Friday the Minister for State Development and I will be attending the turning of the sod for Rheinmetall's Centre of Excellence. I repeat: this Friday work will be underway to build the Centre of Excellence for Rheinmetall in this state. I am incredibly proud of that. We will also be inviting Rheinmetall to our skills summit, because we want to get to the bottom of all of the different skills combinations that Rheinmetall needs in the supply chain for its defence industry contract. Because of securing that contract, we hope that Queensland is well positioned to get even more contracts into the future, right across the state.

I thank Rheinmetall for engaging with the local community. The Centre of Excellence will mean 300 construction jobs and 450 highly skilled operational jobs over the next decade. The supply chain will mean thousands of more jobs. It will contribute \$1 billion to the Queensland economy over 10 years. As I said, that is about the highly skilled jobs of the future. They are the types of jobs that mean we need to get the training into our high schools and our TAFEs now, to take advantage of that opportunity. I am very pleased to be joining the Minister for State Development, as well as local members from around Ipswich, for that very significant event to be held this Friday.

Queensland Teachers' Union, Strike

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education. This year, the QTU wanted to put CFMEU flags in our schools. On 19 July, the education minister said, with respect to the QCU Young Workers Hub, 'I think this is a great initiative of the QCU.' I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 19 July 2018, titled 'Unionists educate Queensland school students on workplace rights' [\[1889\]](#).

Will the minister use her power under the Industrial Relations Act 2016 to order the Queensland Teachers' Union to stop its illegal and politically motivated strike?

Ms GRACE: I thank the honourable member for the question. When it comes to lectures about industrial relations and what I should or should not do, I will not be taking them from you, let me tell you.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms GRACE: I will not be taking them from the member for Kawana; I am sorry, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for anticipating what I was going to say, Minister.

Ms GRACE: I will not be taking any lecture or advice from the member for Kawana in relation to that matter. When it comes to flying the Eureka Stockade flag in schools, they were little stickers no bigger than an inch square. They were stickers. Of course, again we have *Courier-Mail* led hysteria and union bashing. Yesterday, in the House the first question they asked the Premier was whether the QTU supported their air-conditioning plan. Yesterday, the QTU was the flavour of the day, because yesterday they liked what the QTU was saying. Today, they come in here asking about an action—that I think we all support—to bring the children home from Nauru. Those educators feel very passionately about the wellbeing of and support for children. I am led to believe that they have joined 350 other organisations throughout Australia in calling for the children of Nauru to come to Australia.

As educators and feeling very passionately about this, they have decided that, if the federal government does not bring the children home by a particular date, they will join 350 other organisations in taking action throughout Australia. We support their cause. As the Premier and I have said before, there will be no disruption to students.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms GRACE: If they would just listen, I will make very clear what will be happening.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I had not wanted to disrupt the minister, because that is what the interjections were designed to do. The member for Nicklin and the member for Buderim are warned under the standing orders.

Ms GRACE: My understanding is that only a handful of schools will be participating at any time. The action will start in the majority of teachers' own time, after 2.30. Should it happen earlier for those students who possibly leave at three o'clock—and this is only in high schools—there will be mitigating factors put in place and no student will be disrupted.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118, on relevance. I asked whether the minister would use her specific powers in the act to stop this illegal activity.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. I have been listening to the minister's response. I believe she is being responsive to the question asked. She has nearly 30 seconds left on the clock to round out her answer.

Ms GRACE: As I said, Mr Speaker, I will not be taking advice from the member for Kawana in relation to what I should or should not do. There will be minimal disruption. Everyone opposite should just calm down, take a cold shower. It is all right. We understand about the union bashing. I get the point. Calm down it is all right. It is not as bad as you think. It is interesting that nothing was said—

(Time expired)

Distribution of GST

Mr RUSSO: My question is of the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Will the Deputy Premier provide an update on the Commonwealth funding for Queensland and any alternative proposals for how the Commonwealth government can support Queensland?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Toohey for the question. Of course, the member for Toohey and all government members are keenly interested in making sure that the Commonwealth government gives Queensland our fair share of federal funding. We have a lot to be concerned about with regard to the Morrison federal government. We were worried under the Turnbull federal government when Scott Morrison was the Treasurer and now that he is the Prime Minister we are equally worried. We are even more worried.

We know that Queensland hospitals are likely to be hundreds of millions of dollars worse off under the Morrison government. We also know that in terms of funding for remote Indigenous housing that that money from the Commonwealth is no longer forthcoming. We also know when it comes to early education funding that that government just continues to roll over an annual national partnership agreement without any additional funding and without any permanency. That is a disgrace.

In the federal Senate right now there is a debate going on about GST funding across the Commonwealth. Can I note that the only reason Queensland will not be worse off under the new GST distribution formula is that the Palaszczuk Labor government and all states and territories stood up to the federal government and said, 'We will take you on at the next federal election and we will get amendments passed in the federal Senate unless you guarantee us our fair share.'

What did we hear from those opposite? We heard absolutely nothing. Worst of all, I think, is that the Morrison federal government has decided to slash funding for traineeships and apprenticeships in Queensland. We know that Queensland will be up to \$70 million worse off. I do not understand this because this is inconsistent with their own commitment to learning on the job. We know that the federal Treasurer has been learning on the job for a long period of time. We know that he even gets promoted when he does not even pass his competency.

He set up the NAIF. How much money has that distributed to Queensland businesses? Nothing. He led the NEG debate and the NEG negotiations and that was a spectacular failure. Even to his own surprise he got promoted to the role of federal Treasurer. Now he has announced the Australian Business Securitisation Fund—\$2 billion for small and medium businesses. If it is based on the NAIF then I am sure it is going to be a failure. This government is not to be trusted in giving Queensland its fair share.

(Time expired)

Schoolies, Meningococcal B Vaccination Program

Ms BATES: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's comment yesterday, 'It will be a rare day that I adopted any LNP policy,' and the health warning today to schoolies to get a meningococcal B vaccine. Will the Premier put politics aside and adopt the LNP's plan for a targeted meningococcal B vaccination program to keep Queensland schoolies safe?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. The Minister for Health has advised me that the federal government looked at this twice and was advised not to do it. The last time I looked—it may not be for much longer—the federal government was LNP; just checking. That is the advice that I have received.

Whilst I am on my feet, I wish all year 12s all the best as they complete their school year. I wish them all the very best for the future. I urge those students going to schoolies to be safe, to take care and to listen to the authorities. I wish them success in the future.

Industry Development

Ms HOWARD: My question is of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister please update the House on what new industries are being developed under this government? Is the minister aware of any other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Ipswich for her question and for her ongoing commitment to driving opportunities in her community through diversified and new industries. All Queenslanders love it when Queensland beats New South Wales. Just last week in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* we read the complaint about red tape holding Sydney back. The paper stated—

Major developments can take up to four years to get off the ground compared to north of the border where projects take just a few months in Queensland.

What did Meriton founder and one of the biggest property developers in Australia, Harry Triguboff, say about Queensland? He said—

They know that development means income for their government and jobs for their people.

New South Wales knows what the Queensland LNP cannot understand. That is that the Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job, delivering new industries and new opportunities for our state. It was Labor that built the LNG industry in this state. It is Labor that is building the industries of the future.

We heard this morning about the future of advanced manufacturing, as articulated by the Premier. Our road maps are developing opportunities in defence, biofuels, renewable energy, hydrogen, biotech, aerospace and the space industry itself. Recycling is being driven by the new container refund scheme.

When it comes to recycling, it appears the only thing the LNP is interested in in terms of the recycling industry is recycling Donald Trump tweets. Following the Democrat victory in the congressional elections Donald Trump tweeted, 'Tremendous success tonight. Thank you to all!' Who pressed 'like' on Donald Trump's tweet. It was @ LNPQLD. That was fresh off their tremendous success in the by-elections in Longman and Wentworth.

One industry where the LNP does have market dominance is in 'give the job to the bloke' industry. They need more women in parliament, but they have no quotas—a sure sign another woman is going to be dumped. What did we see this week? Felicity Wilson, the New South Wales LNP member for the seat of North Shore, was targeted by the blokes. In her third trimester of pregnancy she held her preselection by one vote—101 to 100—on the back of support from the New South Wales Premier. She had to intervene to save a woman. What did we see last night? We saw four blokes in this parliament from the LNP, led by the deputy leader, attack the member for Mount Ommaney. They underestimate the strength and courage of the member for Mount Ommaney.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DICK: And well might the deputy leader over there complain because he is threatened by strong women.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Coomera, you are already under a warning. Under standing order 253A you will leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Coomera withdrew from the chamber at 10.48 am.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs, I did not want to interrupt previous speakers. You are warned under the standing orders. Member for Kawana, you have made repeated interjections this morning after I have given you some subtle hints. You are warned under the standing orders.

Transmax

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. I table a copy of a letter from an employee and whistleblower sent to the Premier on 26 September 2018.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 26 September 2018, from an employee of Transmax Pty Ltd to the Premier and Minister for Trade, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk, regarding workplace concerns [\[1890\]](#).

It contains serious allegations about unsafe work practices, wage theft, fraud, corrupt conduct, nepotism, cronyism and unethical behaviour happening at Transmax, which is part of the Palaszczuk government. Can the minister explain why he has delayed taking action on these matters?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not familiar with the contents of the letter. I am happy to peruse those. Let me be very clear: if there is any substantial evidence that there is anything untoward, there are clear processes, and I will not hesitate to make sure that those processes are implemented if that is the case. That said, I am happy to look at the letter presented by the member and report back to the House.

Tourism Industry

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister please update the House on the success of Queensland's tourism industry?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. There has been a lot of big news in the tourism industry here today. On the front page of the *Cairns Post* today there is big news about me as the minister signing off on funding to grow the number of flights between New Zealand and Cairns which will be a mega win for that community and inject millions of dollars into the Cairns economy. I thank the honourable member for Cairns and other members from Far North Queensland for their advocacy to make sure that we continue to deliver new flights into Cairns. We know that more flights is a big win for any community.

We have also heard great news—about something that is close to our heart—about the unveiling of the Big Melon in Chinchilla. They are getting the big watermelon ready and it is being unveiled today. I acknowledge Paul McVeigh and the Western Downs Regional Council for their vision in having the big watermelon unveiled today ahead of the melon festival in February next year.

We know that no matter where you go in Queensland you can see big things. You can go to the Sunshine Coast to see the Big Pineapple. You can go to Bowen to see the Big Mango—I was there with the federal member, who is not as big as he was. You can go to Noosaville to see the Big Pelican and Gayndah to see the Big Orange. Of course, the honourable member for Rockhampton knows that when you go to Rocky the first thing you see is the Big Bull. You can go to Gladstone to see the Big Crab.

They have the Big Melon all lined up for the big festival next year, but we are waiting to see whether the member for Broadwater is going to make his big move, whether next year the Leader of the Opposition will be still sitting in the big chair when we all come back after our big break.

Mr Dick: He's got his big billboard up.

Ms JONES: He has his big billboard up. We know that he ditched the people of Townsville for his big move right down to the other end of Queensland.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Ms JONES: What is he saying? We know he has a big mouth, but does he have enough to make the big move? We all know that he wants to be the big kahuna in this House. That is what we know. He is doing the numbers behind the scenes. Is his list quite big enough yet? We will wait to see.

My challenge to those opposite is: will we see the Leader of the Opposition in the big chair when we come back from the big break? My money is on the member for Broadwater making the big move. They are not happy with the polling. They know it is going in one direction. They know it is going backwards. In reality, the boys are a bit of a drag on poor Deb's ticket unfortunately. Watch your back, honourable Leader of the Opposition, because the man from Broadwater is coming for you.

(Time expired)

Police Service, Annual Statistical Review

Mr WATTS: My question without notice is to the Premier. On 18 October the police minister said that he was 'very proud' that he had delivered on an election commitment to publish an independently produced Police Service annual statistical review. Today it is reported that the police minister refuses to release the statistics this year.

Mr Hunt: That's embarrassing.

Mr WATTS: I ask the Premier to explain this clear failure to deliver on an election commitment.

Mr SPEAKER: Who said, 'That's embarrassing'?

Mr Hunt: I did.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin, you are already under a warning. I asked for silence during questions. You can leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Nicklin withdrew from the chamber at 10.54 am.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. The crime statistics unit has been transferred from the Minister for Police to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer.

Ms Trad: The Government Statistician.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Government Statistician. Because that report is compiled and released independently, I am advised that it will be released next year. It is independent. What we do know about those opposite when they were in government is that they scrapped it. They scrapped it.

Ms Trad: There's crime data out monthly.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes. The police minister knows and those opposite know that is crime statistics data that comes out monthly. I remember very clearly when I sat in the Leader of the Opposition's chair over there that there was no report—zero. There was no report because they axed it. I think they set you up, member for Toowoomba North, with all due respect.

Mr SPEAKER: I remind you to please put your comments through the chair, Premier.

Regional Queensland, Health Services

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline what the Palaszczuk government is doing to deliver more health services in regional Queensland?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Mackay for her very important question. She well knows that Queensland Health is employing more doctors, nurses and health professionals right across this state than ever before. There are nearly 90,000 employees of Queensland Health delivering those services. In a decentralised state like Queensland many of our doctors and nurses will be working independently or working in smaller teams than they might if they worked in a big city. That is why we are training our rural doctors with a broad range of skills. The nation-leading Rural Generalist Pathway—

Mrs Frecklington: Thanks, Lawrence Springborg. It was a great initiative.

Dr MILES: That commenced in 2007—is allowing junior medical officers to fast-track their training as rural generalists, allowing practice-ready rural doctors to gain the skills they need to deliver more and better healthcare services right across this state.

Rural generalists have general skills as general practitioners and in emergency care, but they can also carry specialist skills in things like Indigenous medicine, surgery, obstetrics or anaesthetics. I have seen firsthand how they are allowing us to deliver and expand services in regional and rural Queensland. In fact, people are travelling from around the country—indeed from around the world—to see firsthand how our nation-leading rural generalist pathway is training doctors with the skills that they need to deliver that wider range of services.

The member for Mackay might also be interested to know that our initiatives to deliver more services in the Mackay HHS have been widely praised. In fact, in the *Bowen Independent* today, they were hailed as initiatives that would ‘greatly help with the recovery of local patients’. Was that me who said that? No—it was the member for Mudgeeraba! The member for Mudgeeraba was out there praising our initiatives to expand services at Bowen Hospital. She was backed in by the member for Burdekin, who said it was ‘great news for Bowen and surrounds’. It is great to have the member for Mudgeeraba on board—finally—supporting our initiatives to expand renal services in regional areas. She has finally seen the light. It is good to see her welcoming the initiatives of the Palaszczuk government.

Mr SPEAKER: I think *Hansard* will record that accurately, but it is great to see the parliament coming together.

Waste Levy

Mr CRISAFULLI: My question without notice is to the Minister for Environment. I refer the minister to the commencement of the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Will the minister tell the House when she expects the bill to be brought on for debate and if the waste levy will still come into effect on 4 March 2019?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would ask you to consider whether that is anticipation when there is a bill still before the House.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will seek advice from the table, but my understanding as it relates to anticipation is that it relates to the substance of the bill, not procedural elements in terms of timing. Standing order 113(1)(b) deals with ‘proceedings pending in the Legislative Assembly for which the Minister is responsible (but discussion must not be anticipated)’. However, it is not related to the substance of the bill; it is a procedural question, as I see it. I will allow the question, but if it relates to anticipation again the minister should be careful about the substance of that bill.

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. It is great to see some articulation of concern about waste in this state. I did not see it on his billboard so it is great to see that it is being articulated here in the House. Maybe there are other billboards that are going up in other electorates but it certainly was not on the billboard that I saw.

Ms Trad: He’s got a big concern now.

Ms ENOCH: There is big concern now. Maybe the billboard is not part of the leadership agenda just yet. To make it very clear, this piece of legislation which the member is referring to is on the *Notice Paper*, and it is a matter for the Leader of the House and the government to decide when that will be debated. Can I say that this side of the House, the Palaszczuk government, has been committed to consulting with stakeholders through this whole process, as we do with all legislation. Any debate going forward with regard to the legislation will be based on the best advice, it will be based on consultation with stakeholders and it will be based on science.

We need to remember that the waste levy is part of a broader waste strategy that we are implementing in this state that is being supported by other initiatives like the Containers for Change initiative, which has been a massive success.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on two elements. One, the minister is now clearly anticipating the substance of debate—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right!

Mr BLEIJIE: Secondly, with respect to the procedural question asked, the legislation before the House is due to commence before we come back to parliament having not had the bill passed, so how does the minister answer that question?

Mr SPEAKER: The question that was asked related to when the bill may be considered by the House. I have listened to the minister's response and she has been responsive in terms of the process going forward and the deliberations by the government in terms of the timing of that bill. I would caution the minister: I believe you may be straying into the substance of the bill. Do you have anything further to add, Minister?

Ms ENOCH: Containers for Change is not part of the bill obviously. This is an initiative that has already been introduced in this state on 1 November. Tomorrow will mark two weeks since we began that initiative, and we have seen more than 10 million containers returned under the Containers for Change initiative. That is a massive success for Queensland and an indication of Queenslanders' commitment to recycling and Queenslanders' desire to see less waste go to landfill and more investment in recycling, which is what this government is doing. All of that relates to jobs. I am pleased to see that we have had so much success in a number of activities with regard to reducing landfill. I am hoping to see more billboards from the member for Broadwater supporting these kinds of initiatives.

A government member interjected.

Ms ENOCH: I take that interjection: environmentally friendly billboards as well.

Trainees and Apprentices

Mr HARPER: My question is for the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development. Will the minister outline how the Palaszczuk government is supporting apprentices and trainees and what alternative approaches have been put forward?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Thuringowa for his question. I know what a huge supporter he is of apprentices and trainees in Townsville. It was great recently to inspect the works that are happening at the Pimlico TAFE—another fantastic election initiative by the Palaszczuk government to invest in our TAFEs.

The Palaszczuk government is absolutely committed to supporting our apprentices and trainees. Through our Back to Work program we have seen almost 3,000 apprentices and trainees get jobs in regional Queensland. We are bucking the national trend when it comes to commencements for apprentices and trainees. While the rest of the country has seen a decline in the number of commencements for apprentices and trainees, I am really proud that Queensland has almost a five per cent increase in the number of new apprentices and trainees. It is because of the Palaszczuk government's commitment and the Palaszczuk government's investment in skills and training.

We are having to do this all on our own. We have heard the Deputy Premier and Treasurer today talk about the \$70 million cuts from the federal government which puts 7,000 trainees and apprentices at risk. They are also cutting programs like tools for trade. What sort of government cuts a program that enables first-year apprentices to get their tools to start their first job? It is the same government that makes cuts to Foodbank on the eve before Christmas.

We know that those opposite are cut from the same cloth. The Leader of the Opposition took to the election last year—and I have their costings here—a cut not just to scrap Skilling Queenslanders for Work and Back to Work but also to cut \$20 million from the User Choice program. Let me inform the House: that is the \$200 million program that funds apprentices and trainees in Queensland. I am happy to table the costings document.

Tabled paper: LNP Costings Report—Saving and Reprioritisation Measures [\[1891\]](#).

Tabled paper: Photographs of the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, with workers [\[1892\]](#).

The Leader of the Opposition is happy to take selfies with apprentices and trainees right across Queensland but she will not talk to them while she is there about ripping \$20 million from our apprentices and trainees. The member for Nanango—the Leader of the Opposition—is happy to travel Queensland talking to apprentices and taking selfies but will not tell them about her policy to rip \$20 million out of the funding. What about the shadow spokesperson for training?

Mr Dick: Who is it?

Ms FENTIMAN: The opposition spokesperson for training, the member for Maroochydore, has not even visited a TAFE outside her own electorate. This is a lazy opposition which is cutting funding to apprentices and trainees at a time when business is calling out for investment.

(Time expired)

Sexual and Reproductive Health

Ms BOLTON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. With reference to the contributing factors to unplanned pregnancies and terminations, will the minister please advise what initiatives and subsidies will be introduced to ensure that contraception and women's health services are more affordable and accessible to assist in reducing the number of unplanned pregnancies and terminations within Queensland?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Noosa for her question. It is an important one and one that, frankly, we should discuss more in this place. The same stigma that stops us talking about sexual and reproductive health here is the stigma that stops many people from seeking the advice and services that they need in the community. I think we can lead by example by discussing it more regularly and more openly. I know the member for Noosa and I discussed these matters extensively as she deliberated on how she would vote on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill, as I know a number of other members did. I discussed these matters with them also. I agree that education and access to safe and affordable contraception is incredibly important in avoiding unwanted pregnancies that can have devastating impacts on people.

Primarily, responsibility for contraception is best delivered in a primary healthcare setting with a regular GP who can provide prescriptions for medicines and other products that can be delivered, again, in a primary healthcare setting, but the state does acknowledge that we have an important role, particularly for people who cannot access those services.

This government has rebuilt sexual and reproductive health services after they were systematically dismantled by our predecessors. That \$15 million sexual and reproductive health strategy, delivered by and large by my predecessor the member for Woodridge, has been important. It included the reopening of the Biala centre, which was cruelly and wrongly closed.

Other initiatives include our school based nurses, who have an incredibly important role in both educating and referring young people to services that they might want to access. In addition to that, just last week the Minister for Child Safety and I spent some time with our nurse navigators who have been allocated to work with children in care. As those children in care approach their teenage years, the nurse navigators take on a role educating them about sexual and reproductive health and assisting them to access contraceptive services. I was disturbed to learn just how many children become parents within 12 months of leaving the care of the child safety department, so I think that initiative is incredibly valuable.

Just recently I addressed a youth sexual and reproductive health forum which brought together young people, stakeholders and clinicians to talk about what more we could do. I opened that forum but I was not able to stay for all of it. I am looking forward to hearing from them about other initiatives that we should implement from here.

Transition 2 Success

Ms RICHARDS: My question is of the Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Would the minister update the House on the latest results of the Transition 2 Success program?

Ms FARMER: I thank the member for her question and for her passionate interest in the young people of Queensland. We on this side of the House are absolutely intent on changing the story on youth justice both for the community and for young people. That is why I am really delighted to talk about the results of the recent evaluation we undertook of the Transition 2 Success program—T2S.

We know that our community expects our young people to be accountable for their actions, but they also do not want them to reoffend. Of course, that is exactly what is going to happen if we just lock them up: they will be more likely to reoffend. If we just keep doing the same thing over and over again we cannot expect anything to be different in youth justice. We need to be confident that what we are doing is based on evidence and actually works, and that is where T2S comes in. This program reconnects our young people with education and training and provides them with the skills they need to make a positive contribution in the community. It is delivered in partnership with local community groups and businesses. At this stage it is operating as far and wide as Aurukun, Townsville, Rockhampton, Hervey Bay, Bundaberg, Sunshine Coast, Logan, Ipswich and Forest Lake.

In common with the Attorney-General, I have been to a number of graduations myself and every time I feel quite emotional when I see the young people celebrating their achievements and how proud their parents are to see them doing something positive with their lives. Even better is the evidence that T2S actually works. It is literally helping young people escape the cycle of reoffending, with 75 per cent

of those young people not reoffending within six months. For every dollar spent on the program, there is \$2.57 in benefits. It has avoided costs of custody of \$18.3 million, costs of supervision of \$15.1 million and costs of crime of \$2.2 million. When we talk about changing the story on youth justice, that is exactly what we are talking about.

It makes me wonder whether there are any other programs that might have been put up for youth justice in the last decade or so. If I give some clues I wonder whether anyone on this side of the House could guess what that might be. This program is one that people can take a helicopter to. A lot of people drive, but some people take helicopters. It is one where the budget blew out from \$4.9 million to \$12.7 million. It is one where the cost per day per young person was \$2,350 compared to \$999 for people in detention. In fact, in relation to the young people who took part in the program, not only was there no drop in reoffending, but they offended at a rate of almost 70 per cent. I wonder if anyone knows what I am talking about. I am talking about the boot camps. Unfortunately, it was the only idea members opposite have had about youth justice. Let's change the story for these young people. Let's go our way.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MOTION

Order of Business



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.14 am), without notice: I move—

That government business order of the day No. 1 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES (FINANCIAL PROVISIONING) BILL

Resumed from 15 February (see p. 102).

Second Reading



Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (11.15 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the committee and the secretariat for its consideration of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill. My thanks also go to those stakeholders who made submissions as part of the committee's examination of the bill and for the time they have put in over the last two years to ensure the bill finds the right balance between improving mining rehabilitation performance and ensuring the continued success of an important Queensland industry. I will give an overview of the bill and take the House through the major reforms it contains before addressing the committee's recommendations.

This bill is the critical first step in meeting the Palaszczuk Labor government's commitment to implement the findings of the 2016 review of Queensland's financial assurance framework and delivers two major reforms: the creation of a new financial provisioning scheme and the improvement of the framework governing the rehabilitation of mine land. When I introduced this bill in February, I informed the House that these reforms represent the most significant upgrade to Queensland's multibillion dollar resource sector financial assurance and rehabilitation framework in nearly 20 years. These groundbreaking reforms strike the right balance for the environment and the resources sector while ensuring resource companies, not Queensland taxpayers, foot the bill for the rehabilitation of failed mines or stranded assets. The reforms ensure that mine rehabilitation actually happens in Queensland and we do not leave a legacy of abandoned mines for future generations or mines that are in care and maintenance for many decades. Our reforms will ensure that we continue to see a thriving resource sector in Queensland while allowing for the expansion of mine rehabilitation and the very many jobs that come with it.

The first major reform in the bill sets up a new financial provisioning scheme, the first of its kind, designed to use the best of worldwide practice. Financial assurance is required from resource companies to ensure that any remaining rehabilitation can be paid for and undertaken by the state if a

company does not fulfil their environmental obligations. Currently, Queensland's financial assurance framework treats all companies the same, providing limited flexibility through allowance of discounts to eligible operators. There are a number of factors that make a company more or less likely to complete the rehabilitation of their resource project. In a state like Queensland with diverse mineral, petroleum and gas sectors, we should have a financial assurance system that considers the relative risk to the state and, therefore, taxpayers associated with each individual resource project. The new financial provisioning scheme in the bill does just that.

The scheme manager will assess all companies with relevant resource projects above a minimum threshold to determine their risk of defaulting and leaving the costs of rehabilitation to the state. Each project will also be assessed and the outcome will determine which part of the scheme they fit into and how much they pay. I said 'which part of the scheme' because one of the innovations of the new scheme is that it has two parts: a pooled fund and surety options. The pooled fund will apply to those operators that are at the lowest risk of not meeting their rehabilitation commitments. These operators will pay an annual contribution, a small percentage of their total rehabilitation liability, into the financial provisioning fund rather than having to provide a large surety, such as a bank guarantee, for the full amount. This will provide significant value to a company, freeing up cash that can be used for investment rather than tied up as part of a surety.

Other projects that the scheme manager assesses as having a higher risk to the state for a variety of reasons will be required to continue to provide surety for the full amount of their rehabilitation liability. In relation to the companies required to provide sureties, the bill provides for more options than are currently available including the introduction of insurance bonds. Providing a wider range of acceptable sureties for companies that are required to provide a surety will expand the market of surety providers and, due to increased competition, enable industry to obtain surety at more cost-effective rates. Designing the scheme in this way enables the state to manage its risks and the risk to taxpayers while potentially freeing up millions of dollars to be invested in Queensland. The pooled fund was recommended by our comprehensive review of financial assurance and provides benefits to both resource companies and the government. There will be thresholds applied to the pooled fund and regular reviews of its operation to ensure its financial integrity.

As well as these benefits to industry, there will be many positive outcomes for the community from the new financial provisioning scheme in this bill. One important benefit of the scheme is that there will be money available to enhance the state's abandoned mines program as well as investing in research and development of rehabilitation techniques for mining and resource activities.

Having additional funds to put towards managing legacy issues is important to the community and to government. To ensure this money has been spent in the most efficient and effective way, the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy has been consulting with industry and the community on ways to enhance the current abandoned mines program. The new financial provisioning scheme is a better financial assurance system: it better manages the financial risk to the state and taxpayers from resource companies failing to undertake rehabilitation; it better protects the community from the impacts of abandoned mines; it better ensures that the amount paid by each company is directly related to the amount of rehabilitation still to be completed; and it better manages the risk of that rehabilitation not being completed. A better financial provisioning scheme achieves better outcomes for the state, for industry, for the environment and for the community.

In Queensland we currently have priority abandoned mine sites like Mount Morgan that are equivalent in area to 10,000 Suncorp Stadium football fields. Through these reforms we have put the resource sector on notice that the practices of the bad old days are over. While we have honoured the approvals of the past, through these reforms we are saying that we will not allow poor practices and poor rehabilitation to continue. Too often the term 'best practice' has become a non-defined catchphrase used in resources industry glossy brochures. That ends today. This bill requires best practice management and minimisation of the risks to the environment. We will hold companies to their word and demand world's best practice. To that end we will explore options for the appointment of a mining rehabilitation commissioner within 12 months to set standards and keep them current and to ensure that the rehabilitation commitments made by mining companies are kept.

I am happy to say that when I put this position to the Queensland resources sector they agreed that this is a position worthy of consideration and investigation, and they are prepared to come along for the journey. For this they should be commended. This government wants the Queensland standard of rehabilitation to resonate across the world. We already export mining engineering technology across the world; under these reforms we will also export mining rehabilitation to the world.

The second major part of the bill amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to implement mining rehabilitation reforms. These reforms deliver clear rehabilitation standards and will ensure that mining companies plan for, and undertake, progressive rehabilitation over the life of the mine. The changes made by this bill will maximise the amount of disturbed land that is rehabilitated to a safe and stable landform which does not cause environmental harm and can sustain an approved postmining land use.

The bill introduces a requirement for progressive rehabilitation and closure plans—known as PRCs—to be developed by current and future operators of large mine sites. Best practice states that planning for closure when designing a mine is the best way to ensure rehabilitation is effective, efficient and results in suitable postmining land uses. Mining companies with current environmental authorities issued under a site-specific application will, over the next three years, be required to begin developing progressive rehabilitation and closure plans for their current operations which will be assessed and approved by the environmental regulator. After the new provisions are in place, a company making a site-specific application for an environmental authority for a mining lease will need to develop a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan.

The plan will include a schedule of maps and tables of time-based milestones which will help the company, the regulator and the community track rehabilitation progress over time. As more rehabilitation is undertaken over the life of Queensland mines, these reforms will encourage long-term regional job opportunities in the growing mine rehabilitation industry. We are also making sure that progressive rehabilitation and closure plans are available to the public so that communities understand how mined land near them will be rehabilitated over the mine's life and what the land will look like after mining has finished.

Mining companies have always been expected to undertake rehabilitation activities under their environmental authorities and meeting the cost of rehabilitation is not new; however, the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan requirements will deliver a much more transparent framework to ensure that it is clear to industry, the community and government what actions are needed to meet each project's rehabilitation expectations. I acknowledge there may be some impacts on industry from increased consultation and public reporting, improved planning and ensuring that rehabilitation expenditure is not delayed; however, for those responsible companies that already plan for rehabilitation and consult with their regional communities the impact of the changes will be limited.

There are some companies operating in Queensland that have historical approvals for rehabilitation outcomes which do not necessarily reflect current best practice. We will not retrospectively amend approvals that have been given under previous policy frameworks. The approvals that exist through current environmental authorities will be recognised and translated into the new progressive rehabilitation and closure plans. Let me be clear: this reform is not retrospective; however, while existing approvals for areas considered to be non-use management areas will be translated into the PRC plans, best practice management of these areas will be required. These areas must still be designed and managed to minimise risks to the environment.

An important benefit of this bill is that these areas will be clearly defined in publically available documents, and requirements for the ongoing management of these sites will be identified, monitored and audited. In the future, however, the policy intent behind this reform will ensure that non-use management areas are only approved in very restricted circumstances. Best practice methods and new technologies now mean that mine operations can be designed to maximise the amount of land which will be returned to the community to support a future use. This is what these reforms aim to achieve.

I will move a set of amendments during consideration in detail to introduce a process which clarifies the restricted circumstances for approval of a non-use management area. These amendments will ensure that a non-use management area will only be approved in a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan where it is found to be in the public interest having regard to the benefits and impacts to the environment and the community from the project as well as what other options have been considered. The assessment will be supported by adding the requirement for the administering authority to seek objective advice from an appropriately experienced and qualified entity during the assessment of the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan.

This new process is called the public interest evaluation and is streamlined with the environmental impact statement and environmental authority process. The amendments ensure the requirements are transparent and known up-front by companies. The time frames are aligned with other processes to minimise delays, and any confidential information is protected. Reports made by the entity conducting the public interest evaluation must include a recommendation and will be made publicly

available. In approving a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule, the administering authority must ensure the schedule is consistent with any recommendations made in the public interest evaluation report.

I will also move amendments during consideration in detail that will clarify the transitional process for obtaining an approved progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule. These amendments respect existing rights while ensuring a clear path to improving rehabilitation planning and performance in Queensland.

To ensure that public interest evaluations operate as intended, as I mentioned earlier the government will explore options for the appointment of a rehabilitation commissioner. To oversee the selection of the qualified entity he will conduct evaluations, work with government and industry to facilitate better public reporting about rehabilitation in Queensland and inform how best practice rehabilitation management will be implemented as part of the framework for non-use management areas.

Let me be clear to both industry and the community: any new mining project will be considered against the government's Mined Land Rehabilitation Policy as implemented through this bill. As well as the limitations I have just outlined, this means that voids created in flood plains during mining operations will unquestionably have to be rehabilitated. This is something that happens around the world, but it does not currently happen here in Queensland. Where landforms, pits or voids cannot be returned to original landform the question should always be: what is the best form of rehabilitation that we can secure for that site and the community post mining?

All of the reforms in the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 are great examples of the types of positive and practical environmental outcomes this government can achieve with innovative problem-solving and dedication to consultation. These reforms will ensure Queensland has modern legislation and systems that reflect worldwide best practice while considering local industry and community needs.

Through this process the government has demonstrated its commitment to consultation with industry, environment and community groups and the public. The policies behind the bill were discussed and developed through consultation via discussion papers and ongoing engagement with key stakeholders over the past two years. I have personally led consultation on the public interest evaluation amendments to deliver the best solution and balance of stakeholders' needs.

As I said in my introductory speech, this bill is just the beginning. There is a whole package of reforms to be implemented over the next few years addressing the range of issues identified in our review of financial assurance and ensuring a holistic, coordinated government response to a very complex issue. Significant time and effort has already been invested, with more to come, but I believe these improvements are important to support an ongoing social licence for the resources industry and to ensure Queenslanders are protected in circumstances where the state has to pick up the rehabilitation bill.

I will now address the Economics and Governance Committee report on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 tabled on 20 April 2018. I thank the Economics and Governance Committee for its thorough report regarding the bill. I also thank those who made submissions to the committee about the bill and those who appeared as witnesses as part of committee's inquiry. I was encouraged to see that the committee's report stated that the majority of submitters expressed general support for reforms to the financial provisioning framework. As one example, the Queensland Resources Council submission noted the 'financial provisioning components of the bill make sense'. There was also support for allowing insurance instruments as a form of surety. Expanding the range of forms of surety will bring greater competition into the market and ensure that those companies that are required to provide surety have a range of options, resulting in lower costs for industry.

The committee report had only two recommendations. The first committee recommendation was that the bill be passed by the House. The second recommendation was a minor drafting amendment. Recommendation 2 of the committee was to amend clause 173 of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill to correct a minor drafting error. The government supports this recommendation. During consideration in detail I will move an amendment to clause 173 to address this drafting error to replace 'annual report' with 'annual return'.

After further examination of the bill it was determined that addressing the committee's recommendation 2 requires related corrections to other sections of the Environmental Protection Act 1994. These amendments are necessary in order to meet public reporting expectations—accurate and

reliable point-in-time data—and allow the Department of Environment and Science to continue to request payment of annual fees through annual notice reinstatements. I will be moving amendments during consideration in detail to ensure this happens.

The Palaszczuk government has committed to consultation and to listening to our constituents. In considering the submissions received by the Economics and Governance Committee the government identified some small amendments to the bill that are required to respond to critical issues raised by key stakeholders. Most noteworthy are the amendments I will be moving to clarify how the assessment of non-use management areas will occur to ensure they will only be approved where it is found to be in the public interest and all other options have been considered.

As outlined in the departmental response to the Economics and Governance Committee's submissions, I will also move some minor drafting amendments that are necessary to: insert the correct sections of the Petroleum and Gas (Safety and Production) Act 1994 so that money can be claimed from the scheme fund for carrying out remediation activities relating to abandoned operating plant; insert an omitted section of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 for all existing environmental authorities to be properly transitioned into the financial provisioning scheme subject to the new risk assessment process; correct section 540 of the EP Act to keep existing financial assurance decisions on the public register; and insert the decision-making criteria for the PRCP schedule in the correct section—176A instead of 194B—for both the administering authority and the Land Court to apply consistent decision-making criteria.

I will also move amendments necessary to ensure that: the bill has a clear process for transitioning existing sites to the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan requirements which respects existing rights and ensures natural justice in the amendment to the environmental authority process; schedule 2 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 is corrected in order to retain existing review and appeal rights for decisions by the administering authority; the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 is amended to enable the Coordinator-General's powers to impose conditions on progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedules subject to the outcome of the public interest evaluation; and the right-to-information provisions align with a recommendation made by the Information Commissioner. Importantly, the amendments I have mentioned today are not changes in policy; they are amendments required to address drafting errors and omissions or to make crystal clear the purpose and intent of the bill.

I am pleased to table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 6, 56th Parliament—Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, government response [[1893](#)].

In summary, the reforms contained within the bill will enable the government to achieve positive outcomes for industry, the environment and the community. Companies will benefit from a modern financial provisioning scheme which considers each project's individual circumstances and ensures they are managed accordingly. The rehabilitation reforms clarify expectations about the standards of rehabilitation required from the resources industry. They will ensure enhanced postmining outcomes to support strong regional development and guarantee transparency for the community on how companies are progressively rehabilitating their land to maximise its use once mining is complete.

This is a significant and once-in-a-lifetime industry and environmental law reform program, and I am enormously proud to be leading these laws through the parliament here today. I commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): The following members are on warnings under the standing orders: the members for Coomera, Ninderry, Moggill, Glass House, Southport, Cooper, Theodore, Maryborough, Everton, Buderim, Nicklin, Southern Downs and Kawana.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.35 am): I rise to address the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, introduced into parliament on 15 February this year by the Treasurer and considered by the Economics and Governance Committee.

As outlined in the explanatory notes, the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 makes various amendments to a number of acts administered by the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. The stated policy objectives of the bill are to: manage the financial risks to the state if mineral and energy resource tenure holders do not comply with their environmental management and rehabilitation obligations; and ensure land disturbed by mining activities is rehabilitated to a safe and stable land form that does not cause environmental harm and can sustain an approved postmining land use.

The bill proposes to replace the current financial assurance framework for resource activities under the Environmental Protection Act with a new financial provisioning scheme. The new scheme will provide government with access to funds for environmental management and rehabilitation activities where an operator does not comply with its obligations and for funding other resource related activities such as rehabilitating abandoned mines and operating sites, and research into rehabilitation techniques.

The bill proposes that the scheme fund will operate on a pooled basis rather than under the current arrangements, where assurance is provided for each EA and may only be applied for rehabilitation activities related to the EA. Operating a pooled fund is intended to avoid the risk of funding shortfalls and require holders to pay only an annual contribution. This is an important issue not only in terms of having a viable resources sector but also to ensure that our natural environment is protected and maintained for generations to come.

The current financial assurance system promotes individual responsibility, but there have been too many occasions of poor rehabilitation—or none at all—and Queensland taxpayers are left with the cost of environmental rehabilitation. In some cases the financial assurance is nowhere near the actual cost that is needed, which is why things need to change.

The resources industry has made and will continue to make an incredible contribution to the Queensland economy. We think that most Queenslanders support our resources industry, the jobs it provides our state and the economic benefits. In 2016-17 our minerals and energy sector contributed over \$25 billion to the Queensland economy with a total supported workforce of almost 51,000 full-time-equivalent positions, and the latest ABS stats show that 63,500 Queenslanders are currently employed directly within the mining industry in Queensland. The industry contributes around \$55.1 billion to the state gross product, amounting to 17.4 per cent of GSP for Queensland through \$25.5 billion in direct effects and \$29.6 billion in supply chain and consumption effects. Some \$25.1 billion in income through wages and salaries is paid to workers and 282,634 full-time-equivalent jobs are supported, equating to 12 per cent of total employment in Queensland during 2016-17 because of the resources industry. Some \$4 billion is paid to the state government—whether that be through royalties, stamp duty, payroll tax or land tax—and in 2017-18 these same royalties have increased to almost \$4.5 billion, and the tip is that the Treasurer is going to get another multimillion dollar bonus in royalties in the midyear estimates.

While most Queenslanders support the industry, they also expect these resource projects to stack up environmentally as well as economically and that the sites should be rehabilitated properly after their operations have finished. We believe that the framework that is included in this bill is the right one going forward and one that we considered when we were in government.

We have had some issues about the right-to-information exemptions. The bill originally proposed to introduce additional categories of documents and entities to which the RTI Act would not apply. It intended to exclude a document created or received by the scheme manager under part 3 of the bill from the operation of the RTI Act and also exclude the scheme manager in relation to the scheme manager's functions from the operation of the RTI Act. This exclusion, described as an exemption, was made with the goal of addressing concerns raised by stakeholders about protecting the confidentiality of commercially sensitive documents, but notably stakeholders such as QRC did not request the blanket exclusions proposed in the bill. However, the government's proposed exclusion to the RTI Act was completely unnecessary and a secretive measure that the LNP has already highlighted in the media. The RTI Act already ensures that all commercially sensitive information is not revealed to the public and there is no reason this particular industry needs an exclusion to the RTI Act.

The Office of the Information Commissioner raised concerns about changing the RTI Act to exempt documents and communications to the scheme or the scheme manager. OIC proposed that while the explanatory notes refer to the proposed amendments to the RTI Act as exemptions they are in fact exclusions, not exemptions, as they would exclude the relevant documents and the scheme manager from the operations of the legislation as a whole. OIC also claims, as has already been mentioned, that the RTI Act already contains sufficient exemptions and exclusions, including for commercial-in-confidence documents and for disclosure that would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest. This completely over-the-top secrecy is typical of the Palaszczuk Labor government that already has a record of delaying damning reports and hiding from media when times get tough. It is yet just another example of Labor trying to shroud yet one more area in secrecy rather than showing even a semblance of accountability. It is my understanding that the amendments put forward—

Mr Power: Read the amendments.

Mr MANDER: It is my understanding, if the member would remain quiet for five seconds, that the amendments put forward in this bill by Labor will somewhat address the RTI issue by having a list of exemptions rather than a blanket exclusion. However, it is disgraceful that it took the combined pressure of the independent Office of the Information Commissioner, Transparency International and the LNP in opposition to stop the Palaszczuk Labor government from tearing a hole in the RTI Act that went beyond the wildest dreams of even the mining industry. The fact that an hour ago over 60 amendments have been added to this bill today, completely bypassing the committee process, shows yet again the arrogance of the Labor government. This has been an incredibly poor process with limited consultation with the right people at the right time which has caused so many amendments to be introduced today by the Treasurer. However, despite the poor process and the fact that amendments have been made with regard to RTI, this side of the chamber will be supporting the bill.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (11.44 am): Queensland values our mining industry, and this government values the mining industry so much that it wants to ensure that it continues to maintain the strong support of the Queensland public and the social licence to continue to operate in Queensland. Throughout the state of Queensland's history, mining has been an important part of our economy and a provider of quality jobs. In the Treasurer's introductory speech it was emphasised that this is also a vital part of our future. In the past there was little or insufficient regulation for mine companies to set aside funds for the rehabilitation of mines after their active mining use. Some of these legacy mines create a significant obligation on the state to step in to ensure sufficient rehabilitation or stabilisation of these sites occurs.

After industry concerns in 2016, the relevant departments saw that there was an opportunity to improve the current framework of financial assurance. Vital to this process is the best practice rehabilitation of mines after use and the financial assurance mechanisms that have the dual purpose of giving confidence that rehabilitation will occur without unnecessarily burdening the finances of the companies that choose to invest in Queensland. This bill puts forward a new system of financial assurance that gives greater confidence to Queenslanders that the vital work of mine rehabilitation will be completed. This strengthens the position of mining within the Queensland economy as we can have greater confidence that all Queensland mines will be rehabilitated by the industry.

This bill was introduced on 15 February and referred to the Economics and Governance Committee, of which I am the chair. A previous bill was introduced into the previous parliament and referred to the then agriculture and environment committee, but it had not completed its inquiry by the time the parliament was dissolved. During the examination of the bill the committee invited submissions, received 51 submissions and received a public briefing from Queensland Treasury and the Department of Environment and Science. The committee held a public hearing on 28 March and also followed up with Queensland Treasury and the department on the issues raised in submissions. After considering the briefings and submissions, the committee made the recommendation to the House through the report that the bill be passed.

The bill was in response to a period of consultation and two discussion papers, the *Financial assurance framework reform* and the *Financial assurance review—providing surety*, and the mines rehabilitation policy. The reports identified that if in a particular case financial assurance is less than the rehabilitation cost there is no source of funding for the shortfall. The cost of bank guarantees is significant for small to midsized operators and the best practice of progressive rehabilitation is not sufficient, increasing the potential financial risk to the state. The bill introduces a new financial provisioning scheme which will provide funds to the government to complete environmental management and rehabilitation where an operator does not comply with its obligation to rehabilitate. This is designed not to change the obligations of a mine to environmental management and rehabilitation but to protect the state's financial interests through this process.

Under the bill's proposed scheme, the fund will operate on a pooled basis instead of the current situation where financial assurance is provided against each EA and because of that may only be applied for rehabilitation activities relating to that EA. Operating the fund as a pool avoids the risk of funding shortfalls and only requires holders to pay an annual contribution to the fund. Generally, submitters supported this in principle, seeing the advantages of a pool. There was also a need to understand the final operation of the financial provisioning scheme. The Queensland Treasury replied to these concerns with some detail on page 6 of the report, outlining the process setting risk categories and contribution rates.

A key feature of the financial provisioning scheme is the process of estimating the rehabilitation costs and the amount of the contribution to the scheme. The bill creates a scheme fund and also sets out the fund accounts and how they are to be kept and how the deposits must be added. To be clear,

payments made to the fund are controlled receipts and not part of consolidated revenue. The fund threshold is \$450 million unless otherwise set by regulation. There was some discussion of this rate by submitters. However, the Queensland Treasury responded that currently this had been set at a rate of around five per cent of the total estimated rehabilitation costs and had been based upon independent advice that came from the process of the QTC financial assurance review. There was some concern from mining companies that the fund would be used for broader unrelated purposes. However, Queensland Treasury makes clear there is within the bill 'clear and specific terms of the purposes which money from that fund can be used' and that there is no allowance for the fund to be spent on other functions of government.

The bill creates the role of the scheme manager, who allocates and reviews risk categories of EAs and sets the investment objectives and policies. There is also a requirement to keep the minister reasonably informed of operations and the financial performance of the scheme. The annual report requires information on the actuarial sustainability of the scheme and information about the effectiveness of the scheme in reaching rehabilitation targets. There is also a timetable of required actuarial investigations to be carried out to report on sustainability, the threshold, risk categories and rates of contribution.

The process of calculating the cost of rehabilitation is an important and contested part of any scheme and it needs to be continued to be calculated if there is any change to the mine design that increases the likely maximum disturbance, the resource activity, or other factors. In response to those concerns and comments on uncertainty, Treasury has advised that the department of environment is committed to providing a calculator that includes contemporary rehabilitation rates, building on the calculators released in 2014 and revised in 2017. We are advised that the new estimated rehabilitation cost calculator will be aligned with the commencement of the scheme.

Under the bill, the scheme manager has the responsibility to allocate a risk category to the project for any EA over \$100,000, or as prescribed by regulation in the future. That is to properly cost the risk associated with the possibility that a company might be unable to fulfil its obligations of rehabilitation. The scheme manager considers the financial soundness of the EA holder, the characteristics of the mining project and, prior to making a final assessment, gives notice and reasons for the assessment. Further, the risk category must be reviewed annually, with a notice of confirmation or change for the EA holder. That calculates the probability that the state incurs a cost because of an inability to fund the required rehabilitation.

The nature of the scheme manager assessing the risk profile and other elements requires the manager to have access to high-level commercial information about a company and about an individual project. That information is by nature sensitive for companies and of a commercial nature and is not usually available to the public or, indeed, competing companies. It is important that companies provide a full account to the government, including information that may be commercially sensitive in nature. For that reason, it was proposed that the RTI Act not apply to this information. The Office of the Information Commissioner noted this exclusion and expressed some concerns about it. Although at the time Treasury advised that the bill does not otherwise, directly or inadvertently, make any changes to information that can currently be publicly accessed under the Environmental Protection Act, or any legislation in relation to the resource industry, the committee noted the concerns of the OIC and I note the amendments and the comments of the minister that the amendments will align the bill's right to information provisions with the recommendation made by the Information Commissioner.

The bill also establishes an advisory committee to give advice to the scheme manager. To ensure that there is a diversity of perspectives on the committee, there will be at least five qualified people, including at least one person nominated by an organisation representing environmental interests and at least one nominated by an organisation representing the mineral and energy sector. It was noted by the industry that the resource sector has diverse interests—across coal, hard rock oil and gas—and that all these sectors would want input. It is noted that the bill calls for at least one representative from the various sectors and does not limit industry or, indeed, environmental participation. This unpaid advisory group will ensure that the scheme manager continues to get good advice from a variety of perspectives. The bill will also encourage progressive rehabilitation by requiring companies to develop a progressive rehabilitation plan as part of the process of applying for a site or a specific EA for a mining lease.

We all know that not all areas can be returned to exactly the condition they were in before they were mined. By definition, we encourage miners to extract resources for other uses. That is categorised as a non-use management area and is allowed only if carrying out rehabilitation would cause greater risk of environmental harm, or if it is justifiable in the public interest. I note the Treasurer's comments

that there are further amendments to the bill to ensure that non-use management areas are approved only in restricted circumstances and further strengthen the application of the public interest test with the administering authority to seek objective advice from an appropriately experienced and qualified entity during the assessment of a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan.

The purpose of this legislation is to give confidence to the Queensland community that we can continue to support the mining and resource industries in our state, not just for the jobs, commodities and revenue that they generate but also for the use of best practice methods to design resource projects that will find broad community support. That is the aim of this bill. I commend the amended bill to the House.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (11.54 am): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018—a bill, I might add, that has far-reaching consequences for our resource sector. Regardless of where people stand on mining, we can all acknowledge the value of the resource sector to the Queensland economy. Based on unreleased figures from the QRC for 2017-18, the resource sector contributed \$62.9 billion to the Queensland economy, supported 316,267 full-time jobs both directly and indirectly but, more importantly, paid \$4.3 billion in royalties. That is more than one-third of the Capital Works Program for the current financial year. It is 100 times the Business Development Fund, which was announced in the state budget. It is also more than the Treasurer committed to keeping our communities safe when she handed down the budget.

This bill has highlighted a fundamental flaw in a unicameral parliament. Substantial amendments—in fact, 39 pages of amendments—have been made to this bill, which significantly change its intent and purpose. These amendments have not been considered by the committee, which makes a mockery of the committee process and its ability to appropriately scrutinise this bill. The committee reported on the original bill—not the amended bill. When we look at these amendments—amendments, I might add, that were given to me some 40 minutes ago—it becomes abundantly clear to us that there are substantial changes to the original bill. We are not playing a game of marbles here; we are talking about a \$63 billion industry that is keeping this state afloat. I want to make it clear that I do not oppose the bill; I oppose the abuse of the parliamentary process. I oppose a government that fails to engage in an honest manner and I definitely oppose a government that claims transparency and then turns its back on being honest with the people of Queensland.

We have a Treasurer who has introduced significant amendments to this bill—amendments that opposition members have had very limited time to scrutinise. This bill was designed to provide financial and environmental certainty to the state regarding the resource sector. It was intended to ensure that that sector behaved responsibly and that land disturbed for the purpose of mining can sustain an appropriate use after mining is completed. Although the vast majority of resource companies do the right thing, there have been a small number of instances in which rehabilitation obligations have not been met. It is true that those failures, for whatever reason they occur, are an impost on the state and, therefore, an impost on all Queenslanders. If the proposed changes require all new projects to backfill final voids, the feasibility of many of them will be diminished.

This legislation certainly makes it much more difficult for new companies intending to enter the mining industry to start up. With financial contributions to the pooled rehabilitation fund linked to risk, it is likely that these new mines will be hit hardest by this legislation, particularly given that they will be required to provide a surety up-front. Do not get me wrong: if miners are not doing the right thing by the environment, if they are not undertaking rehabilitation that meets the standards set by both the government and the broader community, they should be made to pay. There is no place in Queensland for environmental vandals. However, that obligation needs to be balanced with an appreciation of our mining sector and the jobs and economic prosperity it provides to this state.

The spirit of this bill is supported by the Queensland Resources Council, the peak body for resource companies in this state. Those companies and the council acknowledge that the sector must be environmentally aware and ensure that mining sites are fit for use at the conclusion of mining. A mine site can never be rehabilitated to its original state. Tens of millions of tonnes of ore and overburden cannot be pulled out of the ground and then that area be returned to its original state several years down the track. However, where practicable and to the best of their ability, mining companies can rehabilitate these sites for other purposes.

I have seen some great examples of this in my travels throughout this state. I mention New Hope, which has done some fantastic work in rehabilitating its Acland mine. It now has a very successful grazing operation in place on land that was mined previously. Peabody Energy is doing some great work. Glencore is doing some great work. When I visit these mine sites and I talk to the respective mine

managers, the first thing I ask them about is their rehabilitation of areas. I ask them if I can see firsthand what they are doing about rehabilitation. Certainly, when I travel throughout the state, and particularly given that most of the coalmines in Queensland are in my patch of the Burdekin electorate, I am seeing great examples of companies rehabilitating these mine sites to a stage where grazing activities et cetera can be reintroduced. For that they are to be commended.

Rehabilitating land that has been mined is expensive, time consuming and at times extremely difficult. We must achieve a balance in allowing our mining companies to sustainably mine for mineral resources whilst at the same time undertaking rehabilitation that meets community standards and expectations. Our community will support the concept of a pooled funds scheme for meeting unmet rehabilitation requirements. They will also support and demand responsible use of land and natural resources that benefits all of Queensland. The spirit of the bill is supported by those of us on this side of the House. We once again affirm our support of a resources industry that creates jobs and economic benefits for all Queenslanders while ensuring the best possible environmental outcomes. Above all, we support good government, we support public and industry consultation and we support transparency. This is where we differ from those opposite.

I have a particular concern with the public interest test. Can I say to the Treasurer, and recommend for her consideration, that the report should not be prepared by an external person or an organisation. For the sake of consistency and transparency, this process should be brought in-house, with staff employed within the department to carry out this task. As members would appreciate, the preparation of a public interest evaluation could involve the expenditure of substantial funds. I note the Deputy Premier, in her contribution, talked about the consideration of a rehabilitation commissioner and it may well be that that person oversees a unit within the department to undertake these public interest test evaluations. It is not just members on this side of the House who have those concerns. The Queensland Law Society has also expressed concerns with the powers afforded to the scheme manager and recommended oversight by the Queensland Audit Office.

This bill has the potential to ensure so many good outcomes and, as I mentioned earlier, is widely supported by the resources industry. We cannot let poor implementation lead to a bad outcome. This bill can provide a positive outcome for resource companies, for the economy and for all of Queensland, but in order to do that this government needs to address the issues that I have outlined here today. Those on that side of the House need to focus not on a good outcome but on the best possible outcome and the best possible outcome that can be achieved is through consultation and transparency. It is what the resources industry deserves, it is what the Queensland environment deserves and, above all, it is what 300,000 Queenslanders need to ensure a prosperous future.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (12.02 pm): I am pleased to rise to make a very brief contribution in support of what I think is an incredibly important bill. I am proud to be part of a government that has taken on what is a very challenging issue. In 2015, as I came into the role of environment minister for this state, I was surprised, as no doubt many Queenslanders would be, about how little mine rehabilitation was occurring and how many jobs we were missing out on because that rehabilitation was not occurring. During that time a whole series of companies went broke, deserted mines and tailing dams and other facilities and the government was left with a massive shortfall in financial assurance. The more we looked at it the more we discovered that there was a range of structural shortfalls built into the financial assurance system that meant that there would never be enough financial assurance. I think the vast majority of Queenslanders would take the view that they, through their government, issue permits to mining companies to extract resources that they own in return for jobs, in return for taxes and royalties, but on the promise that those sites will be rehabilitated once mining has concluded. That is the deal that has always been there and this bill fundamentally makes good on that deal for the benefit of our environment, for the state, for the jobs in this state and for certainty for the mining sector.

I know that getting to a point where there is consensus across government stakeholders, the resources sector and the environment sector has been very challenging, having been a part of debates like that in the past, so I congratulate Minister Lynham, the Deputy Premier and Minister Enoch in arriving at the point we now find ourselves at. I also acknowledge the role of the former treasurer and now Speaker and the contribution that he made working with myself and Minister Lynham in the previous government to do the foundational work. It is important and I certainly strongly commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (12.05 pm): I rise to speak on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 which seeks to address important issues where mining resources companies do not adequately meet rehabilitation obligations in Queensland. I advise the

House that this was treated as a very urgent bill by this government. In fact, there were only four weeks of committee consideration in April. It is normally six weeks, as members would be aware under the rules for consideration by committees, except for matters that are very urgent and pressing. We are here in the last sitting of parliament in November dealing with this very important and pressing matter.

I go forth in my contribution on this very important bill—six months after it was really urgent—to bring to the attention of the House how important this bill is. From a budget standpoint, mining and resources are hugely important to our state. However, the industry poses significant challenges in the way it affects the land. It is a resource company's responsibility to take part in environmental management by rehabilitating disturbed and changed land. This is agreed to by the LNP, this is agreed to by the mining resources industry and is why this bill is here today and has my support. As can be seen from the committee consideration in April, this bill was agreed to.

When rehabilitation does not occur, aside from the environmental damage, there are various effects on the state, the industry and the community. At the moment the system operates on individual responsibility. In the private sector world that is a very difficult matter to contain. That is why we have this provisioning for financial rehabilitation to occur. Unfortunately, we have seen too many cases of environmental authority holders failing to meet their obligations with the result being inadequate rehabilitation. From memory, there are some 15,000 mines across Queensland. Obviously a lot of those are old gold mines around Charters Towers—holes in the ground that cannot be filled—but the bottom line is there are lots of areas right across Queensland that do need rehabilitation. It is evident that the framework needs to be changed to ensure our resources sector is successful and also to protect Queensland's natural environment.

This bill aims to address shortcomings in the system as it currently stands to improve outcomes in relation to the financial interests of the state and the mining and resources industry as well as the environment itself. In relation to the concerns we had when looking at the financial interests of the state, I said to a knowledgeable mining industry person that this will probably generate about half a billion dollars. He said, 'More likely about a billion dollars'. We are talking about serious money that the state will then be involved in doling out. I hark back to the electricity boards that had saved and put pennies aside for the expansion of the network throughout the state. The then treasurer, Mr Terry Mackenroth, decided it did not need that money for poles and wires for the future and that it was a great little squirrel hole to raid. He took that money, and money from another squirrel hole the Labor government found in those years, and put it into consolidated revenue so it could be spent in other areas. I hope that that does not happen to this very large amount of money, which may be close to \$1 billion, for the rehabilitation of mines throughout the state. I hope the government stays committed to the object of the bill, which is to rehabilitate the environment.

The proposed legislation has two components. The first is the management of the financial risk to the state should mining and resource companies fail to fulfil their environmental and rehabilitation responsibilities. In the event that an authority holder does not meet those responsibilities, the community must be protected. That occurs through the provision of financial assurance for the cost of a third party to manage the rehabilitation of the disturbed area of land. That raises another concern for me, which I have seen occur in other areas and the Gold Coast City Council springs to mind. A council will give green groups rehabilitation and greening work, but with no oversight or auditing of whether the money is spent on the actual greening works that they are supposed to be doing or whether some of it goes towards political activity.

That brings me to another issue that the committee and the Integrity Commissioner raised, which relates to the RTI. The minister said earlier that the amendments introduced 40 minutes ago will address this matter. The exemption from RTI really created great concerns about where the money would be spent and who it would be given to. I am very pleased that the Treasurer has put back in place proper RTI arrangements, so that we can keep track of where this money is spent, who it is spent by and who benefits from it, so that we can see environmental rehabilitation take place. That is a very important part of the bill.

Concerns were raised with the legislation when it was originally introduced. I note that this speech was written six months ago and I have not had time to read the amendments that came through only 40 minutes ago. A review by the Queensland Treasury Corporation found that the current system had various disadvantages. Significantly, there is the danger of financial shortfall if the assurance held for a site is less than the actual cost of rehabilitation. This impacts the state, of course, which currently does not have a source to fund such shortfalls. The QTC found that financial assurance usually takes the form of a bank guarantee, which can be expensive for small and midsized operators. It is okay for

the international companies, but a lot of the exploration work is done by smaller companies. While the amount of surety required can be minimised by operators through progressive rehabilitation, there is little indication that this has been helpful in increasing rehabilitation activity rates.

The proposed legislation is a response from the Queensland Treasury to the findings of the QTC report, which was introduced to parliament on 15 February 2018. It aims to replace the financial assurance framework as it currently stands with a new scheme that will enable the state to have access to funding in the event that an operator does not meet its rehabilitation responsibilities. The bill stipulates that an environmental authority holder must make a contribution to the fund or pay a surety.

I understand from industry sources that the bill that we dealt with as a committee was entirely different to what is proposed, through amendment, to be considered in this House. Again I note that I have not read the amendments that we received only 40 minutes ago. The retrospectivity part of the bill was going to impact heavily on operators. Industry sources were complaining loudly that retrospectively would have a cost that could send companies to the wall. I understand that these amendments have taken away that retrospectivity. From my brief reading, the greens tell me that retrospectivity is taken out of the equation. I am pleased that the mining sector has flexed its muscles.

That might have something to do with their great pals at the CFMEU who run a few of the lefties over there. The puppet strings are pulled and they say, 'Now it's time to help my CFMEU industry'. I can see one of them over there now, dancing on his puppet strings. Well done to the CFMEU for getting their little puppets to dance to the right tune and in concert with the players in the mining resources industry, so that we get a good outcome that does not look back in history and send those people who would be caught up in retrospectivity to the wall.

We have heard the figures that show the importance of the mining industry to the Queensland taxpayers. They do not like to say the word 'coal'—I will say it very quietly. Funnily enough, they cannot say the word 'Shorten'. We hear a lot about Turnbull and ScoMo, but we do not hear the word 'Shorten'. I look forward to many more speeches in this House in relation to the bill that will tell me what that wonderful person Bill Shorten is going to do for the mining industry.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Thank you, member for Mermaid Beach. I was about to bring you back to the long title of the bill.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (12.15 pm): I rise in support of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. The need for financial assurance reform became clear following the Queensland Treasury Corporation's review of Queensland's financial assurance framework for the resources sector in 2016. The findings of that review recommended a package of reforms to deliver positive environmental outcomes, improve site rehabilitation and ultimately reduce the amount of rehabilitation required at the end of a resource site's lifecycle.

My department has been developing reforms that will be complementary to the bill, publically releasing two discussion papers in May this year. One paper concerned the management of the state's abandoned mine sites. The other was in relation to the monitoring and management of risks associated with current mining operations that enter care and maintenance, are disclaimed or change ownership.

The abandoned mines discussion paper contained a number of reform ideas. One was to clearly articulate the Queensland government's objectives for managing abandoned mines. The paper also proposed to amend legislative and regulatory frameworks to better assist the Queensland government and the private sector to make abandoned mines safe and secure, and to return them to a productive use where practical. Another key principle was to establish improved administrative processes by which hazards associated with abandoned mine sites are prioritised for mitigation to ensure an efficient allocation of the Queensland government's resources.

These reforms are complementary to the bill and provide the government with access to interest accrued from the principal of the financial provisioning fund. Due to the framework in place in the early parts of the last century, there are about 120 abandoned or legacy mines that the state has responsibility for maintaining. For the first time, industry will have a role in assisting us maintain those sites through their contributions to this fund. The government can use this interest for the management of existing legacy abandoned mine sites and to fund research that may contribute to identifying better ways to recommercialise, repurpose or rehabilitate land on which resource activities have been carried out.

One of the key aspects of the new financial provisioning scheme is that it provides a pool of funds for the state to call on for rehabilitation in the event that a mining company defaults on its environmental obligations to undertake site rehabilitation. This approach differs from the current arrangement that

sees funding put aside on a site-by-site basis. By pooling funds, we spread the risk and increase the flexibility to apply funds where they are needed most. This better protects Queensland from liability, whilst keeping the costs for industry down.

The second discussion paper that my department has released proposes reforms to better manage the state's ability to monitor and manage risks associated with existing operating mines that enter care and maintenance, are disclaimed by liquidators or change ownership such as through a share transfer. These ideas are complementary to the bill, which provides for notification to the financial provisioning scheme manager when there is a change in control of a resource authority and/or cessation of production, so that an updated assessment of the risk to the state arising from the changes can be made.

Stakeholder feedback has been vital in assisting my department to determine the best path to take in finalising the policy positions for the reform ideas stated in the discussion papers. Final positions on these issues will be released next year. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (12.19 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 as a member of the Economics and Governance Committee. I was nostalgic to revisit this piece of legislation as our committee looked through it initially way back in March, with our report delivered in April. The bill we looked into looked a bit different to this as we now have had over 60 amendments dropped on us just over an hour ago.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Members.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Logan.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. Mining is a huge contributor to the Queensland economy with the government taking \$4.6 billion in royalties alone, in addition to tens of billions of dollars of other investment every year from the industry.

An important part of regulation around the mining industry is an environmental authority which requires operators to take steps to minimise the environmental burden of their activities and return the land to a useful state. In some situations these operations do not meet their obligations to repair the land they disturb. That risk falls back on the government as it is the one that has to pick up the slack and repair the land.

The reason for this legislation is to deliver better outcomes for our environment and to protect the financial interests of the state of Queensland. The problem this bill attempts to address is the several cases where operators were not able to meet their environmental repair obligations. Through our public hearings we heard the state currently holds around \$6.9 billion in bank guarantees and, in some instances, cash. There is a significant shortfall in this amount. If the state had to suddenly repair every operating mine in Queensland, the cost estimate was around \$8.9 billion.

The explanation for this discrepancy was the system of discounts in place and the underestimation of the financial assurance required. If the amount of assurance is less than the cost of rehabilitation, the state has to stump up and we found the rate of progressive rehabilitation falling behind the growth in disturbance, which has led to an increase in the financial risk to government.

The new scheme this bill proposes operates as a pool to try to avoid the risk of funding shortfalls and to make the EA holders only pay an annual contribution. The forms of surety will be expanded to add insurance bonds to the existing requirement of bank guarantees or cash. It is good to see the fund will not be part of consolidated revenue—concerns that the member for Mermaid Beach raised—making sure it will be used for what it is meant for. The bill sets out very specific circumstances in which the money can be used. These include restoring the environment, authorising rehabilitation of an abandoned mine, research that may help rehabilitation of land and action to prevent or minimise the potential environmental harm.

The scheme will require an advisory committee to be set up with at least five qualified persons, including one each from the mineral and energy resources sector and environmental interests. I think it is appropriate for the minister to have discretion over the appointments. I note there is no maximum number of committee members. There is no provision for members to be paid expenses or remuneration. I hope the minister takes on board the suggestion to have representatives from both the mining and petroleum sectors as they are vastly different industries with significant differences in environmental risks and rehabilitation.

We heard from the Queensland Resources Council that for about 15 years we have been fiddling around with the financial assurance system. They noted none of the stakeholders they represent oppose the principles of the legislation or the reasons for bringing it forward. They also told us how the removal of the plan of operations locks into particular numbers and processes.

At the hearing we heard of the potential for larger operators to end up paying for the smaller ones, with BHP putting forward concerns about the moral hazards that could come with the new scheme. They were worried some mining operators would not fulfil the highest standards of environmental management because the pooled nature of the fund could mean they assume it would absorb the costs. Treasury estimates the rates of contribution for the scheme will be roughly in line with the current costs paid for the industry, which is welcomed.

A central element of the reforms is to force operators to develop and implement a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan when they apply for a site-specific EA for a particular mining lease. The plan will have a rehabilitation and planning section and a proposed schedule for its rollout. It is all to improve the progressive rehabilitation of the land.

There were also some industry concerns about adhering to these rigid areas and time frames. The sector operates over very long time frames and often mining practices and technologies will improve, which means areas that were previously mined could potentially be mined again to extract more resource and to make the best use of the land.

The bill makes no changes to the information already publicly available. It maintains that the Right to Information Act does not apply to the scheme manager as a body or to documents related to the manager. Regarding this provision, just because this is similar to the information available under the existing system does not mean that more openness or transparency should be considered. I am glad to see among the many amendments put forward there is an amendment to change the exclusion provisions to exemption provisions on advice from the Office of the Information Commissioner. The initial proposal was a completely unnecessary level of secrecy.

I thank the Deputy Premier and Treasurer for taking on and expanding the drafting error amendments outlined in our committee's report. I do not thank the Deputy Premier and Treasurer for bypassing our committee by bringing such a large number of amendments to this bill barely an hour ago. We have had seven months since we handed down our report, which was plenty of time to consider these significant changes to the drafting of the legislation.

It certainly is strange timing that on Friday, for the first time, I received correspondence from the CFMEU outlining their concerns. It probably would not surprise members for me to say I am not normally on their mailing list. Just a few days later we have seen the government present amendments to address some of those issues. There were problems with retrospectivity however and although the initial draft was not intended to breach fundamental legislative principles, clarification is welcome.

In conclusion, this new framework is important but these amendments show great contempt for our committee, and that is disappointing. I am sure my fellow members share that disappointment—the member for Mermaid Beach, the member for Ninderry and the member for Logan, the chair of the committee. We are there to do a job and we had plenty of time to do it.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (12.25 pm): The Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 is the most important reform in mining rehabilitation requirements in generations. It ensures a just and equitable outcome for future generations, meaning our children and grandchildren will not be cleaning up the mine site disturbance that is created today. It also protects taxpayers from having to pay for rehabilitation of mine sites.

Community attitudes around mined land have changed and the standards that were applied 50 years ago no longer meet the expectations of Queenslanders today. Today over 84 per cent of Queenslanders believe the mining industry should take responsibility for mine rehabilitation when mines are closed. As such, companies need to expand their progressive rehabilitation, and these reforms will accelerate that positive change. We have also listened carefully to industry stakeholders and we have ensured that these new laws are not retrospective.

The review of the financial assurance framework by the Queensland Treasury Corporation revealed an increasing gap between the amount of land disturbed by mining and the amount of land rehabilitated. Over 90 per cent of land disturbed by mining was not rehabilitated. Low rates of rehabilitation increase the risk of more land becoming a financial liability for taxpayers and increases the risks of environmental harm from contaminants. It is also a lost economic opportunity as converting

mined land to an alternative use can provide jobs and long-term economic prospects for regional communities. The bill addresses these findings and provides a framework to increase rates of progressive rehabilitation. It delivers on community expectations that commitments for land to be rehabilitated and returned to a postmining land use will occur according to a transparent schedule.

This legislation positions Queensland to become a world leader in financial assurance and mine site rehabilitation. Communities will be able to plan for their future, now having certainty about how mines will be rehabilitated. Through the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan or PRCP, mining companies will plan from the beginning and deliver quality progressive and final rehabilitation. Through the maps and tables of rehabilitation milestones with set time frames for delivery, the PRCP will deliver certainty for the community, industry and the government for rehabilitation outcomes for a site.

Plans will be made available on the public register, delivering a transparent approach to inform the community of the rehabilitation requirements for mine sites. Ongoing monitoring of rehabilitation performance is included in the bill, with mandatory three yearly audits. This is an early warning mechanism to assess compliance against the milestone outlined in the PRCP.

Operators are also required to report annually on their performance towards the achievement of milestones. It is an offence not to comply with the PRCP schedule. Noncompliance may trigger a range of responses under the Environmental Protection Act including environmental protection orders. The bill acknowledges that in the future some areas may not be able to support a postmining land use forever. These areas are referred to as non-use management areas and will only be approved in restricted circumstances. Land forms such as final voids or tailings facilities may not be able to support a postmining land use in the long term. New unapproved non-use management areas will need to meet the strict criteria set in the bill and be supported by sufficient justification for their approval. In addition, government has set the expectation that, unless already approved, no mine will be allowed to leave a void in a flood plain as a non-use management area.

I commend the Deputy Premier and Treasurer on her proposals to move amendments to provide a rigorous and objective process for evaluating non-use management areas that are justified in the public interest. The new public interest evaluation will ensure an objective assessment must be carried out by a qualified entity and not the applicant themselves. A non-use management area must not be approved in a PRCP unless the public interest evaluation report recommends that it is in the public interest. This is a significant step for the consideration of what is in the best interests of the community.

Approved non-use management areas will still have management milestones which will ensure that the area is designed to deliver best management practices and to minimise risks to the environment. In response to community feedback the government will also establish a rehabilitation commissioner to ensure the standards for rehabilitation in all PRCPs meet environmental best practice and the expectations of the community. Appointment of this role will take place over the next 12 months. The commissioner will be responsible for establishing best practice management for these areas providing the community with confidence that rehabilitation outcomes will stand the test of time. While existing approved non-use management areas will retain their rights, they will move to the new planning framework and will have a PRCP clearly outlining the postmining outcome.

These reforms will create jobs in an emerging rehabilitation industry. In addition, quality progressive rehabilitation will improve the social licence that the mining industry needs to have with the community. These reforms are a significant and mature step forward for Queensland's mining industry and for community confidence in mine rehabilitation.

I would like to acknowledge the work of my predecessor, Minister Miles, the former environment minister, for all of his work in progressing this bill to where we are now. I would like to acknowledge the former treasurer now Speaker, Curtis Pitt, for his work also. I would also like to acknowledge my colleague Minister Lynham and, of course, the Deputy Premier and Treasurer for all of her work and leadership in getting this bill here. This is going to make a huge difference and it is world leading, nation leading, for Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (12.32 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. This bill was originally tabled back in October 2017 in the 55th Parliament prior to the last election and obviously lapsed. This new bill was introduced into the 56th Parliament back in February.

The 2017 bill was considered by the parliamentary committee but was never debated in parliament. This new similar bill was introduced into the 56th Parliament back in February, as I said, and was referred to the Economics and Governance Committee. This being the last bill for our committee that we will be debating this year I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the

members of the committee. I would like to acknowledge our chair, the member for Logan, and our esteemed deputy chair, the honourable member for Mermaid Beach, along with the members for Pine Rivers and Redlands. I would also like to acknowledge the very honourable member for Bonney. Although he does not look that honourable at the moment with his mo, I can say that back when we debated this bill he did look honourable. I hope he is making some money for prostate cancer for Movember because he is not making any friends at the moment.

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Ninderry, you have been asked to withdraw.

Mr PURDIE: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's get back to the bill, member for Ninderry.

Mr PURDIE: It is an important issue. Seriously, I would like to genuinely acknowledge the work of the secretariat. We all know of the hard work that they do and the support that they have given not just on this bill but on all the bills we have considered and the reports we have drafted and tabled this year. I would sincerely like to thank the secretariat.

In relation to this bill, our committee received a considerable number of submissions—about 50. We heard from a number of stakeholders during the public briefing and public hearings. I think it is a shame that this bill has been before the 55th Parliament and this parliament for over a year and we have only now in the last few hours been given 40 pages of amendments that neither the committee nor I have had the appropriate time to scrutinise.

As I said, this is an important issue. No-one in this state wants to see an abandoned mine that has not been rehabilitated to an acceptable standard. As we have heard others outline earlier in this debate, the policy objectives of this bill are to manage the financial risk to the state if mineral and energy resource tenure holders do not comply with their environmental management and rehabilitation obligations and to ensure land disturbed by mining activities is rehabilitated to a safe and stable land form that does not cause environmental harm and can sustain an improved postmining land use. The bill proposes to implement these reforms by establishing a new financial provisioning scheme and by implementing mining rehabilitation reforms.

The catalyst for this bill is that unfortunately a number of cases have emerged where operators were unable to meet their rehabilitation obligations. Concerns had also been raised about the quality of rehabilitation work undertaken. As a result, the Queensland Treasury Corporation undertook a review into current financial assurance arrangements. The explanatory notes state that the proposed new scheme 'does not change the environmental or rehabilitation obligations' but is 'designed to protect the state's financial interest'.

The explanatory notes also state that the new financial provisioning scheme seeks to substantially be self-funded. This scheme fund sets out the requirements for how the fund accounts are to be kept, how amounts must be deposited and how the scheme is to be managed. An important point is that payments made to the fund are controlled receipts and are not part of consolidated revenue. An amount is payable from the fund only for the purposes of the act or to repay an amount advanced to the fund by the Treasurer.

There are some alarming components of this bill. The first one is the lack of transparency. During the committee process, the Office of the Information Commissioner raised concerns about changing the RTI Act to exempt documents and communications to the scheme manager. I understand from a sidebar conversation with the chair of the committee that the 40 pages of amendments that I have not had a chance to scrutinise in detail yet do address some of these issues.

Unsurprisingly, though, there were a number of submissions received by the committee raising concerns about these lack of transparency issues as this government talks the talk about transparency but certainly does not walk the walk. This is an important issue not only in terms of having a viable resource sector but to ensure that our natural environment is protected and maintained for future generations to come.

As at April 2017, Australia had 220,000 hectares of land that were under resource exploration, with an estimated rehabilitation cost of \$8.7 billion. In 2016-17 our minerals and energy sector contributed over \$25 billion to the Queensland economy, with a total supported workforce of almost

51,000 full-time employee positions and around 300,000 total jobs linked directly to the mining industry in Queensland. That also included \$4 billion paid to the state government whether that be by royalties, stamp duty, payroll tax or land tax.

Although I think everyone supports a regime or legislation that supports a viable and sustainable resource sector that ensures our natural environment is protected, there are major concerns around this bill from a number of key stakeholders, even stakeholders who do not always see eye to eye. The CFMEU, in conjunction with the Queensland Resources Council, sent all members of the Economics and Governance Committee a copy of a letter addressed to the Premier on Friday raising their joint concerns about the bill in its then current form. They believed that the bill, as it was drafted, could jeopardise the 300,000 Queensland jobs that are directly tied to the mining industry in this state.

As I mentioned earlier, this bill was originally tabled in the previous parliament, and I understand new amendments were frantically being drafted over the past few days only after the intervention of and to appease the CFMEU. It is disappointing that the committee has not had a good chance to research and deliberate on these amendments. An article in the *Australian* newspaper on Monday, written off the back of an independent audit conducted by Ernst & Young, reported that 16 Queensland mines may be forced to shut and more than 2,500 jobs may be lost under this rehabilitation plan proposed by the Treasurer that could lead to a \$100 billion hit to the state's commodity producers. The *Australian* goes on to say—

Some of the world's largest resources companies, including BHP, Anglo America, Peabody Energy and Glencore, are reeling from amendments to the Mineral and Energy Resources Bill that threaten to impose crippling financial imposts on existing mines ... 16 mines are at high risk of "net asset deficiencies", which indicates potential insolvency.

If the mines owned by those companies closed, the sector could lose 2540 jobs, representing \$306 million in wages and \$2.2 billion in economic output ...

As I said earlier, I appreciate that 40 pages of amendments were circulated through the chamber at about 11 o'clock this morning and some of these issues I understand might be addressed in those amendments. Again, it is disappointing that we have not had a chance to scrutinise them at this stage. In closing, we need to balance the need for a thriving mining sector with protecting our environment, and we need to make sure these bills and the amendments do that.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (12.40 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. The reforms contained in the bill present a significant upgrade to Queensland's financial assurance and rehabilitation framework. The new reform package will include a new financial provisioning scheme which includes a risk based pooled fund model and expanded surety options such as insurance bonds.

The bill will manage risk to the state and provide the Queensland government with the necessary funds to rehabilitate mine sites when environmental authority holders do not comply with their environmental management and rehabilitation obligations. The state's finances will be protected by the establishment of a pooled financial provisioning fund to operate alongside those surety options. A scheme manager will be established as a statutory officer to manage the fund and the other elements of this scheme.

This bill is unique in that it carries out a risk assessment which has not been done in other jurisdictions. Lower risk projects will provide an annual contribution and higher risk projects will continue to provide surety. Surety providers will still benefit from this reform as they will be given greater flexibility in their surety options through the introduction of insurance bonds as well as the adoption of a modular approach which will allow a combination of different surety types to be provided.

These important reforms arise out of the government's 2016 review of financial assurance. Substantial consultation has been undertaken since this time with all interested stakeholders. I am advised that the government departments will work closely with operators to ensure a smooth transition over the three-year transition period.

Queensland Treasury has worked closely with the Department of Environment and Science and the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy to finetune transitional activities required to implement this scheme. This is critical to ensure that the people involved know what is happening and have time to do it.

Another important aspect of the reforms is the improvements to what were previously called financial assurance calculators and which have now been renamed the estimated rehabilitation cost calculator. The estimated rehabilitation cost is the cost to rehabilitate the land on which the activity is

being carried out and is based on the current disturbance at that site. I have visited several mines around the state lately and have seen some of the great rehabilitation being done as the mine carries on and the benefits that can have. I am sure that this bill will ensure companies do that in the future to make sure they are continuously rehabilitating their mines as they go along. The reforms have delivered a contemporary calculator which is more effective in estimating the current rehabilitation cost for a project. The calculated ERC is important as it determines the amount of surety required or contribution to the fund required from the environmental authority holder.

The bill also amends the EP Act to deliver on the government's Mined Land Rehabilitation Policy that we released last year. This policy is not retrospective but it requires all site-specific mines to prepare progressive rehabilitation and closure plans, or PRC plans. These plans and the associated schedules will provide greater certainty to industry, landholders and the community about what a mine will rehabilitate, to what standard and when. For existing mines the approvals contained in current environmental authorities and associated documents will be translated into the PRC plans. New mines will need to comply with the new policy, and this includes a prohibition on final voids in flood plains.

Our government committed to progressing these reforms during the last election campaign. Following extensive consultation with industry and the community, this bill achieves the objectives of improving the financial assurance regime and requiring mines to undertake progressive rehabilitation at their sites. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (12.45 pm): I too rise to address the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. As others on this side have already expressed, I and the LNP certainly welcome this legislation and will be supporting it not only because of what it achieves but also because of the history that sits behind it. I have heard those opposite reflect on previous Labor environment ministers, previous mines ministers and previous treasurers. The reality is that this issue first arose way back in 2013-14 through some work undertaken when I was the minister for environment, the then member for Hinchinbrook, Andrew Cripps, was the minister for mines and the then member for Pumicestone, Lisa France, was his assistant minister. We—along with the then deputy premier and then member for Callide, Jeff Seeney, and the then treasurer and member for Clayfield, Tim Nicholls—realised that the state of Queensland was at a huge risk should rehabilitation of mine sites not be done in accordance with their environmental approvals. I guess part of this arose when then minister Cripps looked at the abandoned mines issues. A lot of what people see in terms of poor rehabilitation or voids has arisen historically. It is not current; it is historic.

Having said that, I do appreciate that a number of contemporary mining companies have not done the right thing by their EA. They have not undertaken the rehabilitation that they committed to do and therefore there had been cause to tap into the financial assurance held by the state. It was through some of those aspects that that list of former ministers and assistant ministers started putting our heads together as to what was required. One of the models we looked at was a pooled model used by Western Australian. During those discussions it was decided that Queensland Treasury Corporation needed to look at this in more detail and put some rigour around what the current situation was, what the risk to the state was and what the potential solutions were. That led to the review of Queensland's financial assurance framework undertaken by QTC which has then resulted in this bill that we have here today.

Like others, I think it is important that we understand that the current financial assurance system promotes individual responsibility. Basically it is the individual mining company or small miner or gem operator which is responsible for their rehabilitation and for the costs associated with it, but we were seeing, as I said, a number of poor rehabilitation efforts or none at all and the Queensland government was being left carrying the can for that.

What we are shifting to is a new scheme where the environmental authority holder is required to either make a contribution to the scheme fund or pay a surety in the form of a bank guarantee insurance bond issued by a prescribed insurer or cash depending on the estimated rehabilitation cost for that environmental authority and, if applicable, the risk category assigned to that authority. In some cases a small-scale mining tenure holder is required to give a surety.

The bill proposes that the scheme fund will operate on a pooled basis rather than under the current arrangements where assurance is provided for each individual environmental authority and may only be applied for rehabilitation activities relating to that environmental authority. Operating a pooled fund is intended to avoid the risk of funding shortfalls and requires holders to pay only an annual contribution.

One of the things we quickly had to grapple with is something that I notice has been picked up in some of the submissions and contributions from stakeholders and it has been reported in the committee's report. It was BHP which actually expressed that concern around a pooled scheme. They referred to the potential 'moral hazards' associated with a pooled scheme, saying that it—

... may make certain mine operators less motivated to pursue high-standard environmental and rehabilitation outcomes due to the assumption that the associated costs will be absorbed by the fund in certain circumstances.

The BHP submission went on to say—

Queensland's mine operators are essentially being asked to pay for rehabilitation twice: once for their own operations and again for the entities which draw upon the fund.

There is an element of truth to what BHP are saying. There are many operators, such as BHP, which do an exceptional job on their rehabilitation, but we still hold a financial provision for that should things go wrong. In those instances, it is very likely that BHP will pay but then pay again because other companies may not do the right thing and the state government will have to tap into that pooled scheme to achieve the outcome that Queenslanders rightly expect when it comes to environmental rehabilitation. There is truth in what BHP are saying, but I still believe that what we are voting on and considering today is the best outcome in terms of ensuring that the state is covered, that Queensland is covered and that our environmental outcomes are the right ones.

I want to conclude my contribution by again reflecting on the fact that these outcomes all commenced through some of the work of the former LNP government. I am very proud of the role I played as the then minister for environment. One of the key successes was starting to tackle some of these hairier and problematic issues. During my tenure, we were also able to transition many companies and operators which were operating on antiquated approvals to modern environmental authorities. That does allow governments to have greater scrutiny and to check more regularly on their operations. Where a company fails to achieve those expectations, the government can throw the book at them and take them to court. I will not mention specifics because a number of them are still underway in the courts, but there are a number of proceedings that are occurring because of action taken during my tenure as minister for environment. Certainly, we welcome the resource industry and we welcome all industries in Queensland but, like everyone else, we have high expectations about their environmental responsibilities. When they do not meet those responsibilities, the book should be thrown at them and it certainly was.

I am also very pleased that during that time we were able to tackle other hairy issues, such as mine water releases in the Fitzroy Basin. We were able to come up with a scientifically based solution in relation to the release of mine water—one that we were able to very effectively communicate to concerned residents in the Fitzroy Basin. With the more recent dry seasons, that is less of an issue, but should we have rainfall like we did in the years preceding the LNP government in 2010 and 2011, then the government can rest assured with the system that was put in place by the former LNP government when it comes to aspects such as mine water release in the Fitzroy Basin.

All Queenslanders have high expectations when it comes to environmental protection. It is not something that is held by only one side of politics. All sides of politics agree that Queenslanders should be able to look out on their landscape and continue to witness a pristine environment—one that is enjoyed not only by us domestically but by international tourists who visit as well. Again, I echo the words of my colleagues, particularly the shadow Treasurer and the shadow minister for mines, in saying that this legislation is welcomed. I am pleased to see the concerns of the LNP and other stakeholders are addressed through some of these amendments. I welcome the ongoing debate on this bill.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (12.54 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. I would like to take a moment to thank the committee for their work on this bill and thank all those people who took the time to make a submission. I also thank the Deputy Premier and Treasurer for her work on this bill.

I am proud to be part of a government that is taking a major step forward in ensuring that, when mining occurs in this state, the community is not left with a bill for the clean-up after the mining has ceased. The reality is that the majority of businesses involved in the mining industry do the right thing, but we do know from experience that there are times when things go wrong. There are times when rehabilitation does not occur at all or it does not occur to a standard that the community expects or demands.

When I talk to people in my electorate about mining and the mining industry, there are certainly mixed views but most people acknowledge a range of things. They acknowledge that our society relies on mining for many of the products that are fundamental to our activities of daily living—such as food, energy, housing, transport, clothing, health care and the list could go on. They acknowledge that, as a state, we are reliant on the revenue generated from the mining industry. They also acknowledge that there will be a demand for the products of mining for many years to come. However, there is also a universal view in my community that when mining occurs the mining site should be properly rehabilitated and the people of Queensland should not be left with that bill as the company exits with the profits.

Mining has been occurring in our state for a very long time. I spent some of my childhood growing up in Charters Towers and it was not uncommon for me and my brothers and sisters and friends to play in and around abandoned mine sites. Some of those were conveniently located in people's backyards just on the edge of town or even closer to town. As members know, mining in that town has been going on for well over a century. There are no doubt many other mining towns where there are historic mining sites that nobody and no business is responsible for.

This bill not only provides us with the capacity to ensure that we have the funds to rehabilitate existing and ongoing mining sites; it also allows for the state to deal with these types of legacy mining sites. I believe that is an extremely good thing, particularly in places like Charters Towers, because it probably was not ideal for kids to be playing in and around mining sites.

Changing the way we manage the financial provisioning for resource projects will be of benefit to small and medium resource businesses as the changes will result in a reduction in financial assurance costs. I talked about my community's views in relation to mining. I think this bill is really important because it will ensure community support for mining, particularly for sustainable mining practices into the future.

In various debates around this issue and others, those opposite have had some fun claiming that members on this side of the House cannot say a word that begins with 'c'—coal. Coal is an important resource in our state and will be part of the mix of producing energy and steel for many years to come, as well as income for our state. However, I can also say two other words that begin with 'c'—climate change. Those opposite certainly cannot say those words. In fact, if they all buried their heads collectively, we could fill some of these voids that we have been talking about here today.

I am proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government that is leading the way on creating a renewable future and ensuring that, where coalmining communities are affected, there is a just transition. I am proud to be part of a government that acknowledges that climate change is real and is taking real action on climate change. Like all good governments, the Palaszczuk government must balance the competing interests in our society. When it comes to the activities of the mining industry, there are numerous competing interests in this area. This presents challenges for all governments to balance those competing interests, particularly across a state as big and diverse as ours.

I am pleased to be part of a government that through this bill is taking important steps towards balancing out those competing interests. I know the people in my community will certainly welcome the fact that we are supporting the mining industry to continue to produce those things that are so important to our community. We are making sure that we support the people in the mining industry to do the right thing and do rehabilitation properly, but we are also holding to account those people who do the wrong thing and, importantly, we are making sure that Queenslanders are not left with that bill. We not only have money there to undertake this important rehabilitation work; we are not diverting money away from other important services, like hospitals, schools and child safety services.

This bill demonstrates that we support the mining industry by ensuring better financial practices, but we also acknowledge the community expectation that mining companies will rehabilitate former mining sites without leaving the bill for someone else to pay. This bill ensures that we have the financial resources to rehabilitate former, existing and future mine sites. With those few words I would like to commend the bill to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): I remind members that the unveiling of former Speaker Peter Wellington's portrait will happen now in the Speaker's Hall. I invite you all to attend.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (2.00 pm): I rise to speak to the Queensland Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. This bill is a step in the right direction in terms of preserving Queensland's stunning natural environment and moving towards an economically and environmentally sustainable mining industry. Ensuring that mines are rehabilitated to sustain a postmining use should not be controversial. Mining and associated activities are core to Queensland's economy, comprising nearly 10 per cent of Queensland's gross state product, but so are industries that depend on preserving our natural environment such as tourism, which contributes a similar amount to our GSP as does mining.

The economic benefits generated by a mine are temporary, but its environmental impacts are permanent and generate negative externalities by impacting other key industries in Queensland. This bill will assist to mitigate the negative externalities generated by the resources industry and generate better economic and environmental outcomes for all industries and all Queenslanders. Yes, this bill may increase the cost of mining operations, but that is not the whole picture. As a diversified economy, we need to be looking at how different industries impact others. The slight cost increases this bill will generate for the mining sector will be recovered in multiple ways in terms of environmental outcomes and benefits to other industries such as tourism and agriculture.

While the government should be commended for introducing this bill, which brings increased rigour to mine rehabilitation in Queensland, there have been particular concerns. Firstly, there is a concern regarding some circumstances in which a non-use management area can be declared. A non-use management area, as we have heard, is the term used in this bill for an area that cannot support a postmining use such as agriculture or tourism. Particular concerns lie in proposed section 126D(2) of the bill. This section in its current form would allow mine sites to not be made suitable for a postmining use on the basis of cost and the public interest.

While I acknowledge that the government in its explanatory notes for this bill envisage that non-use management areas for new sites would be unlikely to be allowed in most cases, the section 126D(2) exemptions for cost and public interest could be interpreted widely by subsequent governments and used for greenfield sites more regularly. This bill could have been futureproofed by clearly setting out in primary legislation the limited situation envisioned in the explanatory statement in which a cost or public interest exemption would apply that would allow a mine to be left unrehabilitated. These exceptions should be very limited and should carefully consider the long-term economic impacts of leaving unrehabilitated areas that cannot sustain a postmining use. However, as outlined in the amendments, the use of an independent assessor for the public interest test will go some way to alleviate concerns about this.

Secondly, there is the issue that existing mines would not come under the new framework. Currently, the amount of existing financial assurances is insufficient to complete the rehabilitation of a number of coalmines in Queensland, with shortfall estimates reported by media at around \$3 billion. This may lead to extra costs to taxpayers or mines that will not be returned to a postmining use. This is not acceptable and provisions need to be made to accommodate this should the interest from the assurances not cover these mines. Rehabilitation of mines in itself is an opportunity for job creation for our regional and remote areas and their economy.

I urge the government to keep in mind that the economic flows from a mine are only temporary, whereas the opportunity cost of unrehabilitated land with no economic use is permanent. This balance, along with the ecological impacts of unrehabilitated land, needs to be carefully considered in the use of the cost and public interest exemptions set out in section 126D(2).

I thank the government for bringing this much needed bill before the House and I look forward to the many examples of good rehabilitation initiatives, projects and postmining outcomes for existing and future sites and for the communities and industries that are located in their proximity.

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (2.04 pm): I rise in this House today to speak in support of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, a bill that will address the environmental impacts of resource activities and remedy a system that has not been optimal in its function. We know that we have significant problems with abandoned mines scattered across Queensland such that it has been said that their area is equivalent to over 10,000 Suncorp Stadiums. The existing financial assurance scheme has not been adequate. It has not covered the government's costs in managing environmental harm or undertaking rehabilitation when resource companies have gone into liquidation and defaulted on their obligations.

The parliamentary committee received 51 submissions and conducted a public hearing in March with key stakeholders including the Queensland Resources Council, Queensland Law Society, WWF Australia, Lock the Gate, the Environmental Defenders Office, BHP and the Office of the Information Commissioner. I thank our committee, the chair and the secretariat staff for their work in this process.

Mining and resource industries have been an integral part of Queensland's economic success. These industries contribute significantly to the economy, create jobs and provide support for our local communities. Developing a wide variety of resources naturally found in Queensland such as coal, minerals and gas for decades has allowed our great state to prosper. We know that mining activity should minimise impact on the environment. We should expect those companies that profit from the land to meet their obligations to manage their operations to minimise impacts on the community and ensure they clean up as they go.

There has been extensive consultation on this bill and it has landed in a place that manages the fine balance of the environment and the economics of the mining and resource sector. It delivers major reform that will ensure a continued prosperous mining industry and an industry that delivers world's best practice in environmental rehabilitation. For the most part, the majority of the mining companies have met their financial and environmental obligations. This legislation will ensure that those few that do not will not slip through the cracks but will be held to account. We will ensure that we embed into our legislation transparency and accountability.

Industry and community expressed their concerns about the effectiveness of the financial assurance framework. The cases of resource companies that are unable to complete their rehabilitation activities have further highlighted the issues with the framework as it exists. These issues are significant for the Queensland government, and they are significant for the Queensland community and have resulted in a large financial burden for the state and the taxpayers of Queensland. These issues must be addressed to ensure the long-term sustainability of this important industry, and this legislation does just that.

The bill introduces two significant reforms: firstly, it establishes an improved financial assurance scheme to better manage the state's financial risks. Taxpayers should not be paying for mine rehabilitation. This innovative new scheme proposed combines the best of worldwide financial assurance schemes to enable the state to manage risk. The redesigned financial assurance framework allows for a tailored and contextualised assessment. It looks at each project and evaluates based on their size and level of risk. It delivers innovation and provides options for assessment to consider pooled fund and surety options, again tailored to consider each unique set of project circumstances. It will free up cash flow for companies that can be used for investment instead of being locked up in surety.

There will be thresholds applied to the pooled funds to ensure its financial integrity. The pooled fund was recommended by the review and provides benefits to both resource companies and the government. Companies that contribute to the fund will have small annual payments rather than the need to provide very large bank guarantees. The government will have a pool of funds to draw on to rehabilitate a site when a company has not fulfilled its obligations. Other operators which the scheme manager assesses as a higher risk will be required to provide surety for the full amount of rehabilitation liability. For the companies required to provide surety, the bill provides more options than are currently available such as insurance bonds.

The bill also amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to implement the rehabilitation reforms. These reforms will ensure land disturbed by mining activities is rehabilitated to a safe and stable landform that does not cause environmental harm, unless in the public interest, and can sustain an approved postmining land use. Mining companies with site-specific environmental authority approvals to develop a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan for its current operations will be assessed and approved by the environmental regulator. Progressive rehabilitation and closure plans will be required when a company applies for a site-specific environmental authority for a mining lease by requiring companies to consider the site's full lifecycle and planned foreclosure from the beginning. I think it is really important to note that we are thinking about things up-front rather than waiting until the end of a project when the bank is a little bit lighter and funds are not flowing as freely.

Progressive rehabilitation can be factored into day-to-day mine operations, making the completion of rehabilitation more likely. This makes sense not only from an environmental perspective but, in relation to companies, economically as well. By requiring ongoing progressive rehabilitation, these reforms will encourage improved mine design and encourage job opportunities in the developing mine rehabilitation industry.

Communities will appreciate having publicly available progressive rehabilitation and closure plans that demonstrate how mined land will be rehabilitated over a mine's life and a clear picture of what the final land use will be. Companies with existing approvals will be assured that transitional arrangements for the development of progressive rehabilitation and closure plans are effective and that the bill is not retrospective, as we heard in the media last week. In addition to ensuring that best practice rehabilitation standards are met and progressive rehabilitation is planned for, the system delivers on transparent community engagement processes and a robust audit and reporting mechanism to track rehabilitation performance. The two parts of the bill are closely interconnected and encourage better rehabilitation practices over the life of the project while covering the risks to the Queensland taxpayer if rehabilitation does not occur and the company walks away.

A constituent in my electorate contacted me and raised concerns about the bill. Sue stated that she was concerned about the right to information provisions, especially as taxpayers have been repeatedly left to clean up mining messes when rehabilitation plans and financing have been inadequate. I am really pleased to advise my resident that the amendments embed further transparency and accountability within the bill. The bill also applies a rigorous public interest test and evaluation process that will ensure an objective and independent assessment of where a new unapproved non-use management area is in the public interest and should be allowed to proceed. In addition, it ensures that information provided which is not commercially sensitive is subject to RTI. This is the preferred approach of the Queensland Information Commissioner.

These reforms in themselves are a huge step forward and will ensure that Queensland taxpayers are not footing the costly expense of a mining clean-up. These reforms strike a fine balance for the industry and ensure that the new scheme is fair, efficient and integrated for the mining industry and Queenslanders. The Palaszczuk government will always work to ensure that the legacy we leave behind for future generations is one we can all be proud of. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (2.12 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 as the shadow minister for the environment. I have obviously engaged the Deputy Premier, who looks like she is calling for the third umpire, but I think she is signalling a billboard. I say to the Deputy Premier: when your side of politics comes up with three issues you are going to do something about, put up a billboard yourself. I am going to make a contribution about the RTI component—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Treasurer, you will have your turn when we wind up the bill.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will talk about what started as a farcical response regarding the RTI provisions. It was a complete and utter overreach to the point where what was offered was over and above what industry sought. Industry was quite rightly seeking the protection of individual details—predominantly financial details—which would affect their commercial transactions. That is fit and proper and reasonable. To go a step further and somehow exempt this entirely, as was originally put forward, was wrong and it did not make sense, and that is why the opposition stood up without fear or favour. I read with interest some of the advice, particularly from the Office of the Information Commissioner, who, along with the opposition, said that in their view there was a complete and utter lack of transparency. That point of view came across very, very strongly, and I note that this amendment does address those concerns. We have seen this amendment, as my good friend the member for Burdekin highlighted, with all of about half an hour's notice; nonetheless, I think it has gone a step towards what we were seeking to achieve, and that is to enable a bit of transparency.

Let me repeat: I do not want to see one figure from one project that would cost one job. That is not what this is about. It is about making sure that the taxpayers of Queensland, who want to see good, sustainable long-term mining operations, know that if the state needs to step in and assist in rehabilitation those figures are done in a transparent way without compromising any commercial realities.

I want to use this opportunity to address why rehabilitating old mines is so very important and why the opposition will support this. During the estimates process in this place I raised the issue of Baal Gammon mine. That was three months ago. I have written to the minister. We raised concerns nationwide on 7.30. The best response I have received is a letter that I would describe as paltry. It is one thing to talk about the environment, but you have to live it. Living it involves holding people to account, so let me tell you a little bit about Baal Gammon mine.

Since the beginning of this year the department of environment has known about run-off that is occurring in this part of the world, which is represented by the member for Hill. I will tell you about the water run-off and the tests: aluminium, copper, zinc and cadmium. Some of them are thousands of times the acceptable level—not one and a bit, not half a dozen but thousands of times. There may only be a couple of hundred people in the little community of Watsonville and they may not matter a lot when it comes to electoral power, but when they cannot drink their water anymore, when they cannot go for a swim in their local creek and when a guy on dialysis cannot get treatment because the water in that town is so bad, and the best response I can get after three months is a half-baked letter, there is something seriously wrong. I am going to keep raising it in this place and I am going to keep raising it publicly, because eventually we are going to see what happens when a government fails to keep its community safe.

This goes back to the issuing of licences—albeit this is a debate for the future—and a two-word term that means so very much. That term is ‘suitable operator’. Before somebody can take over a mine they need to prove that they are a suitable operator. I am asking questions about that. I have put in a few right-to-information requests about what it is to be a suitable operator, what responsibilities they have and their track records.

The other thing I want to know is, since this suitable operator provision came in, how many people who have applied across both sides of politics have been denied the status of suitable operator? I do not know the answer, but I reckon it is somewhere around zero. That is about where I have it. It is somewhere less than one. That rings alarm bells. In the case of Baal Gammon, I would not be surprised if there is a bit of correspondence that points to what a suitable operator looks and feels like. I look forward to seeing that.

The opposition will be supporting this legislation to have a quantum of money that can be used in an open and transparent way, subject to all the questions people can ask. I hope that the changes foreshadowed at the eleventh hour go far enough to ensure that the opposition and the community can ask questions without compromising a single job or a single dollar of mining investment. I hope that the changes to the RTI provision allow that to occur.

I want to ensure that when a mine goes into care and maintenance the people of communities like Watsonville can be protected. At the moment, there is not a lot of care and there ain't no maintenance. That is happening in many places. They might be miles away from the building we sit in—

An opposition member: Off the beaten track.

Mr CRISAFULLI: They might be off the beaten track indeed. There are people there who rely on that water for their way of life. I ask the Deputy Premier in her reply speech to assure us that she is confident this enables us to take a step in the right direction. If it is as I suspect it is then it will be a good step forward, but legislation without intent will be useless.

Let me tell members what intent looks like. Intent looks like the Department of Environment and Science getting serious about holding people to account when mines close. Intent looks like, if a quantum of money will be set aside, people having the right to know that it will be spent where it was collected and for the purpose it was collected and that the rehabilitation occurs. Intent looks like, when people apply in the future for a licence, operators in fact being suitable to operate in these precious environments.

 **Ms SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (2.22 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 because it is sensible reform. As the youngest member of this parliament I feel a deep sense of responsibility to ensure that my generation's future is protected. I distinctly remember visiting a Queensland mine site when I was studying biology and chemistry in year 10. We learned about not only the process of mining minerals but also the importance of minimising the impact of these operations by rehabilitating the site. This was a concept that I understood and supported as a 15-year-old and it is a concept that I support now.

It is simple: if you make a mess, you need to clean it up. Mining companies should not be able to leave taxpayers the bill after abandoning mines. Unfortunately, we have all heard of recent cases where resource companies have been unable to complete their rehabilitation activities, resulting in a large financial burden for the Queensland government and Queensland taxpayers. What this means for Gold Coasters is that, if we have to foot the bill for mining companies that do not comply with their obligations, there is less money that we have to spend on road upgrades, schools and hospitals.

We all acknowledge that the resources industry contributes significantly to the Queensland economy by creating jobs and supporting local communities. I have spoken to a number of FIFO workers in my electorate while out doorknocking and I have family who have worked on mine sites, so I absolutely appreciate the importance of this industry. That is why it is so important that these issues are addressed, to ensure the long-term sustainability of this important sector. The department has travelled far and wide and listened to community groups, industry and the public. Stakeholders from environmental groups and industry groups have engaged throughout the process to ensure that we strike the right balance.

We have made a rock-solid commitment to the resources sector that this reform will not be applied retrospectively. If a mine has a current environmental approval, that environmental approval will stand. What this bill sets out to do is set up a financial assurance scheme to require mining companies to make an annual contribution to a pooled fund which will be used if a company is unable to deliver on its environmental obligations. The amount will be determined for each project by applying their assessed risk based on the total cost of rehabilitating land disturbed by mining activity. This scheme will provide government with access to funds where a company does not comply with this obligation. Companies that contribute to the fund will have small annual payments rather than the need to provide very large bank guarantees.

The other part of this bill amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to implement rehabilitation reforms. This reform will ensure land disturbed by mining activities is rehabilitated to a safe and stable land form that does not cause environmental harm and can sustain an approved postmining land use. The bill will require mining companies with site-specific environmental authority approvals to develop a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan for its current operations which will be assessed and approved by the environmental regulator. By requiring these companies to plan for closure from the very start, progressive rehabilitation can be factored into day-to-day operations. This will encourage more regional job opportunities in the growing mine rehabilitation industry.

These reforms have been designed based on the extensive review by Queensland Treasury, the Department of Environment and Science and the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy of the existing financial assurance laws and has benefited from the independent research and financial modelling undertaken by QTC. I would also like to acknowledge the committee for its work on this bill.

I know that there are many people in our communities who have mixed feelings about mining, but I think most people acknowledge that we are reliant on many of the products that we mine and that this sector does contribute significantly to the Queensland economy. I do, however, know that my community does not support the government having to foot the bill to clean up the mess made by mining companies. Queensland's abandoned mines equate to almost 10,000 Suncorp Stadiums in size. This bill aims to stop that from happening while creating an economically and environmentally sustainable mining industry. It is sensible reform that plans for the future, and I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (2.26 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. The objectives of the bill are to manage the financial risk to the state if mineral and energy resource tenure holders do not comply with their environmental management and rehabilitation obligations and to ensure land disturbed by mining activities is rehabilitated to a safe and stable landform that does not cause environmental harm and can sustain an approved postmining land use.

Mining activities in Queensland are regulated through a mining authority such as a mining lease and an environmental authority. A mining authority provides an operator with a right to enter land and undertake mining activities, while an environmental authority requires the operator to manage the environmental impact of mining activities to minimise the environmental harm and to return the disturbed land to a useful purpose.

Following a number of cases where operators were unable to meet their rehabilitation obligations and growing concerns about the quantity and quality of rehabilitation being undertaken, the Queensland Treasury Corporation was commissioned to review financial assurance arrangements and identify possible improvements to rehabilitation performance. Its report identified a number of areas of concern with the current legislation, including that if the financial assurance held is less than the rehabilitation cost the state has no source of funding for the shortfall.

The bill proposes to replace the current financial assurance framework for resource activities under the Environmental Protection Act with a new financial provisioning scheme. The new scheme will provide government with access to funds for environmental management and rehabilitation activities

where an operator does not comply with its obligations and for funding other resource related activities such as rehabilitating abandoned mines and operating sites, and research into rehabilitation techniques.

Under the proposed new scheme, an environmental authority holder is required to either make a contribution to the scheme fund or pay a surety in the form of a bank guarantee or insurance bond issued by a prescribed insurer or cash, depending on the estimated rehabilitation cost. A number of submitters and witnesses raised concerns regarding the lack of available detail of how the new financial provisioning scheme will operate. For example, BHP submitted—

We also wish to reiterate our concerns regarding the lack of detail released by the Queensland Government at this point in time, as the Bill does not provide mine operators with enough information to properly understand the potential cost implications of this framework.

Similarly, the Queensland Resources Council stated—

While of itself, the financial provisioning components of the Bill make sense and are not of any surprise, it is the numbers that will ultimately make the difference between the sector's support or not. Unfortunately, Government only appears willing to communicate these post the Bill's Committee process.

These concerns held by the resource industry have been borne out for all to see with the last-minute negotiations between the Deputy Premier, QRC and the CFMEU being held as late as yesterday. The bill provides for the establishment of the scheme fund with a threshold of \$450 million unless an alternate amount is prescribed by regulation, and we are hearing that that could be much higher than \$450 million. In relation to the use of the fund, Queensland Treasury advised at the public briefing—

The bill is very clear and specific in terms of the purposes for which money from that fund can be used. It is solely for a cost associated with the scheme, for rehabilitation works that have to be made by the particular chief executives ... there is no allowance within the bill for broad expenditure examples that you could spend it on in terms of other functions of government.

To manage the new financial provisioning scheme, the bill provides for the appointment of a scheme manager. The manager is appointed by the Governor in Council for a term of up to five years. The bill provides that the scheme manager must allocate an environmental authority a risk category—very low, low, moderate or high—if the ERC for the environmental authority is \$100,000 or more. Prior to making a final decision about the risk category, the scheme manager must give the environmental authority holder notice of the proposed risk category, the reason for the proposed allocation and whether a contribution to the scheme fund or a surety would be required. The environmental authority holder may make submissions to the scheme manager within 20 business days of being given notice of the proposed risk category if they disagree with the risk category proposed. The risk category must be reviewed annually and the scheme manager may confirm or change the category. The review must be within 30 business days of the expiry date of the environmental authority.

In the electorate of Condamine there is currently only one mine. This is the New Hope Acland mine located near Oakey which I am sure all members in this room have heard about. It is a significant employer and a great contributor to the local community. The New Hope Group has an excellent track record for the rehabilitation of mined land. To date it has rehabilitated 45 per cent of all mined land across its Queensland operations, including New Acland, leading the way for best practice in the open-cut mines industry. The New Acland mine commenced operation in 2002 and soon after the rehabilitation program was implemented. As of December 2017, 490 hectares of mined land at New Acland were rehabilitated to a standard of grazing land, with 240 hectares of this area having the capacity to raise between 75 and 100 head of cattle. The New Hope Group commissioned research conducted over a five-year period by independent livestock consultants. This research determined that the cattle performed equally or better on rehabilitated land than the cattle grazing on undisturbed land.

Earlier this month the New Hope Group's leading environmental credentials have been formally ratified through the Queensland government's certification of 349 hectares of progressively rehabilitated mined land at New Acland. New Hope's Managing Director, Shane Stephan, said that this is in recognition of its ongoing commitment to the environment and he is proud to say that this area of land is the largest single area of certified rehabilitation for an open-cut mine in Queensland. In 2016 New Hope Group was the recipient of the Australian Business Awards for Sustainability for its rehabilitation practices. Following this, in 2018 New Hope Group won three ABAs including the business innovations award which recognised New Acland for its innovative work to improve the quality of coal before it is processed through the mine's wash plant. As well as the rehabilitation of land at Acland for grazing and livestock, New Hope Group has also participated in the native tree and seedling program with Greening Australia using recycled water from the mine.

Although not in the Condamine electorate, the Peabody Wilkie Creek mine prior to the redistribution was located on the boundary of the Condamine electorate. This is another story of successful rehabilitation of mined land, with pastures introduced to enable the grazing of cattle. Peabody has over time progressively rehabilitated the land, starting well before the closure of the mine in 2013. It is expected that the completion of the rehabilitation works will occur by 2023 to 2025. Wilkie Creek has now over 60 per cent of the rehabilitation completed, including the backfilling of open-cut voids, reshaping of dumps and undergoing demolition and associated works. Grazing trials are continuing, with 50 cattle currently on a rehabilitated backfill pit performing just as well as the cattle on neighbouring native pastures. Peabody has embraced local knowledge and worked closely with the adjoining landowners to monitor and manage groundwater flows to prepare the rehabilitated land for cattle grazing. These are two examples of rehabilitation that I had the opportunity to view personally and the continuation of this work will allow for disused land after mining activities to once more be productive for the environment and the economy.

I do have some concerns about this legislation, those being that the bill does not provide a right for a merits review of decisions made by the scheme manager. Decisions of the scheme manager are final and conclusive unless affected by jurisdictional error under the JR Act. These concerns were shared by the Queensland Law Society, which stated—

QLS submits that the grounds of review for scheme manager's decisions should be not be limited in this way, and that there should be a process for appeal or internal review of these decisions.

I also have concerns around the right to information to the financial provisioning scheme, but it is my understanding that this has been addressed by the amendments. We will not be opposing the bill.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (2.36 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 and want to try to cut to the heart of what are the most serious issues with this legislation. There was a lot of good work done between the mining companies and the government in terms of the intent of the primary purpose of this bill with regard to tidying things up relating to financial securities. It is disappointing that there used to be a mechanism that said that if people were doing the right thing there were discounts available to them to progress, but I believe that is not available anymore. There was some good work done, but there is a concern about bringing in the amendments which raise some serious issues around the future investment of mining in the region.

We are very mindful—and I note that both sides of the House are in support of this—and concerned about the growing rise of environmental movements. Mount Isa and the north-west has a front-row seat in terms of the impact between the environment and mining. We have our problems such as Mary Kathleen and Mount Oxide, and there were problems with Ernest Henry as well with its water initially. There are problems—we are well aware of that—and miners need to be able to pay for their clean-up. However, we also need to be conscious that there are some highly active, very well resourced environmental lobby groups that are looking for a way in to every mechanism available to constrain and restrict more mining development in this state.

In terms of the projected revenue and the existing revenue with regard to what mining contributes, it is a big thing and it does not just happen and I think that is something that is lost on this House over and over again. We cannot just expect the industry to keep ticking over and contributing to the economy unless the settings are right. I am all for these people paying their way and for those financial securities being there, but there needs to be some consideration of when we are doing damage to future investment in the industry, because we will wake up in 20 years and there will be no mining industry left or a small portion of what we used to know as the mining industry left because we have put too many incremental changes on it.

One thing we know is that there are strong environmental movements that want to encroach on the mining industry and this gives them another lever. It gives them another way to get in and stop development, and that is the thing that concerns me the most. Having some highly paid consultant who comes in and makes a decision outside of those community areas puts a lot of risk on someone who is coming in.

No doubt, there are a lot of big ugly mining companies out there that try to do as little as possible to fix things up but, at the same time, we need some of these companies to invest. There are already a lot of constraints. We have a government process. If that process needs tweaking or improving, let us do that. If I am a potential investor looking to invest in the north-west minerals province, it would scare the life out of me if there were new regulations and new opportunities for environmental lobby

groups to come in after everything that I have wanted to do has been approved and everything has been done. If I am mining zinc and the price of zinc drops and I look at mining for copper at a greenfield site and, because of that, the whole mining process changes and it is now open to that public interest test, that must impact on my decision-making process. There is an increased level of risk. The government could say, 'Trust us. We're the government,' but, in this environment now, there are well-resourced environmental lobby groups that go to Mount Isa and scare the hell out of everyone by saying, 'This is terrible. We're going to make the mines do this.'

Sometimes these groups can prey on people's ignorance and sometimes their campaigns are justified. Lock the Gate did a good job in its fight against coal seam gas. Now, we have groups that are so anti mining that, if anything crops up, they will get on a plane or a bus from Brisbane and go to those far-flung areas and rouse all the locals. That could be called a public interest. I can see a scenario where this whole process can be thwarted. No-one in this room can deny that the environmental lobby group is a growing force and has the ability to cause that disruption.

That is what concerns me the most about this bill. I live in an area that relies very heavily, if not solely, on mining to keep it running. We know what is needed. There have been some failures. The legislation has not been perfect. Some of the provisions in this bill are good—for example, increasing the requirements for financial security. However, the government has to be conscious of the fact that, every time it opens the door for these environmental groups to come in, there will be a cost to the budget and there will be a cost to the economy. I do not think that has been measured properly. It would be very difficult to measure. I do not know how it could be done. The government cannot complain when big holes are blown in the budget in the future when it is trying to rehabilitate the Mount Morgan mine or Mary Kathleen and does not have the money to do it. We need to have investment in mines so that they can operate and generate an income so that there is the capacity to undertake environmental clean-up activities.

This bill has inadvertent effects. It is opening the door to overzealous environmental lobby groups that, in some cases, can be misguided. It is a shame that some consultants could make a big business out of this legislation and often that can take money away from a mining community. I think that is a real problem. I have serious concerns about that part of the bill. We will closely consider opposing that part of the bill.

We are happy with the financial securities part of the bill. I think it is good that we hold mining companies to account and that there will be money in the till when they need to clean up these mines. However, when the government changes the parameters and puts in all of these risks to mining in the future, that can raise significantly the risk profile of a project. It is fair to say that, in the current political environment, we have very well resourced environmental lobby groups. Those provisions would scare the hell out of investors which, in my view, would have a definite impact on the future of mining investment in this state, which I think is a very serious issue indeed.

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (2.44 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. Some seven months ago the Economics and Governance Committee recommended that the bill be passed and made one other recommendation in relation to a minor drafting error in clause 173. There are two major objectives of this bill: to manage the state's financial risk that currently exists for when or if mineral and energy resource tenure holders do not comply with their environmental management and rehabilitation obligations and to ensure that the land disturbed by mining activities is rehabilitated to a safe and stable landform that does not cause environmental harm and can sustain an approved postmining land use.

A number of cases have emerged in which operators have been unable to meet their rehabilitation obligations. Concerns have also been raised about the quality of the rehabilitation work being undertaken. As a result, the Queensland Treasury Corporation undertook a review and produced a report that identified a number of key disadvantages within the current system. As a result of that report, the QTC advised the government to develop a reform package.

The bill proposes to replace the current financial assurance framework for resource activities under the EP Act. The new replacement scheme would provide the government with access to funds for environmental management and rehabilitation activities when an operator does not appropriately comply. Additionally, if this bill is passed, the government would have access to funds for undertaking other resource related activity, such as the rehabilitation of abandoned mines and operating sites as well as research into rehabilitation techniques.

Under the proposed new scheme, an environmental authority holder is required to either make a contribution to the scheme fund or pay a surety, depending on the estimated rehabilitation cost, if applicable. Additionally, a small-scale mining tenure holder is also required to give a surety. The bill proposes that the scheme fund will operate on a pooled basis rather than the current process where assurance is provided for each environmental authority and may be applied only for rehabilitation purposes relating specifically to that environmental authority. Operating a pooled fund is intended to avoid the risk of funding shortfalls and requires the holder to pay only an annual contribution.

The new financial provisioning scheme is said to be substantially self-funded. In order to achieve that, the bill provides for investment in the scheme fund and for the collection of fees for participants in the scheme for cost-recovery purposes. The bill provides for the establishment of the scheme fund. It sets out the requirements for how the fund accounts are to be kept, how amounts must be deposited and how the scheme is to be managed. The fund threshold is \$450 million, unless an alternative amount is prescribed by regulation. This component of the bill was to commence on 1 July this year.

This is an important issue not only in terms of having a viable resource sector but also to ensure that our natural environment is protected and maintained for future generations. As at April 2017, Queensland had 220,000 hectares of land under resource exploration and extraction, with an estimated rehabilitation cost of \$8.7 billion. In 2016-17, our minerals and energy sector contributed over \$25 billion to the Queensland economy, with a total supported workforce of almost 51,000 FTE positions. That contribution also included \$4 billion paid to the state government, whether that be in royalties, stamp duty, payroll tax or land tax.

The current financial system promotes individual responsibility, but there have been too many occasions of poor rehabilitation, or none at all, and the Queensland taxpayers are left with that cost of rehabilitation. In some cases, the financial assurance is nowhere near the cost that is required to undertake rehabilitation, which is why things need to change. As the QTC said in its report, the status quo does not protect the state's financial interests, is expensive for industry and does not promote good environmental outcomes.

I am sure most Queenslanders support our resource industry, the jobs that it provides for our state and the economic benefits it brings. Many of our schools and hospitals are built from the royalties that our resource sector provides to the Queensland budget. Queenslanders also expect resource projects to stack up environmentally as well as economically and that mining sites are rehabilitated properly after operations have finished.

Although both sides of the argument in this debate have raised concerns about this bill, I believe that the framework is the right one going forward and one that the LNP also considered when it was in government. It is the government's job to ensure that these important reforms are implemented properly and have the intended effect. It is important that all of these changes are done properly, because they are important in protecting our natural environment as well as bringing industry on the reform journey with the government. In conclusion, I support the passing of this bill.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (2.50 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill. If you make a mess you clean it up. It is a simple concept. Even most kids understand that. The need for serious reform on mining rehabilitation has been clear for years. This is an issue that the Greens have been pursuing long before taking a seat in this House. We welcome the small steps taken by Labor in this bill, but there is no doubt that much could be improved in the bill and much remains to be done. It is vital that we get this right. Good steady jobs in rehabilitation are one incredibly important part of a jobs-rich transition to clean energy. They are located at the former mine sites and they generally require similar skills to mining. Digging up coal creates a lot of jobs pushing dirt out of a big hole. We have a big opportunity to create thousands of more jobs pushing it back in. In our fight for a cleaner future, which is also a fairer one, we cannot afford to leave mining communities behind.

For the last week big mining companies have been throwing a massive tantrum chucking their toys out of the pram and all of this because there was a hint—just a hint—that they would be forced to clean up their own mess. Their bullying has worked. Labor seems to have rolled over and is leaving a few massive loopholes in these laws that will let big companies walk away leaving toxic final voids for Queensland taxpayers, local communities and the environment to deal with.

There are certainly some things to applaud, but Labor looks like it is set for yet another big cave-in to big coal. One could indeed drive a mining truck through some of the loopholes in Labor's bill. Even after the government's amendments the bill will allow almost any existing mine to leave behind a

massive final void. The companies and Labor have talked endlessly about how we cannot make existing mines clean up their own mess because that would amount to retrospectivity. That is complete rubbish. By bringing on this legislation Labor has admitted what we have said for years: the mining rehabilitation system in Queensland is fundamentally broken. That means we need to fix it, not lock in out-of-date approvals. There is nothing retrospective about saying to a company, 'Times have changed. The community will no longer accept massive holes in the ground that leach toxic chemicals and pollute local rivers.'

The vast bulk of mines in Queensland in terms of area of land disturbed by mining are currently operating. Months ago I had made inquiries with the Minister for Environment about how many voids there are in Queensland as a consequence of past and current mining operations. Surely having this information to hand is essential for us as legislators when we are considering changes like those proposed in the bill. Minister Enoch replied to me advising that she would not and could not provide this information even after the bill had been introduced. Just today we find out, based on independent analysis, that 218 final voids will be unaffected by this reform. That is 218 final voids that industry will not be required to clean up. Industry groups tell us that this clean-up would cost \$20 billion, far too much for them to be able to pay for. Instead, either that mess is left behind completely or that is \$20 billion that Queenslanders are left to pay.

On the issue of financial assurance, we have some concerns about moving away from mining rehabilitation bonds for big miners and moving towards an insurance model which could continue to expose the public purse to big risks. For example, the thermal coal sector is at huge risk of going bust as the world switches to clean energy in time to avoid catastrophic global warming. In these circumstances there is a real risk that the scheme fund will not be sufficient to cover downturn in an entire sector and once again Queenslanders are left holding the baby.

The bill totally leaves out the massive CSG and fracking industry, despite the fact that Labor is currently going hell for leather expanding fracking. Public notification and consultation on rehabilitation plans are weak and should be strengthened because local communities have a huge stake in the future of their own places. We are concerned that shonky operators or companies owned by corporations with dodgy track records overseas will get an easy ride because of loopholes in the bill. When an old mine gets sold to a \$1 shelf company there must be proper oversight. As it stands, it is not clear that there will be any way for regulators to check whether companies can actually do the work to rehabilitate old mines. These weak laws are what the billionaire mining companies get in return for their massive donations to Labor and the LNP. The boom and bust of corporate greed is leaving Queenslanders behind. I am calling on Labor to finally stand up to their donors, the billionaire mining companies.

Labor's amendments are totally focused on what happens in the future. There is already an obligation to rehabilitate existing mines under our existing laws, but Labor's bill allows these companies to continue to get away with shoddy rehabilitation. The amendments I will move today go some way to addressing the shortcomings of the bill. Firstly, they remove the exemption that would allow automatic approval to leave behind decades of industry waste, toxic final voids, waste rock dumps and tailings dams. Secondly, they would require that no coalmine be allowed to leave a final void. In the USA it has been 40 years now since this practice was allowed, yet nothing in the bill brings Queensland up to that standard. Companies that operate in both Australia and the US can readily meet this requirement overseas but not in Australia since they are not required to. Finally, my amendments would delete the outrageous gag clause that keeps vital information about risks to the taxpayer secret from the public.

Labor's big cave-in to big coal will cost thousands of jobs in rehabilitation in Central Queensland and the south-east. This is at a time when we know we need a jobs-rich transition away from coal. My amendments would create 5,000 jobs in just the 10 biggest coalmines in Queensland and Lock the Gate have estimated that they would create 12,000 across Queensland. It is a crying shame that Labor continually fails to stand up to these billionaire coalmining companies and refuses to create these rehabilitation jobs for Queensland. Jobs in rehabilitation are one important part of a just transition away from coal: they are steady, they are located at the former mine site and they require similar skills to coalmining. By failing to apply to existing voids, this legislation misses a massive opportunity to create 12,000 jobs.

The Greens welcome the government's commitment to a mining rehabilitation commission. In fact, the Greens announced a policy calling for a mining rehabilitation commissioner in 2016, if members would believe it. The commission must be adequately funded and it must have real oversight powers, including reviews and audits, of both the Department of Environment and Science and the mining industry. It must also have the responsibility to define best practice mine rehabilitation for non-use

management areas and more generally. We welcome the proposed amendments in response to the information commissioner's criticism of the bill, but the proposed exemption through schedule 3 of the RTI Act is still overreach and an unnecessary capitulation to the resources sector. There is ample provision in the RTI Act to protect genuinely confidential information and this carve-out for private commercial interests is an unusual and perhaps even an unprecedented use of the schedule 3 exemption.

I will speak to my amendments in some more detail if time permits in consideration in detail, but whatever the outcome regarding these amendments I will support the bill.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.57 pm): Today we will make history, but going by the member for Maiwar's contribution just now one would not know it. We will pass nation-leading legislation that will ensure that mining companies, not Queensland taxpayers, are responsible for rehabilitation after mining. This legislation means that there is now an historic new standard for mine rehabilitation. Proposals for new mines will have to meet new standards for postmining uses. Mining companies will need to provide a progressive rehabilitation plan seeing mining rehabilitation jobs created throughout the life of the mine, not left until the never-never of a closure plan.

I am proud to be part of establishing this new historic standard for the Queensland mining industry. I think that the Greens and the member for Maiwar really need to get on board with this historic bill that is before the parliament and support these provisions rather than talking it down and talking down the jobs in this industry.

Mr Berkman interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: You might support the bill, member for Maiwar, but all we are hearing from the Greens is a running down of this bill. They need to support this historic bill before the parliament. I know that the expertise of mine rehabilitation that we have here in Queensland will not only serve us well but also be something we can export to other parts of the world. Why should overseas mines be held to any lesser standard?

I am a town-planner by profession and I take seriously my obligation to protect the environment and our built environment for future generations. Despite their election appeals asking voters to make history, the most hypocritical contribution was that made by the member for Maiwar as the representative of the Greens. They say that they care more for the environment than for politics, but the Greens' approach is the most cynically political. Labor has brought historic legislation to the House to protect the environment and Rick Humphries from activist group Lock the Gate said that the government should be congratulated for the most comprehensive review of mine rehabilitation law in Australia's history, yet all the Greens do is come in here and attack Labor—not the LNP, not the mining industry, but Labor.

Let me explain how the Greens work. They used to be about the environment, but now they are all about building political power. They have completely lost their way.

Honourable members: Ha, ha!

Mrs LAUGA: It is funny. Their political strategy means they cannot give Labor any credit, so they have to continually move to more extreme positions—not smarter policy but more extreme policy positions. That is why just now the member for Maiwar spent almost his entire speech criticising this historic bill. They say they care about jobs but then lower themselves by joining the LNP in promoting a culture war at the expense of the environment. The LNP love to say that governments must choose between jobs and the environment. The Greens give this culture war oxygen for their own political benefit. Their own political strategy means that they must set the environmental bar too high for anyone else to meet. They take extreme positions so that Labor cannot support them without hurting the working people we stand for, but we will not do it.

I know we do not have to choose between jobs and a better environment. There is a better way and it means putting people ahead of politics. However, today the Greens put politics ahead of people. We can achieve a balance between jobs and the environment, and Labor has struck that balance in this bill. They say they want an inclusive society, but the Greens take part in the cheap politics of dividing regional Queensland from the south-east. They say they care about people, but they are not prepared to work with industry and the unions to manage the transition to modern environmental standards like those contained in this bill. Adding insult to injury, they say they support diversity but spend the entire 2017 election campaign campaigning in South Brisbane and McConnell against progressive Labor women from migrant families. It is ludicrous. I am proud to be part of making history here today by supporting the bill before the House.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (3.02 pm): I rise to speak on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. As we have heard from other members here today, this very important bill came before the House in 2017, was considered by a committee and was due to be debated in December 2017. Unfortunately, the election got in the way of that. The bill came back and was rushed through the committee stages in only four weeks. One of the big issues before the House now is that we are being asked to consider legislation that we have not even seen. That is what is happening.

Ms Trad: Amendments—they have been circulated.

Mr HART: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. These amendments change the legislation before the House. They are called amendments because they change the legislation before the House. In this place there are 93 members and in our areas we represent 36,000 electors who all have concerns about mining, the health of the economy and the way forward for all of those things in Queensland. One would think it would be very important for us all to have a full understanding of the legislation that we are debating and to fully understand what it will mean for the mining industry, especially when we consider the ramifications that it could have in terms of sovereign risk.

Therefore, it is surprising that the Deputy Premier would come into the House this morning and put the amendments in front of us all with very little notice. We are expected to read through these amendments and understand how they will impact the legislation. Over the weekend, I read in the newspapers of the concerns that the resource industry has with this. Over the weekend I saw a couple of front-page articles that stated that the Resources Council thought that if these amendments were in fact retrospective—and I understand the Deputy Premier has been talking to the resource industry and the environmental movement about that—the impact on the resource industry could be something like \$22 billion. In fact, I also saw—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. I am sorry, member. There is far too much audible noise. If you are having conversations, please take those conversations outside.

Mr HART: Over the weekend I read another article that said that the impost on the mining companies might be as much as \$100 billion. Mining companies put together plans for their mines based on the laws and the rules at the time. Of course, to be financially viable you do not want anything much to change. They take into account changes in the value of whatever it is they are pulling out of the ground, whether that is coal—a word that we do not like the other side to hear—gold, silver, nickel or any of the other minerals that are taken out of the ground. They understand that those prices fluctuate over a period and, of course, they take that into account. However, they do not take into account the changes that governments may make, especially Labor governments, at the last minute and the impact that may have into the future on their businesses. The sovereign risk that this sort of legislation could possibly have is too great to even consider.

I understand that these amendments were brought in this morning. The opposition sought to have access to the amendments, but we were not given access. We were given a briefing, but we were not given access to the written words, so we did not have the opportunity to look at the amendments overnight, digest them and fully understand them. Today we are here debating this legislation without the full knowledge that we should have and that the members of our electorates want us to have.

Various things in the legislation worry me. One of them is the exemption to the right to information that has been put forward. Parts of this will be exempt from the RTI Act, which is another example of the Labor Party hiding information that could embarrass them and that they do not want made public. They have put an exemption in place to exclude from the operation of the RTI Act documents created or received by the scheme manager under part 3 of the bill. They have excluded that whole section, which I do not think is appropriate.

The other thing that concerns me is that they have put a public interest test into the amendments. I understand that will be controlled by an external contractor. I ask the Deputy Premier to explain that, because from what I have read in the explanatory notes it is not quite clear whether the company or the government will appoint that external contractor. Is there a panel that the external contractor can be approved for? Will they be Labor mates? What will happen here?

Ms Trad: It won't be Michael Caltabiano.

Mr HART: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. If you are offering him a job, I am sure he would be happy to have a job. There are 61 amendments—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. Minister for Education, you need to be in your own seat if you are going to interject. Manager of Opposition Business, there will be no further conversations across the chamber.

Mr HART: The member for Condamine or somebody else this morning mentioned that they had had a look at the New Acland mine. I went out to the New Acland mine when I was the deputy chair of the committee that was looking at the changes to regulations around mines. Those who have been there would know that the New Acland mine has done a fantastic job of rehabilitating that mine. They have filled in the holes. If people walked through the grass one would not see them. There are cows feeding on the grass. They have done a wonderful job. I would encourage other mining companies to have a look at what they have done at the New Acland mine. They have done an excellent job when it comes to rehabilitation.

Then we go to other parts of Queensland and we see ugly holes in the ground that should be filled in. To that extent, it does make a lot of sense to have a combined fund to take care of that. Mines run for 30, 40 or 50 years. After that time, the amount of money that might have been set aside or might not have been set aside for rehabilitation more than likely would not cover the cost of filling in the holes, growing grass, planting trees and getting animals in—putting it back to the way it was. I fully support that part of the legislation around having that fund in place, but there are a number of things that concern me. If the Deputy Premier could take on board a couple of the things I have said and give me some feedback on them that would be great.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (3.11 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018. I will try to make my contribution brief because we know that the debate on this bill is about to get cut off. I know there are a number of members who are still keen to speak on this bill.

I know that residents in the electorate of Moggill truly believe that our mining and resources sector is very important to Queensland's economy, but they also believe that our mining and resources sector needs to be responsible for cleaning up any adverse outcomes and contribute to mine rehabilitation. We certainly cannot have the ongoing situation in Queensland where taxpayers are shouldering the burden of issues around mine rehabilitation and adverse environmental outcomes.

When it comes to a financial assurance scheme in Queensland we certainly need a scheme that is fair and evidenced based and not one that is used for any purpose other than what it was intended for. We know that when there is a multibillion dollar fund created in Queensland there is the potential risk that the government might look to that scheme and use it for purposes that it was not really intended for.

We only have to look back to the previous parliamentary term where the Palaszczuk Labor government used the long service leave fund of public servants and the defined benefits scheme to come up with some of their voodoo economics where they loaded general debt onto government owned corporations. So we have concerns that they may use this fund for purposes other than it was originally intended. We all need our mining and resource companies to play their part and meet their environmental and rehabilitation obligations.

When I was shadow minister for environment and heritage protection and shadow minister for national parks and the Great Barrier Reef I visited a number of parts of Queensland where mining and resource companies were doing terrific work. I went up to Weipa and saw the Rio Tinto bauxite mine. They have delivered some great outcomes over the last 30 years when it comes to rehabilitation. It was certainly a pleasure to go up there with the member for Chatsworth in his former role as shadow minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships. Rio Tinto is also contributing to some great employment programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

I know that environmental groups will be supportive of this legislation. In my capacity as the state member for Moggill and shadow minister I have certainly met with them. They reinforced with me the importance of getting mine rehabilitation right here in Queensland, not only in relation to some poor environmental legacy issues but moving forward in the future. I acknowledge that the government has negotiated that this legislation will not be retrospective.

Importantly, in Queensland we certainly need royalties coming from our mining and resources sector. Those royalties are needed for building our hospitals, roads, bridges and schools not only in my electorate of Moggill but right across Queensland. That is very important when we have a high unemployment rate in Queensland—the highest of any state jurisdiction. We have debt in Queensland reaching \$83 billion by 2021-22. We cannot afford not to have that investment in Queensland.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I call the Deputy Premier to reply to the second reading debate.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (3.15 pm), in reply: I start by thanking all members for their contributions to these historical reforms—

Mr Lister: I didn't get to contribute because you cut us off.

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from the member for Southern Downs because he is the only one on that side of the House who makes an incredible contribution on every bill I introduce into this House—much better than the deputy opposition leader, can I say.

Mr LISTER: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I find those compliments from the Deputy Premier offensive and unhelpful and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Deputy Premier, I ask you to withdraw those comments.

Ms TRAD: Sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker. I withdraw those compliments. I thank all members for their contributions to this debate. It is historic reform and once in many generations reform that we are actually considering in this House. We should not lose sight of that. I think that is evident by the fact that these laws have widespread support across the chamber. I do want to reflect on that momentarily before responding to some of the issues and concerns that have been raised during the debate.

I take a moment to thank my ministerial colleagues, both former and present, who have made an enormous contribution to this bill presented for debate and hopefully endorsement and adoption shortly. To the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy, Anthony Lynham, and the Minister for Environment and Minister for Science I say a big thank you. To the Speaker, the former treasurer, and the former environment minister and then member for Mount Coot-tha, the now Minister for Health, Stephen Miles; I say thank you for your enormous contribution to the significant amount of work that has been done in relation to this bill. I thank all of the members of the Economics and Governance Committee and the committee secretariat for the enormous work they have done in relation to the financial assurance laws that we are adopting here today.

I want to address some of the complaints that have been made around process by those opposite. Firstly, we heard from the member for Everton and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Burleigh and a number of other contributors about the concerns they have regarding the volume of amendments that have been presented to be considered during the consideration in detail stage. I say to all of those members that the government is aware that this has produced an additional burden and additional taxation on the thinking and engagement of members in this House and that is why the Leader of the House has proposed an additional period of time for the consideration in detail debate.

These amendments were circulated some four hours ago. As the member for Burleigh—and only the member for Burleigh from those opposite—has advised the House, the government did provide the opposition members with a briefing yesterday, as well as the crossbench. Whoever asked for a briefing on all of the amendments got a briefing when they asked for it. In fact, we had publicised many weeks ago that we will be pursuing amendments to this legislation before the House. We had said that publicly. We had said it to a number of stakeholders who had been engaging with us repeatedly around the concerns that they still had in relation to this bill. We had made it very clear publicly that we were pursuing amendments.

The first request that we got for a briefing on the amendments that we were proposing was just this Monday past from the opposition office. We responded promptly to that request and provided a fulsome briefing yesterday afternoon to those members of the opposition who had been nominated by the Leader of the Opposition's office to attend that briefing and go through all of the amendments. I want to thank my departmental staff and staff from my office who provided that briefing to the opposition and to the member for Noosa upon her request. I understand that all of the questions were answered by the staff and officials in attendance, and that took something in the vicinity of 40 minutes. Let's be very clear: we have afforded those opposite and those who are interested in understanding the amendments more the opportunity to be briefed on the amendments before they come into this House and participate in the consideration in detail debate.

In relation to the concerns that some members opposite have professed that they have championed around this bill and largely the right to information exclusions or exemptions contained within the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill, I do want to respond to that. I believe that these are hollow statements made particularly by the member for Broadwater and other members of the opposition. The member for Broadwater wants to talk about raising issues without fear or favour. There was an opportunity during the parliamentary committee process, where these concerns were raised by stakeholders, where any number of opposition members—the member for Mermaid Beach, the member for Bonney, the member for Ninderry—could have put in a dissenting report or could have made a statement. In fact, the shadow environment minister could have made a submission himself to the parliamentary committee process.

Any single member of this House, if they were so aggrieved by that provision, should have gone through the parliamentary committee process, put in a dissenting report and, quite frankly, put their arguments through that process for the government to consider. They did not do that. There is no dissenting report. There are no concerns expressed by either the member for Broadwater or the member for Mermaid Beach or the member for Bonney or the member for Ninderry. Instead, they hold their fire and come into this place and want to complain about it. I think that just proves that they are political grandstanders and not policy contributors.

I will go to some of the other issues raised by those opposite. I was entertained by the position put by both the member for Everton and the member for Glass House that this was a significant piece of work that was actually commenced under them and, in fact, that it was the former natural resources minister—a man who is well known to many in this House—Andrew Cripps, the former member for Hinchinbrook, who started this because he was so concerned about the legacy issue of abandoned mines. I was very entertained by this statement. I was so entertained by this statement that we did some rapid research to try to get an understanding of what had happened.

Mr Butcher: Get some clarity on this.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Gladstone—to try to get some clarity, to try to get some evidence of those having pursued the financial provisioning reforms that we need to see in this state to make sure that Queensland taxpayers do not foot the bill for mining companies that do not do the right thing and rehabilitate land and clean up after themselves. I could not find anything actually that had been released by those opposite when they were in government.

I did find a resources update from December 2014 from Piper Alderman. They talked about an update on amendments to Queensland's financial assurance system. They talked about a discussion paper that was released for consultation in June. They must have done that quietly. It must have been a targeted consultation. They talked about the discussion around a new alternative being proposed looking at a 'pooled fund model' for environmental authority holders for mining, petroleum and gas activities in Queensland. It would include things like a contribution rate based on the credit rating of the operator or its parent company—tick—or a fixed contribution rate applicable to all operators regardless of their or their parent company's credit rating. That was very interesting.

What did the government do about this discussion paper or what did Piper Alderman say the government was going to do in relation to this? Let us not forget that this was in December 2014 and that it was a matter of weeks before Campbell Newman called the election in 2015 during people's Christmas holidays. Apparently, according to Piper Alderman, the government announced that it would 'not be proceeding with the amendments in the form proposed and is developing a further alternative "negotiated risk evaluated" framework' after substantial concerns were raised by the industry.

Those opposite might claim they started something, although there is very little evidence of it. After the industry essentially said, 'No, we're not interested.' They said, 'Okay, we won't do it.' I am so excited that the LNP have come in here and have seen the light and have decided that progressing a system of financial assurance for mining operations in this state to protect the Queensland taxpayer is now the new vogue. I am very happy to have their support on board in relation to this.

The Liberal National Party, when they were in government, oversaw a 33 per cent reduction in staff in the environment department—that is almost 500 jobs gone. They cut the Office of Climate Change. They stopped the Sustainable Energy Innovation Fund and the ClimateSmart Home Service. They took an axe to tree-clearing laws. They repealed the waste levy—they just scrapped it and made Queensland the dumping ground for New South Wales and Victoria. They shelved our first biodiversity strategy. They announced that they would start uranium mining again in Queensland after saying they would not. They approved the dumping of dredge spoil on the Great Barrier Reef. Then the issue that

is so close to the heart of the member for Broadwater—that issue that you have to live by: ‘You cannot just talk about the environment; you have to live it,’ he said. ‘You have to live it.’ The issue that is so close to his heart, the Baal Gammon Mine, actually recommenced in 2012 under the LNP. I was entertained by the notion that the same party that presided over this devastating environmental record in our state would progress these groundbreaking reforms in mine rehabilitation and financial assurance for resource activities. Quite frankly, it is laughable. Those opposite cannot expect anyone on this side of the chamber to believe a word of it.

Let me go to some of the other issues raised during the debate. I am incredibly proud of the fact that we have done a significant amount to ensure full consultation on this legislation. I want to call out a number of the organisations that have been involved in the consultation process to date. Of course, we have the Resources Industry Advisory Committee, which includes APPEA, QRC, AMEC, BHP, Glencore, Jellinbah and APLNG. We have consulted with the Queensland Resources Council, APPEA, AMEC, Lock the Gate Alliance, the Environmental Defenders Office, the Queensland Conservation Council, the Mackay Conservation Council and the World Wide Fund for Nature. They have been repeatedly involved in this process.

As we have mentioned on many occasions before, we are a government that consults. We have provided a number of discussion papers to stakeholders so that they can work through the very heavy complex and detailed technical information that is required for us to implement these laws, and I am very proud of the work that has been done to ensure that stakeholders have had a full say in these historic reforms.

Can I respond to the member for Noosa. I thank her for her support on this bill. I do acknowledge her concerns about leaving non-use areas for mining. Can I say that I share those concerns. That is why amendments proposed by the government have an expanded public interest test. I am very proud that we will be introducing an independent and robust mechanism to analyse in the public interest whether or not non-use management areas should be approved.

In relation to abandoned mines and the issue of continuing non-use management areas, I want to say to the member for Noosa that this is why we are doing a whole big piece around abandoned mines. I want to acknowledge my cabinet colleague the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts, who will be leading that process around the residual risk framework into the future. Very importantly, the pooled funds that this legislation will ensure are there for the people of Queensland will provide some funding relief and some recurrent resources for the very important work of research around abandoned mines and proper rehabilitation, and I think that is an excellent outcome.

I acknowledge the contribution of the member for Traeger. The public interest evaluation will take submissions from a whole range of people—people from the local community as well. I want to respond to his concerns by saying that I know he is a strong advocate for people and industry in his community, and I want him to know that they will be included in the public interest evaluation going forward.

In response to the member for Maiwar, can I say very clearly that there are no loopholes in this bill and I am offended by the proposition that there are. We have worked very well and very extensively with a whole range of stakeholders, and we made very clear when we released our rehabilitation policy last year in September 2017 that we do not expect that these laws will be retrospective. We made that clear in September 2017. To come in here and say that we have bowed to the pressure of the resources industry is just a platform for the Greens political party to keep belting up on Labor. Quite frankly, if the Greens political party 10 years ago had supported an emissions trading scheme in this country, we would be more than a decade down the road with an emissions trading scheme with resources companies in this state having to account for their fugitive emissions, but instead at a federal level the Greens political party did what the member for Maiwar is doing today—coming in and trashing any sort of environmental reform, holding out a purist position that will never get broad support and in the end we end up with nothing.

The fact that we do not have an emissions trading scheme in this country 10 years down the track and no cohesive economic response to climate change rests squarely at the feet of the Greens political party, and they have never accepted responsibility for that. To the assertion that we should be holding up rehabilitation policy in the United States and following suit, can I say that there has been significant environmental criticism of the US act of 1977. In fact, the ‘Undermined promise II’ report says that there have been absolutely limited rehabilitation outcomes when measured against that act. For the Greens political party to come into this House and say that we should follow suit when there has been significant environmental concern about these exact laws I think is an absolute joke.

I want to thank the members for Burdekin and Burleigh for their contribution. I think they are the only members of the LNP I have ever heard come into the place and say that we need more public servants not less. In terms of the public interest evaluation component, I thank them for their advocacy about in-sourcing or in-housing that. It is very interesting. We would prefer that we kept the public interest evaluation mechanism independent from government. We want them to be arms-length, independent, expert, and frank and fearless in their advice to government.

I want to thank a number of people. This has been a herculean effort. I want to say from the outset that this would not have been possible without significant work from a whole range of hardworking public servants. I want to particularly thank Kirsten Vagne, Stephanie Ning, Maria Rosier, Geoff Robson, Jacqui Elliott, Lawrie Wade, Helen James and Rebecca Barbierato. I also want to thank the ministerial staff of Hannah Jackson and Sonja Litz, Matthew Pittman and particularly Peter Power from my office. Peter is finishing up in my office very soon. I am very sad about that. He is going to join his wife in Canberra. I think that will be a very big disappointment for Peter in terms of geography not in terms of partner. Peter has done the most remarkable job in working through the technical complexity and getting people on board with not only the spirit of the bill but also the amendments we have before the House. I commend the bill to members of parliament.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 62, as read, agreed to.

Clause 63—



Ms TRAD (3.37 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 63 (Application of subdivision)

Page 56, line 19, '799G'—

omit, insert—

799D

I table the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Jackie Trad's amendments [[1894](#)].

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 63, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 64 to 78, as read, agreed to.

Clause 79—



Mr LISTER (3.38 pm): I am delighted to have at least a short opportunity to talk about this component of the bill since the government guillotine prevented me from giving a speech earlier on. I notice that the Office of the Information Commissioner was not at all impressed with the bill as it stood before, so I am glad to see that amendments have been made to make things a little more transparent.

I was interested to hear the Deputy Premier wax lyrical about how the government bent over backwards to help us. They were so keen to give us a briefing. It would have been much better if these amendments were not needed and the government had done proper consultation. It would have been great if the committee had been able to consider the amendments that we have before us as part of the original bill, but we know that that did not happen.

What happened is that they were presented to us this morning so there was no time for us to digest them properly and see them for their benefits and drawbacks. This is typical of this government. We have seen it over and over again. I am told by those who have been around a little longer than me that the last term of the Labor government was much the same because there would be 200 amendments presented at a time. Things cannot be going well when that is the case. It does not reflect very well on the government. It reflects no credit at all on the government—

Mr Bleijie: That was the racing amendments.

Mr LISTER: The racing amendments?

Mr Bleijie: The member for McConnel.

Mr LISTER: Surely not. We need time to consider things. It is a feature of this government and it is a feature of the way this parliament operates these days that we are denied the opportunity to consider things with sufficient time to sort out their merits and to consult with stakeholders. There are 61 amendments being presented to us today, and that really shows that something went seriously amiss. I will bet a penny to a pound that it was because there was not adequate consultation and that stakeholders have come back through whatever back channels they were able to identify to get into the ear of the Deputy Premier or the department to say, 'We really need to change this.'

That is not the way the government should operate. While the LNP does support this amendment, I would like it to be noted that this amendment and all the others really should have been part of the bill originally. This should have been thought through better. We should have more time to consider the amendments before they are voted on in this House. The committee should be able to see these kinds of things. It should be part of the original bill. That is what the committee is there for. It is there to sort through the bill in detail in a way that is not available to the House as a whole, but we are not seeing that and we have to ask ourselves why. I do support the amendments.

Ms TRAD: I am sympathetic to the member for Southern Downs's contribution, but I would ask that he please extend me a level of sympathy and I hope that he understands my position. When not one single LNP MP put in a dissenting report based on the RTI provisions within the parliamentary committee report, I thought they were not interested in the RTI provisions. Excuse me for just thinking that perhaps this was not an issue.

What we are talking about in terms of clause 79 is in fact narrowing the scope around the exemption from RTI. I want people to actually understand that this was an issue that was brought up in the consultations that we had with industry. We are requiring industry to hand over significant amounts of critical financial information in order for the scheme manager to make a credit rating based assessment so that they can pay the rates that are commensurable to the risk that they represent to the state and the Queensland taxpayer. This information is commercial and it is sensitive. It is not information that would be out in the public domain.

I note that industry in their submissions to the parliamentary committee report thanked the government and said that this actually went a distance to responding to their concerns that had been expressed. This was a provision that was included in the 2017 legislation that was presented in this House before the parliament was prorogued. This was a longstanding element to this legislation.

In responding to concerns that were raised by the conservation movement as well as the chief Information Commissioner, we made the decision that we would go back and rescope the exclusion. I am pleased to say that, after discussions between the Acting Under Treasurer and the chief information officer, we have landed on a position that the chief information officer thinks is much better through these amendments than what was presented in the bill originally. There have been significant discussions with the resources sector around the application of RTI, the narrowing of the scope of exclusions. What we have done is we have taken the advice of the chief information officer and relooked at this legislation. I am very pleased that we were able to do that. I table a copy of the letter from the chief Information Commissioner in relation to these amendments and her assessment that these amendments are consistent with the alternative option that she in fact outlined in her submission to the committee.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 November 2018, from the Information Commissioner, Ms Rachael Rangihaeata, to the Acting Under Treasurer, Ms Mary-Anne Curtis, regarding the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018 [1895].

I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 79 (Definitions for part)

Page 64, after line 22—

insert—

(iia) about an allocation decision for an authority; or

3 Clause 79 (Definitions for part)

Page 64, line 24, 'and'—

omit, insert—

or

4 Clause 79 (Definitions for part)

Page 64, after line 24—

insert—

(iv) about an investigation, or report, under section 73; or

(v) about a function of the scheme manager under section 21(1)(d); and

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 79, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 80 to 82, as read, agreed to.

Clause 83—

 **Ms LEAHY** (3.45 pm): Clause 83 of the bill establishes an advisory committee to give advice on the requesting entity or scheme manager. The bill is actually quite specific in that there must be persons representing the environmental interests and persons representing the mineral and energy sector. It was raised in the submission to the committee by APPEA that there is a lot of difference between the mining and petroleum sectors. There is about \$70 billion invested in Queensland's petroleum projects, and there is a clear rationale of separation between the petroleum industry and the representation on the committee.

I would be very interested to know the government's response in relation to enabling someone from the petroleum industry to be a representative on that advisory committee. There are very, very clear differences between what happens in the mining industry and the requirements for rehabilitation and what happens in the petroleum industry, as they are encouraged to do rehabilitation as their projects are underway. I would be very interested to hear if the government has any thoughts or proposal to at least ensure that someone from the petroleum industry—who does represent that \$70 billion worth of investment in Queensland, and a considerable amount in my electorate as well—could have a place on that advisory committee. I am most interested in the government's response to that.

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Warrego for her question to me and her contribution. I do have to say that, ultimately, as the minister, I will be making the determination on who is included in the advisory committee. I am very happy to talk to the petroleum industry about whether or not they would like inclusion. Of course, the CFMEU have specifically requested inclusion on the advisory committee, and I am pleased to say that I will accept a nomination from the CFMEU in relation to their participation on the advisory committee. I do know that, if all stakeholders have a contribution and a seat at the table, we are going to get better outcomes. I am very happy to take that on board. We will be continuing to operate in the spirit in which we have been to date—that is, consulting with all stakeholders and making sure that we get the right mix.

Clause 83, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 84 to 90, as read, agreed to.

Clause 91—

 **Ms TRAD** (3.48 pm): I move the following amendment—

5 Clause 91 (Initial allocation decision not required until scheme manager gives transition notice)

Page 71, line 26, after 'section 761(3)(a)'—

insert—

or 762(3)(a)(i)

This is just a minor technical correction.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 91, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 92 to 95, as read, agreed to.

Clause 96—

 **Mr MANDER** (3.48 pm): We received a briefing yesterday on the amendments. Without being critical at all of the officers who were involved with that—they of course answered our questions—we were obviously flying blind because we did not have the amendments. It was difficult to know exactly what we should be asking. Information was provided to us and then we could respond as that information was provided. As we can see from these amendments, they are very technical and very detailed. That is why we have a number of questions seeking more information.

More specifically, I would appreciate if the Treasurer could help us understand what the potential ramifications might be when integrating the public interest evaluation process with the environmental impact statement process, both financially and in terms of time frame.

Ms TRAD: Again, I reiterate that for weeks now we have made it clear publicly that we would be moving amendments to this legislation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that the first time the opposition actually requested a briefing from government on the amendments was on Monday of this week, so they only have themselves to blame in terms of engagement in this process.

I can confirm for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that amendment No. 6 is the first amendment that deals with the public interest evaluation. I want to make clear that it is not the intention of government that the public interest evaluation add to the time that it would take to do an environmental impact statement. It is to run concurrently and in parallel with the EIS process. That is our intention. However, we do know that a range of issues come up, both during the EIS process and during the mining application process, that sometimes require considerably more information, scientific assessment and research. It is our intention that the public interest evaluation does not hold up the whole process around environmental impact assessment and public consultation.

I am incredibly proud of the fact that we will be introducing an independent public benefit evaluation process through this legislation. It is a nation first, I think, particularly in relation to rehabilitation and environmental policy. I think it is something that we should all be proud of. We know that there are a whole range of things that are beneficial to the community economically, environmentally and socially. We want these to be considered when the Coordinator-General has to make a final determination around an application for a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan whether or not a non-use management area will continue and whether or not it is in the public interest to do so. We think that this is good public policy; it is good public administration. We are very keen to work with industry and the conservation sector—the environment sector—to get the implementation of this right.

Of course, the other angle, which I think is very important and very groundbreaking, is the rehabilitation commissioner. I do want to confirm for members of the House that it is an area that we are pursuing because of a recommendation from stakeholders and because of work that is currently being done in Victoria, not because the member for Maiwar thinks that the Greens had a policy about this some time ago. We think that this is something that the public will demand. In fact, when I put it to the QRC that we would be pursuing it, that we would work with industry and the environment sector to get up this position of the rehabilitation commissioner to work in conjunction with the public interest evaluation process, they were very keen on exploring this because they actually understand that the social licence around some of the impacts that we are seeing around our landscape regarding mining activities is not there for that. They need to demonstrate a much better performance for the people of Queensland not just today, but for generations to come.

Mr LAST: I have a question for the Treasurer regarding the final dot point in that amendment. It states—

the Chief Executive can only allow an EIS to proceed to the 'decision stage' in Chapter 3 if it is consistent with the public interest evaluation report. An EIS which is inconsistent with the public interest evaluation report will be refused from proceeding under section 56A to the 'decision stage' ...

Is it the case that there is no avenue for appeal or review, having regard to that? Is it just simply refused? Alternatively, is there an avenue for appeal or review when it is refused?

Ms TRAD: I am sorry, I could barely hear the member for Burdekin. If I understand correctly, his question was: is there a process for appeal in relation to a public interest evaluation? Is that the question?

Mr LAST: Yes, having regard to that final dot point—where the EIS is inconsistent with the public interest evaluation report and it is refused from proceeding—is there an avenue for appeal or review, or is it simply that is it; it is refused and there are no more options to proceed?

Ms TRAD: No. I can confirm for the member for Burdekin that there will be the capacity for review of public interest evaluation determinations based on vexatious or erroneous outcomes. Yes, there is a mechanism for review. That was something that was requested by stakeholders and something that the government considered in good faith, and it is replicated in further amendments down the track.

Clause 96, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Ms TRAD (3.55 pm): I move the following amendment—

6 After clause 96

Page 74, after line 5—

insert—

96A Amendment of s 49 (Decision on whether EIS may proceed)

(1) Section 49—

insert—

(5A) Subsection (5B) applies if—

- (a) under the final terms of reference for the EIS, the EIS submitted by the proponent includes a proposed PRC plan; and
- (b) the proposed PRCP schedule for the plan identifies an area of land as a non-use management area under section 126D(2)(b); and
- (c) the chief executive decides to allow the EIS to proceed.

(5B) The chief executive must, as soon as practicable after making the decision, ask a qualified entity to—

- (a) carry out a public interest evaluation for each area of land mentioned in subsection (5A)(b); and
- (b) before the end of the submission period for the EIS, give the chief executive a report about the evaluation that complies with section 316PB.

(2) Section 49—

insert—

(8) In this section—

qualified entity means an entity, other than the proponent, that has the experience and qualifications, prescribed by regulation, necessary to carry out a public interest evaluation.

96B Replacement of ch 3, pt 1, div 4, sdiv 2, hdg (Submissions)

Chapter 3, part 1, division 4, subdivision 2, heading—

omit, insert—

Subdivision 2 Submissions and response to report about public interest evaluation

96C Amendment of s 56 (Response to submissions)

(1) Section 56(1)—

omit, insert—

(1) The chief executive must, within 10 business days after the submission period ends, give the proponent a copy of the following documents—

- (a) each submission accepted by the chief executive;
- (b) if a public interest evaluation has been carried out for a proposed non-use management area for the project—the report about the public interest evaluation.

(1A) However, if the report mentioned in subsection (1)(b) is received by the chief executive after the submission period ends, the chief executive must give the proponent copies of the documents mentioned in subsection (1) within 10 business days after the report is received by the chief executive.

(1B) If subsection (1)(b) applies, the chief executive must also, subject to section 316PE, give a copy of the report to each person who made a submission under section 54 about the EIS at the same time as the chief executive gives the proponent a copy of the report.

(2) Section 56(2) c)—

omit, insert—

- (c) if subsection (1)(b) applies—a statement of the proponent's response to the report; and
- (d) any amendments of the submitted EIS because of the submissions or report, together with an EIS amendment notice under section 66 for the amendments.

(3) Section 56(3), definition *relevant period*, paragraph (a)—

omit, insert—

(a) generally—

- (i) if section (1)(b) applies and an entity asks for a review of the report under section 316PC—20 business days after notice of the reviewing entity's decision is given to the proponent under section 316PC(7); or
- (ii) otherwise—20 business days after the proponent is given a copy of all submissions accepted by the chief executive; or

96D Amendment of s 56A (Assessment of adequacy of response to submission and submitted EIS)

- (1) Section 56A(1)—
omit, insert—
- (1) This section applies if—
- (a) a submission is accepted by the chief executive under section 55; or
 - (b) a public interest evaluation is carried out for a proposed non-use management area for the project.
- (2) Section 56A(4)(a) and (b)—
omit, insert—
- (a) the proponent's response to the submission, and any report about a public interest evaluation, is adequate; and
 - (b) the submitted EIS is consistent with the recommendations made in any report about a public interest evaluation; and
 - (c) the proponent has made all appropriate amendments to the submitted EIS because of the submission and any report about a public interest evaluation.
- (3) Section 56A(6)(d), 'submissions'—
omit, insert—
submission or report

96E Amendment of s 56AA (Proponent may resubmit EIS)

- (1) Section 56AA(2), 'submissions'—
omit, insert—
submission or report mentioned in section 56A(1)
- (2) Section 56AA(5), 'submissions'—
omit, insert—
submission or report

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 97 and 98, as read, agreed to.

Clause 99—



Ms TRAD (3.56 pm): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 99 (Amendment of s 112 (Other key definitions for ch 5))

Page 75, after line 22—

insert—

public interest consideration see section 316PA(3).

public interest evaluation means an evaluation of a proposed non-use management area conducted under section 316PA.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 99, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 100 to 103, as read, agreed to.

Clause 104—



Ms TRAD (3.57 pm): I move the following amendments—

8 Clause 104 (Insertion of new ss 126B–126D)

Page 79, line 21, 'plan'—

omit, insert—

PRCP schedule for the plan

9 Clause 104 (Insertion of new ss 126B–126D)

Page 80, lines 26 to 30—

omit, insert—

- (ii) the applicant considers, having regard to each public interest consideration, that it is in the public interest for the land not to be rehabilitated to a stable condition.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr BERKMAN: I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 104 (Insertion of new ss 126B–126D)

Page 80, lines 31 to 34 and page 81, line 1—

omit, insert—

- (3) Despite subsection (2), the proposed PRCP schedule must provide for rehabilitation of land the subject of the schedule to a stable condition if—
 - (a) a resource activity to be carried out on the land is a mining activity under a coal exploration tenement or coal mining lease under the Mineral Resources Act; or
 - (b) the land will contain a void situated wholly or partly in a flood plain.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Michael Berkman's amendments [1896].

I will speak very briefly to this amendment. The Deputy Premier has made her position very clear on it, although I find it interesting that she simply points to some noncompliance with the requirements in the USA as sufficient reason to not expect an equally high standard of miners in Australia. We know that there are companies operating in both the USA and Australia who feel they have made off like bandits when they come to Australia and they do not have to fill their final voids. When they are left, these voids are a threat to our groundwater, and Queenslanders are not prepared to let industry just walk away from them.

We saw quite a bizarre reflection on climate policy from the Deputy Premier in relation to the parallels she tried to draw with this. The reality is that at some point in the future I expect we will see Labor come back and revisit these issues that are proposed by the Greens. Honourable members should remember that in federal politics it was a Rudd government—he was the prime minister at that point—who walked away from climate policy. We saw the dominos start toppling at that point. Down they went.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Resume your seat. Order, members. The member is not being provocative. He is making a contribution. We will hear him in silence.

Mr BERKMAN: The leadership dominos have not stopped toppling since. When the Greens actually had some sway and Adam Bandt was in the lower house that was when we saw some effective, world-leading climate policy. The LNP repealed it, yet this government wants to point the finger at the Greens for all their ills. Somehow we are responsible for everything. It is quite the joke.

The reality is that this amendment would require a higher standard, one that is not unreasonable, and one that companies can meet internationally. If those on the government side of the chamber had some gall we would see these sorts of changes made. We would expect more of industry and we would see a bucketload of jobs created in the process too. You have to dig the holes and you have to fill them back in—the same jobs in the same location. It would be good for Queensland.

Ms TRAD: I have two key points in relation to the amendment from the member for Maiwar. Firstly, more than a year ago we made a commitment that our policy would not be retrospective. I, like many people, have sympathy for the very simplistic position of the member for Maiwar. It is easy to understand, but there are tens of thousands of jobs in current mining operations that would be at risk if this amendment were to get up. We believe that the resources sector should, and could, be doing more, which is exactly what this legislation seeks to achieve. In relation to whether it is coal, petroleum or minerals, this legislation treats all commodities, all extractions, the same and fairly. We do not single out one or the other. We want to rely on science, best practice and independent and robust analysis in order to make the decision, not political grandstanding from any political party.

We are seeking to get the balance right, and it is only the Labor Party that you can trust to get the balance right—to put the Queensland taxpayers ahead of sectional interests and say, 'Yes, we want to protect those jobs in the resources sector that are there now.' I invite the member for Maiwar to go to Mount Isa, Townsville, Central Queensland or Mackay and have the conversation there. Do not just go to inner city suburbs, but go to regional communities and have these conversations. What we have sought to do is get the balance right between protecting current jobs in the mining industry and protecting those regional communities that rely upon those activities and those jobs for the local economy.

What we have also sought to do is breathe life into a new industry in this state through rehabilitation standards that are world-class and which will lead to more jobs in regional communities for rehabilitation activities and ensure that we deliver for communities and future generations by improving environmental protection and regulation in this state. We have managed to get the balance right. We have not just spoken to one stakeholder, one sectional interest or one geographic community in this state. We have exhaustively consulted around this. As I said, you can only trust Labor to get the balance right, to get the process underway and to keep improving it for the benefit of future generations.

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

Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negatived.



Ms TRAD: I move the following amendments—

10 Clause 104 (Insertion of new ss 126B–126D)

Page 81, line 18, 'resource'—

omit, insert—

probable or proved ore reserve that is

11 Clause 104 (Insertion of new ss 126B–126D)

Page 81, after line 20—

insert—

(ba) the land is required for the mining of a probable or proved ore reserve mentioned in paragraph (b); or

12 Clause 104 (Insertion of new ss 126B–126D)

Page 81, after line 27—

insert—

probable or proved ore reserve means a probable ore reserve or proved ore reserve mentioned in the listing rules made by ASX Limited (ACN 008 624 691) for the listing of corporations on the Australian stock exchange.

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

Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106(10).

Clause 104, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 105, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 106 to 108, as read, agreed to.

Clause 109—



Mr MANDER (4.15 pm): It is difficult to get a briefing any earlier when amendments are still being put together at the time of the briefing. Nothing had been finalised so there are still questions that I would appreciate the Treasurer answering. This particular clause talks about the qualified entity carrying out the public interest evaluation. Could the Treasurer tell us who would bear the cost of that qualified entity?

Mr HART: As the member who spoke before me just said, these amendments were given to us only this morning so we have not had a long time to look at them. I have a slightly broader question. This whole thing is about rehabilitating big holes in the ground: people blow it up and then take some of the minerals and rocks away. I have a big quarry in my electorate—a big hole in the ground. I would really like to see it rehabilitated. Can the Deputy Premier tell us whether this bill applies to that and whether this clause applies to quarries?

Ms TRAD: In relation to the member for Everton's question, I can confirm that the proponent pays for the public interest evaluation but it is the government that chooses the appropriate person or the appropriate entity to conduct the public interest evaluation, not the proponent itself.

In relation to the member for Burleigh's question, quarries are not covered by this legislation. As I said previously in relation to the retrospectivity issue, where there are current approvals in place for any sort of activity—quarrying would be included generally in this remark but they do not apply within this legislation—those approvals need to be abided by. It is as simple as that.

I can advise the member for Burleigh and all members of the House that my ministerial colleague the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts will be leading a process around the residual risk framework. I think this is a very important piece of

policy reform that the community needs to be engaged in, and I encourage all members of parliament to be engaged in that process around how we deal with legacy impacts from resource activities in this state. It is something that I think we are all cognisant of and aware of in terms of the legacy for future generations, which is why I am incredibly proud that the Palaszczuk Labor government is continuing on this massive policy reform agenda to address all elements, starting with financial assurance and rehabilitation responsibility. The next leg of that will be the residual risks that are left in community. I encourage the member for Burleigh and all members of the House to be engaged in that.

Clause 109, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Ms TRAD (4.19 pm): I move the following amendment—

13 After clause 109

Page 83, after line 16—

insert—

109A Insertion of new s 136A

After section 136—

insert—

136A Administering authority must obtain report about public interest evaluation for particular applications

(1) This section applies if—

- (a) the application stage for a site-specific application for a mining activity relating to a mining lease ends; and
- (b) the application is accompanied by a proposed PRC plan that includes a proposed PRCP schedule identifying an area of land as a non-use management area under section 126D(2)(b); and
- (c) either—
 - (i) a public interest evaluation by a qualified entity for the area of land mentioned in paragraph (b) has not been carried out for an EIS; or
 - (ii) a public interest evaluation by a qualified entity for the area of land mentioned in paragraph (b) has been carried out for an EIS and, since the evaluation was carried out, the proposed non-use management area has changed.

(2) The administering authority must, as soon as practicable after the application stage ends, ask a qualified entity to—

- (a) carry out a public interest evaluation for each area of land mentioned in subsection (1)(b); and
- (b) give the administering authority a report about the evaluation that complies with section 316PB.

Note—

See section 167A(4) for when particular reports must be given to the administering authority under paragraph (b).

(3) In this section—

EIS includes an EIS under the State Development Act.

qualified entity means an entity, other than the applicant, that has the experience and qualifications, prescribed by regulation, necessary to carry out a public interest evaluation.

Amendment No. 13 inserts new section 136A into the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to require the administering authority to request a public interest evaluation where a proposed progressive rehabilitation and closure plan includes a non-use management area justified in the public interest. This amendment reduces the regulatory duplication by exempting the requirement if a public interest evaluation has already been undertaken by a qualified entity under the Environmental Protection Act 1994 or the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 110 to 115, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Ms TRAD (4.20 pm): I move the following amendment—

14 After clause 115

Page 87, after line 5—

insert—

115A Amendment of s 165 (When does decision stage start—general)

Section 165(2), 'and 167'—

omit, insert—

, 167 and 167A

115B Insertion of new ss 167A–167B

After section 167—

insert—

167A Particular site-specific applications—when decision stage starts and when report about public interest evaluation is required

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) a site-specific application is accompanied by a proposed PRC plan that includes a proposed PRCP schedule for which a report about a public interest evaluation has been requested under section 136A; and
 - (b) the report has not been given to the administering authority on or before the day the decision stage would, other than for this section, have started for the application.
- (2) The decision stage starts on the day the report is given to the administering authority.
- (3) If an EIS has been submitted for the project the subject of the application, the administering authority may, by written notice, require the qualified entity for the report to give the administering authority the report within—
 - (a) a stated period of not more than 12 months; or
 - (b) if the administering authority decides to extend the period mentioned in paragraph (a) by not more than 6 months—the extended period.
- (4) The report about the public interest evaluation must be given to the administering authority within—
 - (a) if subsection (3) applies—the period mentioned in subsection (3)(a) or (b); or
 - (b) otherwise—
 - (i) 30 business days after the day the decision stage would, other than for this section, have started for the application; or
 - (ii) if the administering authority gives the applicant written notice extending the period mentioned in subparagraph (i) by not more than 10 business days—the period stated in the notice; or
 - (iii) if the applicant agrees to a longer period than the period mentioned in subparagraph (ii)—the agreed period.

167B Decision stage may be suspended in particular circumstances

- (1) Subsections (2) to (4) apply in relation to a site-specific application accompanied by a proposed PRC plan that includes a proposed PRCP schedule if—
 - (a) a report about a public interest evaluation has been given to the administering authority for land the subject of the proposed PRCP schedule; and
 - (b) the report includes a statement or recommendation about a non-use management area that is inconsistent with the proposed PRCP schedule.
- (2) The applicant may, by written notice, ask the administering authority to suspend the assessment process to enable the applicant to change the application so it is consistent with the report.
- (3) If a notice is given by the applicant under subsection (2), the application process—
 - (a) stops on the day the applicant gives the administering authority the written notice; and
 - (b) restarts on the earlier of the following days—
 - (i) the day notified by the applicant to the administering authority;
 - (ii) the day that is 18 months after the day the decision stage started for the application.
- (4) Part 2, division 6 does not apply to a change to the application made solely for the purpose mentioned in subsection (2).
- (5) Subsection (6) applies if, under section 316PC, an entity asks the chief executive for a review of a report about a public interest evaluation.
- (6) The assessment process stops on the day the applicant or entity makes the request to the chief executive, and restarts on the day the reviewing entity gives notice of its decision about the report under section 316PC(5)(b).

This amendment inserts new sections 167A and 167B into the Environmental Protection Act 1994. It ensures that the decision stage for the environmental authority application starts once the public interest evaluation report is given to the administering authority. This section provides different time frames by which the report must be given. Where an environmental impact statement has been undertaken for the project, the administering authority will be able to set a period of one year that cannot be extended by more than six months. For other applications, a period of 30 business days is set, which may be extended by 10 business days by the administering authority or longer if agreed to by the applicant. New section 167B ensures that the decision stage is suspended if the applicant wishes to change their progressive rehabilitation and closure plan to reflect the recommendation of the public interest evaluation report, or the applicant or a submitter asks the chief executive to review a report under new section 316PC.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 116 and 117, as read, agreed to.

Clause 118—



Ms TRAD (4.22 pm): I move the following amendment—

15 Clause 118 (Insertion of new s 176A)

Page 89, after line 2—

insert—

- (3) The administering authority must not approve the proposed PRCP schedule unless—
 - (a) each proposed non-use management area under the schedule has been properly identified as a non-use management area; and
 - (b) if a public interest evaluation is required for a proposed non-use management area under the schedule—the report for the evaluation recommends it is in the public interest to approve the area as a non-use management area; and
 - (c) the administering authority is satisfied the schedule provides for all land the subject of the schedule to be—
 - (i) rehabilitated to a stable condition; or
 - (ii) managed as a non-use management area in a way that achieves best practice management of the area and minimises risks to the environment.

This amendment inserts new section 176A into the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to ensure the administering authority only approves a proposed progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule if a public interest evaluation report recommends that it is in the public interest to approve the non-use management area. This amendment moves decision criteria from section 194B to ensure that the administering authority complies with all the regulatory requirements before the decision may be referred to the Land Court.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 118, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 119 to 121, as read, agreed to.

Clause 122—



Ms TRAD (4.23 pm): I move the following amendment—

16 Clause 122 (Replacement of s 194 (Final decision on application))

Page 94, lines 17 to 32—

omit.

This merely moves the decision-making criteria from section 194B to section 176A as made by amendment No. 15.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 122, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 123 to 126, as read, agreed to.

Clause 127—



Ms TRAD (4.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

17 Clause 127 (Amendment of s 205 (Conditions that must be imposed if application relates to coordinated project))

Page 99, lines 18 to 20—

omit, insert—

(3) Section 205(3)—

omit, insert—

(3) However, if a report for a public interest evaluation for an area of land identified as a non-use management area in the PRCP schedule or draft PRCP schedule includes a recommendation that is inconsistent with the Coordinator-General's conditions, the conditions imposed by the administering authority must be consistent with the report.

(4) Any other condition imposed on the authority or PRCP schedule can not be inconsistent with a Coordinator-General's condition.

This amendment amends section 205 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to clarify that if there is an inconsistency between the Coordinator-General's conditions and the recommendation in the public interest evaluation report any conditions imposed on the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule must be consistent with the public interest evaluation report.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 127, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 128 to 146, as read, agreed to.

Clause 147—



Ms TRAD (4.25 pm): I move the following amendment—

18 Clause 147 (Amendment of s 228 (Assessment level decision for amendment application))

Page 113, lines 13 to 21, from 'satisfied—'

omit, insert—

satisfied the applicant has—

(a) undertaken adequate consultation with the community in relation to the proposed amendment; and

(b) adequately addressed any matters raised by the community during consultation.

This amendment amends section 228 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to clarify when resequencing of rehabilitation areas will be considered a minor amendment application to a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule. To deliver a transparent decision-making process, this amendment replaces the consideration of whether the resequencing would likely attract a submission to the assessment of whether the applicant has addressed any matters raised during consultation with the community.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 147, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 148—



Ms TRAD (4.26 pm): I move the following amendments—

19 Clause 148 (Amendment of s 232 (Relevant application process applies))

Page 113, line 28, 'Parts 3 to 5 apply'—

omit, insert—

Section 136A and parts 3 to 5 apply in relation

20 Clause 148 (Amendment of s 232 (Relevant application process applies))

Page 114, lines 6 to 13—

omit, insert—

(2) However—

(a) if the amendment is a change to a PRCP schedule, part 4 does not apply to the application to the extent the change—

(i) reduces the area of a non-use management area under the schedule; or

(ii) is likely to reduce, or cause no change to, the impacts on environmental values caused by the activities the subject of the schedule; or

(b) if the amendment application is for an environmental authority for a resource activity—part 4 applies only if, under section 230, the notice given under section 229 states part 4 applies.

These amendments amend the Environmental Protection Act's section 232 to ensure that the public interest evaluation requirement applies to an amendment application to a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule if the amendment includes a new non-use management area justified in the public interest. Amendment No. 19 clarifies that the application and the public interest evaluation only apply to the scope of the amendment. Amendment No. 20 further amends section 232 of the Environmental Protection Act to allow for particular circumstances where the notification stage will not apply to a major amendment when companies amend their PRCP—their progressive rehabilitation and closure plan—schedule to achieve better environmental or community outcomes.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 148, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 149 to 169, as read, agreed to.

Clause 170—



Ms TRAD (4.28 pm): I move the following amendment—

21 Clause 170 (Amendment of s 278 (Cancellation or suspension by administering authority))

Page 125, lines 15 and 16—

omit.

This amendment retains the ability of the administering authority to suspend or cancel an environmental authority if the holder does not pay their annual fee in compliance with the annual notice inserted by amendment No. 26 relating to new section 316I of the Environmental Protection Act 1994.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 170, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 171 and 172, as read, agreed to.

Clause 173—



Ms TRAD (4.29 pm): I move the following amendments—

22 Clause 173 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 12 (General provisions))

Page 139, lines 7 to 11—

omit, insert—

(2) The administering authority—

- (a) may decide to direct the holder or, for a de-amalgamated environmental authority, each of the holders, to re-apply, under section 298 for an ERC decision for the resource activity; and
- (b) must give the holder, or each of the holders, an information notice for a decision to give a direction under paragraph (a).

23 Clause 173 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 12 (General provisions))

Page 149, line 13, 'this division'—

omit, insert—

division 3

24 Clause 173 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 12 (General provisions))

Page 153, line 7, after 'chapter'—

insert—

or section 318ZJA

25 Clause 173 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 12 (General provisions))

Page 154, line 1, after 'Annual'—

insert—

notices,

26 Clause 173 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 12 (General provisions))

Page 154, lines 2 to 31 and page 155, line 1—

omit, insert—

316I Annual fee

- (1) This section applies to the holder of an environmental authority for which an annual fee is prescribed by regulation.
- (2) At least 20 business days before each anniversary day for the environmental authority, the administering authority must give the holder a written notice complying with subsection (3) (an **annual notice**).
- (3) An annual notice must state—
 - (a) that the holder must pay the administering authority the appropriate annual fee, other than in a circumstance prescribed by regulation; and
 - (b) that the annual fee payable under the notice must be paid to the administering authority within a stated reasonable time, of at least 20 business days, after the day the notice is given; and
 - (c) that, if the holder does not comply with the notice, the environmental authority may be cancelled or suspended.

Note—

See section 278 in relation to cancellation or suspension of an environmental authority.

- (4) If the holder does not pay the annual fee within the time stated for payment in the annual notice, the administering authority may recover the annual fee as a debt.
- (5) A failure to give the notice by the time stated in subsection (2) does not invalidate or otherwise affect the validity of the notice.

316IA Annual returns

- (1) This section applies to the holder of an environmental authority if the administering authority directs the holder, by written notice, to give an annual return for a stated period.
- (2) Unless the holder has a reasonable excuse, the holder must give the administering authority an annual return—
 - (a) in the approved form; and
 - (b) on or before—
 - (i) the day prescribed by regulation; or
 - (ii) if no day is prescribed—1 March immediately following the year to which the annual return relates.

Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.

- (3) If the environmental authority relates to a resource activity, the annual return must state whether there has been a change to the carrying out of the resource activity that may affect the ERC decision for the activity.

316J Particular requirement for annual returns for PRCP schedule holders

- (1) This section applies to the holder of a PRCP schedule who is given a direction under section 316IA(1).
- (2) The holder's annual return must include an evaluation of the effectiveness of—
 - (a) the actions taken in relation to each rehabilitation milestone or management milestone under the schedule; and
 - (b) the environmental management carried out under the schedule.

27 Clause 173 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 12 (General provisions))

Page 158, after line 15—

insert—

Division 4A Public interest evaluations**316PA Public interest evaluations**

- (1) The purpose of a public interest evaluation of a proposed non-use management area identified in a proposed PRCP schedule is to provide a recommendation about whether the approval of the area as a non-use management area is in the public interest.

Note—

See sections 49(5A) and (5B) and 136A for when a public interest evaluation must be carried out.

- (2) A public interest evaluation for a proposed PRCP schedule must include a consideration of the following matters—
- (a) the benefit, including the significance of the benefit, to the community resulting from the mining activity or resource project the subject of the environmental authority application to which the PRCP schedule relates;
 - (b) any impacts, including long-term impacts for the environment or the community, that may reduce the benefit mentioned in paragraph (a) or have other negative impacts on the environment or community;
 - (c) whether there are any alternative options to approving the area as a non-use management area having regard to—
 - (i) the costs or other consequences of the alternative options; and
 - (ii) the impact of the costs or other consequences on the financial viability of the mining activity or resource project;
 - (d) whether the benefit to the community mentioned in paragraph (a), weighed against the impacts mentioned in paragraph (b), is likely to justify the approval of the non-use management area having regard to any alternative options mentioned in paragraph (c);
 - (e) another matter prescribed by regulation.
- (3) Each matter mentioned in subsection (2) is a **public interest consideration**.
- (4) A regulation may prescribe the following in relation to the carrying out of a public interest evaluation—
- (a) how the evaluation must be carried out;
 - (b) the matters to be considered in evaluating each public interest consideration.

316PB Requirements for report about particular public interest evaluations

- (1) This section applies in relation to a report about a public interest evaluation for land the subject of—
- (a) a proposed PRCP schedule included with an EIS mentioned in section 49(5A); or
 - (b) a site-specific application mentioned in section 136A(1)(b).
- (2) The qualified entity who gives the report must, before giving the report to the administering authority, give the proponent for the EIS or applicant for the application—
- (a) a copy of the proposed report; and
 - (b) a notice stating that the proponent or applicant may, within 20 business days after the notice is given, make submissions to the qualified entity about the proposed report.
- (3) Before finalising the report, the qualified entity must consider any submissions properly made by the proponent or applicant within the period stated in the notice under subsection (2)(b).
- (4) The report given to the chief executive must include—
- (a) a recommendation about whether it is in the public interest to approve the non-use management area; and
 - (b) the reasons for the recommendation; and
 - (c) a response to, or statement about how the qualified entity has considered, any properly made submissions by the proponent or applicant; and
 - (d) another matter prescribed by regulation.
- (5) The administering authority must, within 5 business days after receiving the report—
- (a) publish the report on the register kept under section 540; and
 - (b) notify the following entities that the report has been received—
 - (i) for a report mentioned in subsection (1)(a)—the proponent for the EIS;
 - (ii) for a report mentioned in subsection (1)(b)—the applicant;
 - (iii) each entity who made a submission to the chief executive about the EIS under section 54 or the administering authority about the application under section 160.

316PC Review of report

- (1) This section applies if—
- (a) an entity is notified under section 316PB(5)(b) that a report (the **original report**) has been received; and
 - (b) the entity—
 - (i) has justifiable doubts about the impartiality or independence of the qualified entity who gave the original report; or
 - (ii) reasonably believes the qualified entity has made a substantive error in carrying out the public interest evaluation that affects a recommendation made in the original report.
- (2) The entity may, within 15 business days after being notified about the original report, ask the chief executive to arrange for another qualified entity to review the original report.

- (3) If the chief executive receives a request under subsection (2), the chief executive must ask another entity (the **reviewing entity**) to review the original report.
- (4) The reviewing entity must be—
 - (a) an entity that has the experience and qualifications, prescribed by regulation, necessary to carry out a public interest evaluation; and
 - (b) if the original report is—
 - (i) a report mentioned in section 316PB(1)(a)—an entity other than the proponent for the EIS; or
 - (ii) a report mentioned in section 316PB(1)(b)—an entity other than the applicant.
- (5) After reviewing the original report, the reviewing entity must, within 6 months after the chief executive makes the request under subsection (3)—
 - (a) decide to—
 - (i) confirm each recommendation made in the original report; or
 - (ii) substitute 1 or more recommendations made in the original report; and
 - (b) give written notice of the decision to—
 - (i) the chief executive; and
 - (ii) the entity who asked for the review under subsection (2).
- (6) The written notice must include reasons for the reviewing entity's decision under subsection (5) (a).
- (7) The chief executive must, within 5 business days after receiving the notice—
 - (a) ensure the administering authority notes the decision on the register kept under section 540; and
 - (b) notify the following entities about the reviewing entity's decision—
 - (i) for a report mentioned in section 316PB(1)(a)—the proponent for the EIS;
 - (ii) for a report mentioned in section 316PB(1)(b)—the applicant;
 - (iii) each entity who made a submission to the chief executive about the EIS under section 54 or the administering authority about the application under section 160.

316PD Costs of public interest evaluations and reviews

- (1) The costs reasonably incurred by the administering authority in obtaining a report about a public interest evaluation are a debt payable by the applicant to the administering authority.
- (2) The costs reasonably incurred by the chief executive in asking a reviewing entity to review a report about a public interest evaluation under section 316PC are a debt payable by the following entity to the State—
 - (a) if an entity other than the applicant or proponent requested the review and all recommendations made in the report are confirmed under section 316PC(5)(a)(i)—the entity;
 - (b) otherwise—the proponent or applicant.

316PE Confidentiality of public interest evaluation

- (1) This section applies to a person who—
 - (a) is, or has been, any of the following persons performing functions under this Act for a public interest evaluation—
 - (i) the chief executive;
 - (ii) a public service employee of the department;
 - (iii) a qualified entity under section 49(8) or 136A(3) or a reviewing entity under section 316PC(3); and
 - (b) in that capacity, acquires confidential information.
- (2) The person must not disclose the confidential information or give access to the confidential information to anyone else.
Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.
- (3) However, subsection (2) does not apply if the disclosure of, or the giving of access to, the confidential information—
 - (a) is with the consent of the person to whom the information relates; or
 - (b) is only to the extent the disclosure or access is necessary to perform the person's function under this Act in relation to the public interest evaluation; or
 - (c) is permitted or required under an Act or law.

(4) In this section—

confidential information means information about a person's commercial, business or financial affairs, other than—

- (a) statistical or other information that could not reasonably be expected to result in the identification of the person to whom it relates; or
- (b) information that is publicly available.

These amendments seek to clarify particular elements under section 303 of the Environmental Protection Act. An information notice must be given to the holder of an environmental authority to direct them to reapply for an estimated rehabilitation cost decision after the authority has been deamalgamated.

Amendment No. 23 corrects the reference from this division to division 3 to ensure that the provisions for claiming financial assurance or scheme assurance under the Environmental Protection Act can operate.

Amendment No. 24 inserts a reference to section 318ZJA into section 318H of the Environmental Protection Act to ensure that the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan is updated after approval of a progressive certification application.

Amendment No. 25 inserts notices into the title of chapter 5 part 15 division 2 of the EPA to clarify that the provisions in the division refer to annual notices and annual returns.

Amendment No. 26 reinserts the annual notice provision into the Environmental Protection Act. It decouples the annual notice from the annual return requirements and clarifies the intent of annual returns for progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedules.

Finally, amendment No. 27 inserts new sections into the Environmental Protection Act that relate to the public interest evaluations. New section 316PA states the purpose of the public interest evaluation and lists each public interest consideration to be addressed by the applicant and considered by the person carrying out the evaluation. The public interest considerations seek to weigh the benefits to the community from the project against the risks to the community and environment considering other options instead of leaving the non-use management area.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 173, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 174 to 200, as read, agreed to.

Clause 201—



Ms TRAD (4.32 pm): I move the following amendments—

28 Clause 201 (Amendment of s 540 (Registers to be kept by administering authority))

Page 171, line 21, '316I(2)'—

omit, insert—

316IA(2)

29 Clause 201 (Amendment of s 540 (Registers to be kept by administering authority))

Page 171, lines 23 and 24—

omit, insert—

- (x) information notices given in relation to the amount and form of financial assurance;
- (xi) notices given under section 314(1)(b) or 315(5);
- (xii) reports about public interest evaluations, other than any confidential information within the meaning of section 316PE;

Amendment No. 28 corrects the reference from section 316I(2) to 316IA(2) in section 540 of the Environmental Protection Act to ensure that annual returns are kept on the public register.

Amendment No. 29 ensures that existing financial assurance decisions and public interest evaluation reports are included in the public register in section 540 of the Environmental Protection Act.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 201, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 202, as read, agreed to.

Clause 203—



Ms TRAD (4.33 pm) I move the following amendments—

30 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 173, after line 2—

insert—

assent date means the date of assent of the amending Act.

31 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 173, after line 4—

insert—

land outcome document, for land, means the following documents relating to the land—

- (a) an environmental authority for a resource activity on the land;
- (b) a document made under a condition of an environmental authority mentioned in paragraph (a), if—
 - (i) the document relates to the management of a void within the meaning of section 126D on the land, or the rehabilitation of the land; and
 - (ii) the document was received by the administering authority before the assent date; and
 - (iii) the administering authority has not, within 20 business days after the assent date, given notice to the holder of the environmental authority that the document is insufficient in a material particular relevant to a matter mentioned in subparagraph (i); and
 - (iv) before the assent date, the document had not been superseded;
- (c) a document made under a condition of an environmental authority mentioned in paragraph (a), if—
 - (i) the document relates to the management of a void within the meaning of section 126D on the land, or the rehabilitation of the land; and
 - (ii) the environmental authority requires the document to be given to the administering authority on a stated day that is on or after the assent date, or does not state a day when the document must be given; and
 - (iii) the document is received by the administering authority within 3 years after the assent date; and
 - (iv) the administering authority does not, within 20 business days after receiving the document, give the holder of the environmental authority notice that the document is insufficient in a material particular relevant to a matter mentioned in subparagraph (i);
- (d) a report evaluating an EIS under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, section 34D;
- (e) an EIS assessment report;
- (f) a written agreement between the holder of an environmental authority mentioned in paragraph (a) and the State that is in force on the assent date.

32 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 173, line 23, '1 July 2019'—

omit, insert—

1 November 2019

33 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 175, line 5, 'section 291 until the earlier'—

omit, insert—

the pre-amended Act, and the pre-amended Act, sections 289, 290 and 291 continue to apply in relation to the plan of operations, until the earliest

34 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 175, line 10, 'lease.'—

omit, insert—

lease;

35 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 175, after line 10—

insert—

- (c) if the holder of the mining lease re-applies for an ERC decision under the amended Act, section 304—the day the ERC decision for the application is made.

- (2A) However, from the commencement, the holder may not, under the pre-amended Act, section 289—
- (a) replace the plan; or
 - (b) amend the plan in a way that increases the total area of land the subject of a rehabilitation program mentioned in the pre-amended Act, section 288(1)(c)(iii).

36 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 175, after line 19—

insert—

- (4) However, subsection (5) applies if—
 - (a) the holder fails to comply with the notice given to the holder under section 754 because the holder purported to give the administering authority a proposed PRC plan in compliance with the notice; and
 - (b) the administering authority gives the holder written notice for a decision to refuse to approve the proposed PRCP schedule.
- (5) Section 431A does not apply to the holder until—
 - (a) if the holder re-applies for approval of another proposed PRCP schedule within 40 business days after the written notice is given—the day the administering authority—
 - (i) issues a PRCP schedule under section 195; or
 - (ii) gives the holder written notice refusing to approve the other PRCP schedule; or
 - (b) otherwise—40 business days after the written notice mentioned in subsection (4)(b) is given.

37 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 175, lines 20 and 21—

omit, insert—

754 Requirement for mining EA holders to give proposed PRC plan

38 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 175, lines 30 and 31—

omit, insert—

- (b) the period, of not less than 6 months from the day the notice is given, within which the holder must comply with the notice.

39 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 176, after line 2—

insert—

- (3) The holder is not required to comply with a requirement under section 126C(1)(g) or (h) or 126D(2) or (3) for the proposed PRCP schedule for the plan in relation to land if—
 - (a) an outcome for the land has been identified under a land outcome document; and
 - (b) the outcome for the land is the same as, or substantially similar to, the outcome for the land if it were a non-use management area under a PRCP schedule.

Example of an outcome for land—

A residual void or pit authorised under an environmental authority may constitute the outcome for the land on which the void or pit is located, even though the environmental authority or any other land outcome document does not expressly state anything about the outcome for the land, other than authorising the void or pit.

- (4) However, if the environmental authority or any other land outcome document does not state sufficient detail to identify either the location or area of the land to which the outcome relates, the proposed PRC plan must state—
 - (a) if the area is not identified—how the total area of the land to which the outcome relates will be minimised; and
 - (b) if the location is not identified—how the mining EA holder will ensure the location of the land to which the outcome relates minimises risks to the environment.
- (5) For subsections (3) and (4), if there is an inconsistency in land outcome documents for land, the document appearing first in the list mentioned in section 750, definition *land outcome document* prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.
- (6) The administering authority must keep a register of an extract of a written agreement mentioned in section 750, definition *land outcome document*, paragraph (f) that identifies the location or area of land mentioned in subsection (4).
- (7) Sections 541, 542 and 543 apply in relation to a register mentioned in subsection (6).
- (8) Subsection (9) applies in relation to a proposed PRC plan required under a notice mentioned in subsection (1).
- (9) A regulation may prescribe exceptional circumstances, in addition to a matter mentioned in section 126D(5), in which land the subject of the PRC plan that is not being mined is taken not to be available for rehabilitation for section 126D(4).

These amendments are a variety of minor amendments and technical amendments. I am happy to speak to any of them if any member in the chamber has a specific question.

Mr KATTER: I seek some clarification from the minister on this issue. Amendment No. 31 amends clause 203, which refers to a land outcome document. It appears that there are some gaps in the wording in the explanatory notes to these amendments. I am keen to clarify beyond doubt that it is not the intention of the government to use these amendments, in particular amendment No. 31, to retrospectively impose prohibitive and unjust requirements on existing mines that have an approved environmental authority.

If my understanding is correct, with reference to amendment No. 31, documents required under an environmental authority may also constitute a plan of operations or an environmental management plan if the document is referenced under an EA and is consistent with the EA and has not been superseded by another document addressing the same matter. That lends itself to invoking those retrospectivity issues. We are concerned that this is a sneaky way, through the government, in which extremist groups can be injected back into that process. That is a concern that we express and we would like some clarification from the minister on that.

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Traeger for the question. I do not know how many more times I can say the same thing. I have said it publicly. I will say it in this place. I said it in my second reading speech, which is what the courts rely on when interpreting the law. This bill is not intended to be retrospective in any way. If an authority holder has a condition, permission or authority to leave a non-use management area—a void—that will hold. That has been licensed under current Queensland law and we do not seek to make these laws retrospective.

However, as I have said previously, we will continue to work with all stakeholders around the implementation of these laws. It is vitally important that all stakeholders—communities, environmentalists, industry—have a place at the table in ensuring that the spirit and intent of the laws that we are passing in this chamber today are implemented in the right way. That is a commitment that I give in this chamber today. It is a commitment that I have given to all stakeholders and I will continue to do that.

This bill is not intended to be retrospective. We intend for all mining companies to work with the regulator in improving their progressive rehabilitation and closure plans. There is a requirement for that. We set out a very clear transition framework for achieving that.

The public interest evaluation for future mines is going to be important and the rehabilitation commissioner is going to be critical in terms of ensuring that progressive rehabilitation and closure plans in the future are world class and what the community should expect their government to be delivering on their behalf.

Mr KRAUSE: I seek some clarification in relation to amendment No. 39, moved by the minister, which relates to the broad exemptions for holders of an environmental authority from complying with sections 126C and certain other sections. This clarification relates to a discrete area in the western part of my area around Willowbank and Ebenezer where there are existing mines with environmental authorities and also mines in care and maintenance with environmental authorities in place where there are waste landfill facilities proposed to fill residual voids. Could the minister enlighten us as to whether there is any circumstance where the public interest test may apply in relation to those residual voids? For example, if there were an amendment to an environmental authority required to facilitate the filling of residual voids with landfill waste, would that enliven the public interest test?

Ms TRAD: I think I thank the member for the question. Let me be clear. We are setting up the public interest evaluation mechanism in this bill. What will be acceptable postmining activity uses for particular voids will be determined in the public interest. That is the commitment and that is what the mechanism can do.

The answer to the member's question is not a simple one. I think we have seen from some of the public issues resulting from Ipswich that there is a whole range of local, state and industry intersections around voids being used for waste management purposes.

It is not something that I am going to hypothesise on in talking about this now. What we do know is that the rehabilitation commissioner, who has responsibility for ensuring the process is rigorous, scientific and in the public interest—if that is one of the criteria in the future—will give advice to government. It is certainly not on the table now. We anticipate that mined land or areas subject to resource extraction by mining will be returned to the community for its benefit.

Amendments agreed to.

Ms TRAD: I move the following amendment—

40 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 176, lines 14 to 34 and page 177, lines 1 to 11—

omit, insert—

- (3) However, for applying the assessment process under subsection (2)—
 - (a) the periods mentioned in sections 144(a)(ii), 168(1)(b) and 194(2) (a)(ii) are taken to apply to the administering authority for the assessment process; and
 - (b) the submission period mentioned in section 154 is taken to be the period, of at least 20 business days after the giving and publishing of the application notice for the PRC plan under section 152, decided by the administering authority; and
 - (c) the application stage and notification stage apply subject to sections 755A and 755B.
- (4) If a requirement for the proposed PRCP schedule does not apply to the holder under section 754(3), section 176A(3) does not apply in relation to the administering authority in deciding whether to approve the schedule to the extent the requirement does not apply to the holder.

Amendment No. 40 clarifies the process and time frames for assessing and deciding progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedules for transitional sites under chapter 5 of the Environmental Protection Act. This amendment works with amendment No. 39 to ensure that the requirements that are exempt in section 754 are also exempt in the administering authority's decision criteria in section 176A.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Given that the Deputy Premier's amendment No. 40 has been resolved in the affirmative, the member for Maiwar may not move his amendments Nos 2 and 3 which relate to the same provisions.

Ms TRAD: I move the following amendments—

41 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 177, lines 14 to 18—

omit, insert—

approve the PRCP schedule for the proposed PRC plan under sections 176A and 194B, the authority must also have regard to—

- (a) each land outcome document for land to which the proposed PRC plan relates; and

42 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 177, after line 23—

insert—

755A Application of requirement for public interest evaluation for application stage

- (1) Section 136A does not apply for the assessment of a proposed PRC plan under section 755(2), unless—
 - (a) the PRCP schedule for the proposed PRC plan identifies a non-use management area under section 126D(2)(b); and
 - (b) the holder is required to comply with a requirement under section 126C(1)(g) or (h) or 126D(2) or (3) for the proposed PRCP schedule in relation to land because section 754(3) does not apply for the area.
- (2) Subsection (3) applies if—
 - (a) a public interest evaluation is required for the assessment of the proposed PRC plan; and
 - (b) the qualified entity carrying out the evaluation considers an alternative option to approving the area as a non-use management area under section 316PA(2)(c); and
 - (c) the financial viability of the mining activity or resource project would be jeopardised if the alternative option were implemented.
- (3) The report for the public interest evaluation under section 136A(2) must include a consideration of the stage of, and the land outcome documents relating to, the mining activity or resource project.

755B Application of notification stage

- (1) This section applies if either of the following matters is satisfied in relation to land the subject of a proposed PRCP schedule—
 - (a) the outcome for land under a land outcome document is the same as, or substantially similar to, the post-mining land use or non-use management area stated for the area under the proposed PRCP schedule; or

- (b) for an area of land stated in a land outcome document that could be a proposed non-use management area under the PRCP schedule—the schedule proposes a post-mining land use for all or part of the land.

Example of an outcome for land—

A residual void or pit authorised under an environmental authority may constitute the outcome for the land on which the void or pit is located, even though the environmental authority or any other land outcome document does not expressly state anything about the outcome for the land, other than authorising the void or pit.

- (2) The notification stage under chapter 5, part 4 does not apply for the assessment of the proposed PRCP schedule under section 755(2), to the extent of the matter.
- (3) If the notification stage under chapter 5, part 4 applies for the assessment process because the outcome for land under a land outcome document is different to the outcome for the land under the proposed PRCP schedule, a submission under section 160 may relate only to the difference in outcome for the area.
- (4) For applying subsection (2), if there is an inconsistency in land outcome documents for land, the document appearing first in the list mentioned in section 750, definition *land outcome document* prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

43 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 178, lines 4 to 12, from 'the' to 'relevant register.'—

omit, insert—

chapter 5, part 6 applies as if the amendment were a matter mentioned in section 215(2).

44 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 179, after line 31—

insert—

- (3A) Also, if—
- (a) the administering authority has given the holder of the environmental authority a notice about a proposed requirement to increase the amount of financial assurance under the pre-amended Act, section 306; and
- (b) the requirement has not taken effect before the commencement;
the condition continues to have effect until the increased amount of financial assurance has been given to the administering authority.
- (3B) In addition, if section 760 applies for the financial assurance, the condition continues to have effect until—
- (a) the application mentioned in that section is decided; and
- (b) the amount of financial assurance under the decision has been given to the administering authority.

45 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 179, lines 33 and 34, 'subsection (2) or (3)'—

omit, insert—

this section

46 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 182, line 33, after 'day'—

insert—

or, if the plan period for the holder's plan of operations for the activity ends earlier, the day the plan period ends

47 Clause 203 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 27)

Page 184, line 15, 'if initial ERC period ends'—

omit.

These amendments ensure that the administering authority must consider the list of land outcome documents in section 755 of the Environmental Protection Act to ensure that all previous approvals are considered in the decision to approve a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule for existing sites. This goes a long way to addressing the concerns around retrospectivity in terms of the transition from environmental authorities to progressive rehabilitation and closure plans.

Additionally, amendment No. 42 inserts section 755A and 755B into the Environmental Protection Act to clarify the application of the public interest evaluation process and the public notification process for a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan for a transitional site. New section 755A ensures the

public interest evaluation process only applies to non-use management areas that have not been previously approved respecting existing rights. New section 755B ensures a transitioning site will not be subject to public notification if a land outcome document states an outcome for an area of land and in the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan that outcome is the same or converted to a postmining land use from a non-use management area.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 203, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 204—



Ms TRAD (4.43 pm): I move the following amendments—

48 Clause 204 (Amendment of sch 2 (Original decisions))

Page 186, line 2, after 'sections'—

insert—

233(2)(b)(ii),

49 Clause 204 (Amendment of sch 2 (Original decisions))

Page 186, table after line 6—

insert—

303 decision to require the holder of an environmental authority for a resource activity to apply for a new ERC decision

50 Clause 204 (Amendment of sch 2 (Original decisions))

Page 186, after line 18—

insert—

(5A) Schedule 2, part 1, division 3, entry for section 234(2), '234(2)'—

omit, insert—

234

These are purely tidying-up amendments. Amendment No. 48 includes 233(2)(b)(ii) in the list of sections that are deleted from the list of original decisions in schedule 2 of the Environmental Protection Act because this section no longer exists in the act. Amendment No. 49 adds a section 303—'decision to require the holder of an environmental authority for a resource activity to apply for a new estimated rehabilitation cost decision' to the list of original decisions in schedule 2 of the Environmental Protection Act.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 204, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 205—



Ms TRAD (4.44 pm): I move the following amendments—

51 Clause 205 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 188, after line 7—

insert—

annual notice see section 316I(2).

52 Clause 205 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 189, line 12, ', for chapter 5,'—

omit.

53 Clause 205 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 189, after line 19—

insert—

public interest consideration see section 316PA(3).

public interest evaluation see section 112.

54 Clause 205 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 190, after line 21—

insert—

(5A) Schedule 4, definition *application documents*—

insert—

(d) a report evaluating an EIS under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, section 34D; and

(e) an EIS assessment report.

These are merely definitional amendments. I am happy to answer any questions.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 205, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 206 to 215, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the member for Maiwar's amendment No. 4 proposes to omit clauses 216, 217 and 218. The member should therefore vote against those clauses.

Clause 216, as read, agreed to.

Clause 217—

 **Mr MANDER** (4.46 pm): This clause refers to some of the amendments to the RTI Act. I refer to the document from the Office of the Information Commissioner that the Deputy Premier tabled which talks about the consultation with the office. The Office of the Information Commissioner has expressed grave concerns about the amendments to the RTI Act as it is applying in this particular bill, as has the opposition quite vocally. Why has the Treasurer eventually ended up with a less restrictive amendment than the OIC recommended in its submission to the Economics and Governance Committee?

Ms TRAD: I refer the member for Everton to paragraph 4 of that correspondence where the Information Commissioner says that the proposed amendments to the financial provisioning bill are consistent with the submissions that it made to the parliamentary committee process.

I move the following amendment—

55 Clause 217 (Amendment of sch 1 (Documents to which this Act does not apply))

Page 197, lines 16 to 25—

omit, insert—

217 Amendment of sch 3 (Exempt information)

Schedule 3, section 12(1)—

insert—

- *Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Act 2018*, section 80(2) or 82(2)

This ensures the amendments to the Right to Information Act operate as exemptions rather than exclusions, as I have already outlined, to the Right to Information Act. It omits the current RTI document exclusions and, as I said earlier, this I believe strikes the right balance between ensuring that there is an ability for members of the public to make requests for information from the scheme manager and ensuring that the commercially sensitive information of these companies is not put in the public domain. I believe it strikes the right balance and it is the result of significant consultation and engagement with the Office of the Information Commissioner.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 217, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 218—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the Deputy Premier's amendment No. 56 proposes to omit clause 218. The Deputy Premier should therefore vote against the clause.

Clause 218, as read, negatived.

Insertion of new clauses—



Ms TRAD (4.49 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Ms TRAD: I move the following amendment—

57 After clause 218

Page 198, after line 8—

insert—

Division 5A Amendment of State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971

218A Act amended

This division amends the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*.

218B Amendment of s 47C (Application of Coordinator-General's report to environmental authority)

Section 47C(1), 'for the proposed environmental authority.'—

omit, insert—

for—

- (a) the proposed environmental authority; and
- (b) any proposed PRCP schedule relating to the environmental authority under the Environmental Protection Act.

This amendment amends section 47C of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 to enable the Coordinator-General to impose conditions on a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedule.

Ms LEAHY: I note that this is an additional clause that is outside the long title of the bill. It ensures the powers of the Coordinator-General in relation to the environmental authorities to impose conditions relating to rehabilitation. These conditions may be in the form of rehabilitation or management milestones and may relate to both postmining land uses and non-use management areas.

However, there is a significant issue with this entire bill and its interaction with the chain of responsibility. The chain-of-responsibility legislation was passed by the government with a stated purpose of ensuring that companies and their related parties bear the cost of managing and rehabilitating sites. It does remain unclear as to how the chain of responsibility will interact with the new fund and this legislation, and there are no references whatsoever to the chain of responsibility in the bill or the explanatory notes. I would appreciate some clarification from the government in relation to how that chain-of-responsibility legislation will interact with the fund.

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Warrego for her question. I think it is an important question. I can confirm that the financial provisioning scheme does not affect the interaction between financial assurance and environmental protection orders introduced under the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Act 2016, another great Labor reform. I commend the member for Murrumba for leading that through the House.

The administering authority will continue to determine the most appropriate response on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with its enforcement guidelines and in a way that is proportionate and appropriate to the conduct involved. For example, there may be circumstances where environmental harm has occurred or may occur that may be best remedied by issuing an environmental protection order to a related person. An environmental protection order can direct immediate action be undertaken on a site to address or prevent environmental harm. It may be the case that an environmental protection order will be more effective if it can direct the resources of a person to address the issue onsite in a more timely manner than if the administering authority makes a claim for funds and then conducts the work itself.

The chain-of-responsibility guideline will always be considered prior to making a decision to issue an environmental protection order to a related person. However, there is no hard rule as to whether an environmental protection order will be used ahead of or instead of a claim on the financial provisioning scheme. The ultimate objective for the environmental regulator is to ensure that rehabilitation obligations are complied with. Should there be no compliance by an operator, the regulator will assess the facts of each case to determine the most appropriate way to achieve this, given all of the relevant circumstances.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 219 and 220—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the Deputy Premier's amendment No. 58 proposes to omit clauses 219 and 220. The Deputy Premier should therefore vote against the clauses.

Clauses 219 and 220, as read, negatived.

Schedule 1—



Ms TRAD (4.53 pm): I move the following amendments—

59 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 199, line 6, 'section 799F'—

omit, insert—

section 799C

60 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 202, line 5, 'section 799G'—

omit, insert—

section 799D

Amendment No. 59 corrects a cross-reference, as does amendment No. 60.

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading



Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (4.45 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title



Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (4.55 pm): I move the following amendment—

61 Long title

Long title, 'Waste Reduction and Recycling Amendment Act 2017'—

omit, insert—

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971

Amendment No. 61 amends the long title of the bill to add the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 and to remove the reference to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Amendment Act 2017.

Amendment agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Shark Control Program, Inquiry



Mr PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (4.57 pm): I move—

1. That the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee inquire into the Queensland shark control program and report to the Legislative Assembly by 16 May 2019.
2. In conducting the inquiry, the committee should specifically consider:
 - (a) the effectiveness of the existing program, which has been in place since 1962, to protect community safety;
 - (b) existing locations that are monitored under the program and whether this should be expanded to other key tourism areas like the Whitsundays;

- (c) the use of existing equipment, such as nets and drum lines, and consideration of alternative devices to protect human life and other marine life;
 - (d) research and expert advice into shark population growth and breeding patterns;
 - (e) resourcing needed to enhance the existing program;
 - (f) the Palaszczuk government's response to initial shark attacks in Cid Harbour to install drum lines and the consequent failure to do so after a fatal attack; and
 - (g) the cause of the reduction in shark numbers caught between 2015-16 and 2018-19 and the impact of this reduction on shark numbers on the Queensland coast.
3. In conducting the inquiry, the committee should have regard to international best practice of mitigating the risk of shark attacks and any previous Queensland coronial investigations or inquiries into shark related fatalities.
 4. The committee should also consider the impact of shark attacks on Queensland's domestic and international tourism reputation, noting that the industry provides almost \$13 billion to Queensland's gross state product and sustains almost 220,000 local jobs.

We need to properly manage the problem of sharks. A talkfest and a five-point plan are lazy and superficial. We need practical, common-sense solutions to protect lives. Our first and most critical priority is to protect lives. This inquiry is about the ongoing shark management program and how to alleviate problems.

You will never get rid of the problem of sharks. This is not about culls and emotive responses. Any shark attack is immensely concerning. When it is deadly and follows on from other attacks, a responsible government considers the effectiveness of the existing program. Nothing highlights government ineptitude more than thinking that a talkfest substitutes for good management. A talkfest that comes up with a predictable list of more research, more education and more signs, while ruling out successful measures such as drum lines and shark nets, is not good management.

For the government to dismissively tell local families and tourists not to swim is just shallow and flippant. It is disgraceful yapping. Its priorities are wrong. It puts sharks before people. It puts the environmental movement before people and regional tourism businesses. We need this inquiry because all the government has offered Queensland families, tourists and businesses is a harebrained and negligent plan. It refuses to address management practices. Instead, it wants yet another study into shark behaviour.

Yesterday, the minister for fisheries boasted about spending \$250,000 to work out if there is a shark problem in Cid Harbour. I have news for the minister. In the past six weeks, there have been three attacks. There has been a fatal attack. Everyone else in Queensland knows we have a problem. They do not need to spend \$250,000 on another study to tell them that.

The government's scientific working group is not only not working; it is actively considering phasing out drum lines over the next five years. The Queensland shark control program has been in place since 1962 with full bipartisan support, that is, seemingly until this government was elected. DAF advises that for more than 50 years under the program there has been only one shark related death at a controlled beach. That is clear evidence that drum lines and nets have protected swimmers for more than 50 years.

It is unbelievable that Queensland has 350 drum lines along our coastline protecting 85 beaches but not a single one in the Whitsundays. Why are drum lines not in Cid Harbour when they are used in other tourist spots? If they are not an effective management practice, why are they used at 85 other beaches? Why were they put in following the first two attacks if they are not good management?

The Whitsundays is still just recovering from Cyclone Debbie 18 months ago. Tourism is vital for this region. For the government to come out and state that tourists cannot swim is ridiculous and destructive. It puts the region's economic and business activity at risk.

The government is hiding behind Labor's Shark Control Program Scientific Working Group—a group which is literally not working. In complete disregard for the safety of Queenslanders, the group is not meeting when it is meant to. It is dominated by conservation groups. They are even looking at options to phase out drum lines over the next five years.

It has not formally met since the first attacks in Cid Harbour six weeks ago yet they are meant to meet twice a year and were scheduled to meet in September/October. After submissions from conservationists the group is not considering any new drum lines in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and is investigating phasing them out over the next five years.

This government is soft on sharks because Labor is soft on sharks. Look no further than a recent Senate inquiry. The minister is familiar with a Senate inquiry. As a Labor senator his party was influenced by green activists who inspired federal Labor's decimation of our live cattle industry in 2011.

Last year the Senate environment committee, chaired by the Greens with a Labor majority, recommended that Queensland immediately replace drum lines and phase out shark meshing programs.

Following this recommendation would be catastrophic for Queensland families and tourists. Shark attacks would be prolific with no safety measures for the hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders who regularly visit the controlled beaches. Labor's inability to keep our waters safe risks hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of economic activity. Queensland is in a dire situation where the state Labor government is seemingly following the orders of their federal masters who want to completely remove all shark safety measures from Queensland beaches.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (5.01 pm): I rise to oppose this motion. What we see with this motion is cheap, nasty politics from those opposite. Interestingly, they have a motion before the House that all of sudden talks about wanting to listen to expert advice and scientists. That is not what they have been doing for the last three months. No-one on their side of the House has once publicly quoted one scientist to back up their position anywhere and yet they come into parliament tonight and all of a sudden want to listen to expert advice. I will give you some expert advice.

Mr SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair, Minister.

Ms JONES: Dr Daryl McPhee from Bond University said—

There is no quick fix. Each area is different. There is no equivocal evidence that suggested it [drum lines] will work at Cid Harbour. JCU expert Richard Fitzpatrick told the *Courier-Mail*—

We need to get the science done before anyone can make informed decisions about chucking in baited hooks on drum lines.

Local dive operator Tony Fonts was on ABC—

Mr Costigan: I bet he was. He was a Greens candidate in the past.

Ms JONES:—last week saying—

There are better ways to keep swimmers safe and that of course is through education. We stand with the Whitsunday Tourisms—

I take the interjection from the local member. He would know that the mayor of the Whitsundays and Tourism Whitsundays have said from day one that they want scientific research. They do not want kneejerk reactions. We had a round table up there last week where tourism operators sat down at the table with scientists and agreed to the five point—

An opposition member: A round table talkfest. You don't have a plan.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection—it is a talkfest. Let us talk about that. The member for Broadwater wrote to me in a bipartisan way saying that he wanted to come along to this talkfest.

Mr Crisafulli: And what did you say?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Broadwater.

Ms JONES: He does not like it—glass jaw.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is a certain amount of protection I can afford you, Minister, but not if it is combative against a direct member. I ask members to cease their interjections so we can hear the content of the debate.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection from the member for Broadwater. He knows what I said because I wrote back to him. I wrote back to him saying that despite the member for Broadwater writing me a letter saying he wanted in a bipartisan way to come to the meeting yet within 12 hours his leader put out a media release calling it irresponsible and a talkfest. They are not even on the same page. Who is the leader of the LNP in Queensland? We will see. Give it a few months.

Those whom I listen to when I make my decisions are the leaders on the ground. I spoke to the mayor—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. I take all of those personal attacks.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms JONES: No spine. What else do you want to say?

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: I take all of those interjections. I hope the *Hansard* records that the member for Broadwater's only response is to make personal attacks. The member for Broadwater knows that Tourism Whitsundays—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection from the Leader of the Opposition.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members! Minister, you may well be wanting to take those interjections, but I am not going to allow too many more interjections at the rate that they are going. I want to hear the content of this debate.

Ms JONES: What the honourable members opposite know is that the mayor of the Whitsundays has been unequivocal in his position as has Tourism Whitsundays. What they have said to me very clearly is that they do not want drum lines in Cid Harbour. Why do they say that? They know what I know and what every single scientific expert has said—that is, that if you put them in there we can still not guarantee tourists that it is safe to swim. It would be terribly irresponsible to put drum lines in there and then say to tourists that it is safe. It is a harbour. It is a mooring area. It is murky water.

We have delivered the one thing that the tourism industry asked for on Friday which is \$250,000 for research. If they genuinely cared about the tourism industry they would listen to the tourism industry. If they genuinely cared about the tourism industry they would also write to the Prime Minister of our country asking him to match this funding.

I will give him credit where credit is due. The Prime Minister of this country said that he would work with the state government in any way he could to move this forward. Today I repeat my calls: will the Prime Minister match the funding that the state government has put on the table in a truly bipartisan way? We know that despite the awful tragedy that has happened—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. My general advice to all members is that if you wish to make a contribution to this debate you will rise to your feet and make a contribution. Apart from that, I wish to hear from the members on their feet and those members only.

Ms JONES: We are moving forward by listening to the industry. We know that even after the meeting people who had previously held different positions, including Trevor Rees, said—

The three marine scientists in attendance presented compelling arguments that there was no short-term solution to the problem. Neither drum lines nor a targeted shark kill was likely to improve safety.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker—

Ms JONES: That is what the operators on the ground are saying.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Members, please rise to your feet after a member has ceased their contribution and not beforehand.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I do not need any assistance, members.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.07 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Gympie. Unlike the contribution we just heard from the Minister for Tourism, we do not need letters and we do not need talkfests; we need drum lines. We need to protect the good people of Queensland and Australia and our international visitors.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. We need to put people before sharks.

Mr Costigan: Every day of the week.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Every day of the week. I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday. He gets it. We need to put people before sharks.

Mrs Lauga interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I hear the interjections from the member for Keppel. I dare say she is from an area where we actually have a Shark Control Program. We have a Shark Control Program all the way up—

Mrs Lauga interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Keppel, I have issued a direction to members in the chamber. If you wish to rise and make a contribution, please do so.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am more than happy to hear from the member for Keppel because it appears that she is supporting the minister in saying we do not need a Shark Control Program, we do not need drum lines, we do not need to protect tourists, we do not need to protect people. I put it to the member for Keppel that the good people around Yeppoon who want to be safe in our waters actually want to be put before sharks. I am just going to say that to you, member for Keppel. You can take that back home and ponder on that.

Mr SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair, Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: If you go out into your local community and say, 'I'm going to put sharks before you,' I do not think it is going to go so well—sorry, Mr Speaker—if the member for Keppel is minded to do that.

Mrs Lauga: Have you been to Cid Harbour? Have you been there?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Keppel, I have already asked you to cease your interjections.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I would love to take that interjection, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, there seems to be some confusion about what kind of debate we have in this parliament. This debate is to be conducted in five-minute speeches, not across the chamber at five-second intervals. I ask that you hear the member on their feet and then make a contribution if you wish.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Not only have I been to Cid Harbour; I have actually honeymooned there. I am more than happy to go on a honeymoon there again with my husband. Maybe we could have our second honeymoon there. I have to say this: we might even go to Daydream Island, unlike the member for Mackay, who was announcing something to do with Lindeman Island I think it was today and the Minister for Tourism was standing beside her saying, 'Yep, yep—Lindeman. No, no—Daydream.'

Mr Speaker, I will get back to the motion before the House. I stand here in all seriousness for three people whom we should be recognising—that is, Justine Barwick, a 46-year-old woman who suffered severe injuries to her right thigh and had to undergo reconstructive surgery; Hannah Papps, a 12-year-old girl who lost her leg; and, tragically, Daniel Christidis, a 33-year-old doctor who lost his life.

The Palaszczuk government are so arrogant and so out of touch that the Premier is backing shark welfare over community safety. The LNP says enough is enough. We will put people before sharks. On behalf of those people and their families, we deserve action. Five days after that fatal shark attack all we have seen from this government is a talkfest. Mr Speaker, if that were your son, your brother, your sister or your friend who had died, I do not think that you would think that is an adequate response from this government. What happened after one of the other attacks? This government put drum lines in. Not only did they do that; they said it was based on scientific evidence. Then a week later they took them out again because they were obviously not worried about the people.

Those opposite—and we have just heard from the minister—think that the answer to this is paying a \$250,000 bill to figure out if Cid Harbour in the Whitsundays has a shark problem. I can tell you, Mr Speaker, and government members that it does have a shark problem. There have been three attacks in six weeks. We need to put the drum lines back in. We do not need letters or whatever the minister was talking about. We need to protect the people who want to go to the jewel in the tourism crown in Queensland, and that is Cid Harbour in the Whitsundays. The LNP will always put people before sharks. That is why we need a parliamentary inquiry into the Shark Control Program in Queensland.

(Time expired)

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (5.12 pm): I rise to oppose this motion moved by the member for Gympie. In response to the Leader of the Opposition, who said, 'We don't need talk. We don't need letters,' it is very clear that they do not need science. They do not need facts. They have their own version of reality and they are going to stick to it. They are the same when it comes to dealing with issues of climate change. Any science that they say is tinged with green ideology they reject. It does not matter how well it is based on fact. They are immune to the facts.

It is clear that the LNP would rather play politics with the recent shark attacks in Cid Harbour than seek out the facts of the matter. It is like the motion yesterday. They will pull out one issue. It does not matter if they have a track record on it. They will ignore the facts or reasons. It is just a political opportunity for them. That is what it is.

Simply put, until the recent contribution of the LNP, the Shark Control Program had bipartisan support from both sides of politics. The fundamentals of the Shark Control Program are the same now as when the LNP were in government. There has been no change. The same equipment and the same techniques are being used.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nanango, you have just made a contribution. I ask you to hear the member.

Mr WHITING: There were no drum lines in Cid Harbour under the LNP. There were no drum lines in Cid Harbour under Labor. Why might that be? The reason for no drum lines is this: safety. Have a look at the Shark Control Program, which is conveniently available on a website for them to look at. There is information on swimmer safety. On the page on swimmer safety there are a few facts, and I will read them out for the benefit of the LNP—

- Swim or surf only at patrolled beaches—between the flags and where shark safety equipment is in place
- Obey lifesavers' and lifeguards' advice, and heed all sign and safety warnings
- Leave the water immediately if a shark is sighted
- Do not swim or surf after dusk, at night, or before dawn when sharks become more active
- Do not swim or surf in murky or silt-laden waters
- Do not swim in, or at the mouth of, rivers, estuaries, artificial canals and lakes
- Never swim alone
- Never swim when bleeding
- Do not swim near schools of fish or where fish are being cleaned
- Do not swim near, or interfere with, shark control equipment
- Do not swim with animals.

That advice comes from that website. Let me restate that drum lines do not make an area automatically safe. After two fatal attacks on the Gold Coast drum lines were not put into the canals on a permanent basis. Why is that? Because canals are too dangerous for swimming. It is the same for Cid Harbour. Drum lines or no drum lines, it is too dangerous to swim in Cid Harbour, in canals or in river mouths. The government listened to the experts, and the experts have said Cid Harbour is too dangerous to swim in. There is no doubt that drum lines will catch sharks. After the last attacks, sharks were caught using drum lines—but, drum lines or no drum lines, there are still sharks in Cid Harbour.

Swimmer safety must be paramount. That sometimes means saying that these areas are just too dangerous to swim in, yet it seems that the LNP are more focused on ignoring the experts and listening to their own in-house expert my colleague the member for Whitsunday. They do not want to listen to experts on fisheries. They do not want to listen to experts on climate change either. As I said, if they feel that the science is tinged with green ideology, they will automatically reject it. That is a big mistake.

In terms of this motion—to give a quick recap—the existing program works and, as we have heard, Labor put in additional funds this year. The existing locations are on the website and these are the same as they were under the LNP. In looking at alternatives—also on the website—there are investigations into other equipment options but not at the expense of swimmer safety.

In terms of resources, Labor has put additional funds into the program, unlike the LNP, which cut 28 per cent of Fisheries staff. There were so many cuts, yet they still cry for more money to be spent and for more staff to fix any of their perceived problems. Drum lines are not suitable in all locations, and Cid Harbour is not safe for swimming, drum lines or no drum lines, and this was made clear after the first attack.

My final point in terms of shark catch numbers is that it is clear that the LNP is scientifically illiterate. The Shark Control Program catch numbers fluctuate and shark catches are not based on who is in government.

(Time expired)

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (5.18 pm): I rise to speak on the Queensland Shark Control Program motion moved in the House by the shadow minister for agricultural industry development, fisheries and forestry, the member for Gympie, Tony Perrett. Last week at Cid Harbour in the Whitsundays, a popular tourist destination, a young Victorian tourist, a doctor with a promising career, was fatally attacked by a shark while enjoying the delights of this North Queensland haven. This was the third shark attack in the past two months at Cid Harbour.

You would have thought that the Palaszczuk Labor government would have been concerned about this recent spate of attacks. However, their answer has been succinct and clear—nobody could miss it: stay out of the water. The LNP also has a succinct and clear message: people before sharks. Telling local families and tourists to not swim in what is arguably one of the most beautiful places on earth is just another example of how lazy this government is. It is a momentous policy failure and does not address the real issue.

In 1962 the Queensland Shark Control Program was introduced—a long time before many in this chamber were born. One would think that during the last 56 years changes would have occurred to both the ecology of the oceans and to the habits of humans. The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries has stated that since the inception of the Shark Control Program only one fatality has been recorded at a controlled beach. Whilst official statistics are not recorded, there have been approximately 20 shark fatalities since 1962 on Queensland beaches.

The Labor government would have us believe we can advertise for tourists to come and visit North Queensland with the slogan 'Come and visit North Queensland: a great place to stay out of the water'. This government is putting the welfare of sharks before our tourist industry and the safety of Queenslanders. They are spending \$250,000 of taxpayer dollars to discover there is a shark program in Cid Harbour. The tourism industry contributes \$12.8 billion directly to the economy of Queensland and indirectly \$12.5 billion and employs 217,000 Queenslanders, or 9.1 per cent of the people employed in Queensland. A vast majority of the millions of tourists who come to Queensland come to experience our pristine beaches. These shark attacks are jeopardising our tourism industry. The Labor government wants tourists to come to our beaches. However, the message is 'look but don't touch'. The time to act is now before tourists start choosing a destination they know will be safe for their families.

There is another argument that has been overlooked in this debate, and that is the issue of fishing. Commercial and recreational fishermen and charter boat operators have seen an increase in the number of fish being taken by sharks over the past decade. John Reid, who is 81 and is the state's most experienced fishermen, wrote to Minister Furner in January warning him of the exponential rise in shark numbers with no reply. In his letter Mr Reid wrote, 'As a matter of urgency something should be done to address this problem.' Groups of eight or nine sharks frequently circle under his fishing boat just four nautical miles off the coast. The entries in his logbook detail the experiences he has encountered and the loss of catch due to sharks. Mr Reid's letter states, 'In the last five years the number of sharks has doubled in each of those years. It has been extraordinary. They are so prolific.' He blames a succession of Labor governments. This could open up the argument for having a take of sharks for the survival of not only the tourism industry but also the fishing industry. There was an article in the *Courier-Mail* recently which interviewed Mr Reid, and I am happy to table that. It is quite an interesting read.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 10 November 2018, titled 'Shark warnings ignored' [[1897](#)].

I myself go fishing once a year on a charter boat, and all the charter operators talk about the increasing numbers of sharks. In the coral trout fishery they are losing half the catch to sharks. There is no doubt that there has been a rise in sharks. I support the member for Gympie's motion to have an inquiry into the number of sharks and a control program for the control of sharks. This is asking for an inquiry—not a wholesale cull but an inquiry. If the members opposite want science and a scientific basis, this would deliver it. I support the motion.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (5.23 pm): I rise to speak against this absolutely irresponsible motion. It is absolutely laughable that those opposite think the way they are going to solve this problem and solve this issue is by moving a motion like this in parliament. I begin by joining other members of this place in expressing my condolences for the families of the victims. I also want to recognise the hard work and resilience of the tourism operators in the Whitsundays, especially those in the room last Friday. Those people have the biggest stake in this and they deserve an informed debate. They will not be getting that under the LNP.

It has been interesting to hear the LNP making their commentary tonight because we have heard every single possible position from the LNP so far. How many of those opposite can say they have been to Cid Harbour?

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: If you have actually been there, then you should not be—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, direct your comments through the chair.

Mrs LAUGA: Through the chair, then those opposite should not be supporting this motion tonight because they know that Cid Harbour is murky; that it is turbid. It is not a place that you swim.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: I am glad that you had a great time at Cid Harbour. If those opposite have been to Cid Harbour then they really have no idea and they really should not be supporting this motion tonight. We have the member for Whitsunday on Flemington, our man trackside, making uninformed commentary on a tragic event—2,000 kilometres away from his electorate and even further away from common sense. Why did he not head straight back to the Whitsundays?

Let us look at the member for Everton, who is perpetually outraged, blowing hard but rarely straight. He has called for drum lines to go in. He has called for an independent inquiry. He has called the meeting with experts a 'talkfest'. What does he propose now? He is proposing that a report be tabled in May 2019. Decisive action! The member for Everton is not willing to listen to experts and is not willing to listen to what local people and local tourism operators want. It sounds familiar. It sounds like the same old LNP.

Let us look at the member for Gympie, or let us not because he has been nowhere on this issue. He would not know anything about the Great Barrier Reef to save himself. At least the LNP allowed him an appearance—

Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Gympie!

Mrs LAUGA: At least the LNP allowed him an appearance in question time yesterday. Christmas comes early in the Gympie electorate. To speak of Christmas, in came Crisafulli. Is Verity Barton on the LNP's Christmas card list this year?

The LNP do not want to talk about the facts but they are critical to this debate. Cid Harbour is not a patrolled beach. Cid Harbour is not and has not been part of the Shark Control Program. I have visited Cid Harbour a number of times. My husband and I spent a week on a bareboat charter around the Whitsundays on our honeymoon and we visited again a year later.

An opposition member: And never went in the water?

Mrs LAUGA: No, I did not go in the water because I would not. It is a beautiful spot and a great anchorage in the Whitsundays particularly sheltered from the prevailing south-easterlies.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, the member is not taking interjections. I ask you to hear the member who has the call. If you wish to make a contribution, rise to your feet.

Mrs LAUGA: It really is a great anchorage in any wind, which is why it is a popular spot. There are some great bushwalks accessed from Cid Harbour and it can be a good fishing spot. Cid Harbour is a beautiful spot, but it is not somewhere I would recommend swimming. It has a mud bottom, it has murky water with a higher turbidity and there are lots of baitfish.

When visiting the Whitsundays, bareboat charter companies leave a very informative book on boat for tourists titled *100 Magic Miles*. Those opposite who have visited Cid Harbour would no doubt have read that book—hopefully they have read that book. *100 Magic Miles* is known as the bible of the Whitsunday Islands, and I highly recommend anyone visiting the region to take a copy with them. *100 Magic Miles* provides great information about all of the different moorings, anchorages, fishing, snorkelling and diving spots as well as information about safety in the Whitsundays. The book also outlines very measured safety information relating to things like jellyfish, stonefish, sharks, poisonous fish and a range of safety issues to consider whilst enjoying the Great Barrier Reef.

Mr Lister: But it doesn't say not to swim in Cid Harbour, does it?

Mrs LAUGA: Have you read it?

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Southern Downs!

Mrs LAUGA: The Great Barrier Reef is a habitat, an ecosystem and a natural wonderland that has unrivalled beauty, but like any natural wonderland in the world we must be wary of our environment.

(Time expired)

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (5.28 pm): Before we go any further, I am sure I speak for everyone, no matter where they sit in relation to this debate, when I express my sympathy to the family of the late Daniel Christidis, the 33-year-old doctor coming into the peak of his powers, the time of his life. His life was tragically cut short in Cid Harbour only last week. I cannot imagine the horror that he went through on that fateful day, having the holiday of a lifetime. Our deepest sympathies go to the Christidis family.

We are also thinking of the other victims, particularly young Hannah Papps. She has only one leg, the poor girl. She suffered in that same city where Dr Christidis was. We particularly wish Hannah all the best with her recovery as well.

We have just heard from the member for Keppel. If I was the editor of the *Morning Bulletin*, tomorrow's front page would be 'Pull the drum lines out on the Capricorn Coast'. In a nutshell, the member for Keppel is off her rocker because there are drum lines, as many members of parliament would know—

Mrs LAUGA: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence to being called 'off my rocker' and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, there is a convention in this place. The member for Keppel has found those comments offensive. Member for Whitsunday, will you withdraw?

Mr COSTIGAN: Mr Speaker, I thank you for your guidance. I withdraw. The member for Keppel spoke about the 100 magic miles between Mackay and Bowen. It is amazing, because in the southern part of my electorate, guess what we have? There are drum lines off the beaches in the southern part of the electorate of Whitsunday—off Blacks Beach, Bucasia and Eimeo. However, in the northern part of my electorate, there is nothing as part of the Queensland government's Shark Control Program. The member for Condamine beautifully illustrated the history of that program going back to 1962. I might add that followed a fatal attack on Lamberts Beach on Mackay's north side involving an 18-year-old student teacher, a local girl, Margaret Hobbs, in 1961. At that stage, basically the government of the day had had enough.

As I have said to local media, stakeholders and anyone who is willing to listen, the Labor and Liberal National Party governments have the argy-bargy, the debate, the arguments and whatever you want to call it about public policy—about education, schools, hospitals, roads and whatnot—but one thing that has been sacrosanct and has had bipartisan support for decades is the Shark Control Program in Queensland. There has never been a debate about it. I can only imagine what former Labor MPs up and down the Queensland coast must be thinking. We have heard from members on this side in this debate tonight that people should come before sharks—every day of the week. Ms Hobbs was taken in 1961, and I walked Lamberts Beach only a couple of days ago. As a fifth generation local, I remember that I never swam at Lamberts Beach as a child.

I have not been advocating for a cull. I am not saying that for one minute. This is about an inquiry. I support the motion moved by the member for Gympie, my dear friend and the shadow minister. He has a good handle on this. I do support it, needless to say. We are not calling for a cull. Personally, all I want to see is what everywhere else in the state has—in Cairns, from Holloways through to Ellis Beach; in Townsville, on the Strand, Pallarenda and Magnetic Island; in Mackay, from Harbour Beach through to Bucasia in my own electorate; on the Capricorn Coast, from Emu Park right through to Farnborough; in Bundaberg, from Bargara up to Burnett Heads and Rainbow Beach; on the Gold Coast, from Coolangatta through to The Spit; and on the Sunshine Coast, from memory, from Bribie Island right through to Noosa. How is that for a rollcall, but guess where we do not count? Human life is not important in the Whitsundays. I say that people should come first.

This is going to damage our tourism industry. I have already been contacted by a family from Shellharbour on the south coast of New South Wales. I know it well. That person told me very clearly, 'Good luck with getting the drum lines into the Whitsundays. We want to come up for a snorkelling

holiday next September. However, if the drum lines don't go in, we're not coming.' I have no doubt that, on the back of this bad publicity that is happening under the watch of the Labor Minister for Tourism, this will impact on our tourist numbers in the Whitsundays. We have been the No. 1 departure point for tourists going into the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. It is my prediction that under Labor this will change and Cairns will regain that mantle.

More importantly, how many more people will lose their limbs and how many more people will die? I want to see some drum lines off our beaches on the mainland—at Airlie Beach, Cannonvale and Bowen. Aside from what happened in 1889 in Bowen, this has not happened in the Whitsundays since European settlement. It is one fatality too many, and it is happening under this government's watch. The government is in denial, and I am sorry to say that the mayor and the council are in denial and the industry is in denial. Things need to change and we need to put people ahead of sharks.

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (5.34 pm): I rise to speak against the motion. This motion will do nothing to improve swimmer safety, nothing to support our tourism industry and nothing to advance our knowledge of relevant issues. I want to highlight the large amount of information that is publicly available and is being relied on by the government and the opposition. When we look at this, we can see who is being reasonable. I suspect the members opposite have not done their homework, have not done their research into the issue and are just being plain lazy. We have not heard a peep from the opposition spokesperson, so let us look at the facts.

The tourism industry is critical to the Whitsundays and to the Queensland government. What do the LNP want to talk about? They want to talk about one of the longest running successful programs in Queensland, which until now has operated on a bipartisan basis. I want to talk a little bit about this program because I have had the opportunity to meet with the team at shark headquarters and to see the fantastic work of the team and the Shark Control Program. The Queensland government has established a program scientific working group comprised of expert members—scientists from the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, independent scientists, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Surf Life Saving Queensland, James Cook University, the Alliance for Sustainable Tourism and reef logic. The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, with the leadership of this expert group, continues to monitor the progress of alternative shark deterrent technology trials being conducted in New South Wales. The department is also in regular contact with the Natal Sharks Board in South Africa, which also has active shark control measures in place.

The Queensland government's Shark Control Program operates across 86 locations, as we have heard. The Palaszczuk government is providing an extra \$2.1 million over four years and an additional \$731,000 per annum ongoing to help meet the growing cost of the Shark Control Program. This will take total funding for the program to \$16.1 million over four years and \$4.2 million per annum ongoing.

If new technologies are shown to be effective in preventing marine life fatalities and are practical for use, they will be considered as part of the program. The department is committed to collaborative research programs with academic institutions and to date has undertaken investigations into bull whaler movements in canals and feeding strategies of bull whalers. Other programs have included the Queensland Large Shark Tagging Program by Dr Jonathan Werry and the tiger shark program by fisheries patrol officers in Queensland. Fisheries Queensland conducts ongoing assessments of the program's performance to ensure it is meeting its aims. Based on the evidence to date, traditional capture methods remain the most effective measures to reduce the risk of shark attack. Since establishing the program back in 1962, research on sharks and shark attacks has continued to evolve.

The LNP's latest thought bubble in the wake of these tragic events has been to call for a public inquiry. It is startling to see that, after a week of attempting to capitalise on tragedy and claiming to have all the answers, they now want an inquiry. In light of the free-range commentary provided by members opposite, it is important to put the facts on the record. We know that Cid Harbour is not a patrolled beach. We know it is not somewhere you should be swimming.

What we know is that there have been at least five inquiries into the Shark Control Program since 1992—four by the Queensland parliament and one by the Australian Senate. What we know is that the Shark Control Program has operated since 1962, with only one fatality at a controlled beach. What we know is that the Shark Control Program has operated under successive administrations, including the Labor Party, the Country Party, the Liberal and National parties and the LNP. We know that our government has provided an additional \$2.1 million to maintain the sustainability funding in the last budget—the first increase in the budget since 2009. There was no new money under the LNP, and that is without talking about the LNP's cuts.

What we know is that this information is publicly available from a wide variety of sources and will continue to be made available. We know that the program is reported on publicly each year in the annual report, and that includes catch numbers and bycatch numbers. We know that the opposition is one of the best resourced in the country, and we heard that. We know that the LNP member for the Whitsunday knew about the tragic event and chose to stay on in Melbourne, frolicking at Flemington, rather than fly home. We know he was interviewing people track side rather than coming home to talk to the affected people. I table his Facebook post from the day.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 6 November 2018, from the Facebook page of the member for Whitsunday, Mr Jason Costigan MP, in relation to Melbourne Cup meeting [1898].

Knowing the facts, what can we say about the LNP, this motion and their conduct over the last week? We can draw three conclusions: the LNP do not want to look at the facts, they do not want to do the work and they do not care about our tourism industry, our swimmers and the truth.

 **Mr MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (5.38 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the private member's motion moved by the shadow minister for agriculture and fisheries. It is a considered and constructive motion which would provide for the establishment of an inquiry so that we can discover the facts needed to make an informed decision about protecting the safety of Queenslanders and tourists. Both sides of politics regularly talk about the importance of Queensland's tourism industry, but it is clear that this Palaszczuk Labor government is not willing to make the decisions required to protect that industry and the jobs that rely on the regular flow of tourists through places like the Whitsundays.

It is clear that something is wrong at Cid Harbour, given the three tragic attacks that have occurred in the past two months, and it is clear that tourists are concerned about these events. The government recognised these concerns when drum lines were deployed after the first two attacks in late September, but when called on to again provide protection to Whitsunday residents and tourists after the most recent fatal attack the government decided to ignore the genuine safety concerns. They instead embarked on a talkfest with a preordained outcome which was designed to pay lip-service to the genuine safety concerns that have been expressed by tourists, residents, fisheries experts, the local member and tourism operators.

When pressed, the Minister for Tourism cited scientific reasons for not providing the same protection to the Whitsundays that is already in use at 85 other beaches across Queensland. Given the minister has stated that no scientific basis exists for the use of drum lines in the Whitsundays, I would ask the Minister for Tourism to explain why drum lines were installed at Cid Harbour following the first two non-fatal attacks in September. Was the government's decision at that time a kneejerk reaction not made on the basis of scientific advice, or is the government's failure to act after the most recent fatal attack at Cid Harbour the result of pressure from environmental lobby groups and vested interests? Is the government putting the safety of Queenslanders second to its own political interests?

Queensland's tourism industry generates \$13 billion for the Queensland economy and supports 220,000 local Queensland jobs. It is an industry that diversifies the economies of regional communities and is the mainstay of places like Cairns, the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast and, importantly, the Whitsundays. It is an industry that has been supported by the Shark Control Program, implemented in 1962, which has provided reassurance to an industry that leverages our natural assets in the form of our beaches and marine environment. Since the Shark Control Program has been protecting Queenslanders, there have been around 20 fatal shark attacks across the state. In the same time frame only one fatality has been recorded at a controlled beach. The evidence speaks for itself.

It is understandable that there have been numerous calls to implement the Shark Control Program in the one major coastal tourism market that is still not protected: the Whitsundays. It is the same place that has seen three attacks in the past two months. There are hundreds of drum lines up and down the coast, but there is not a single one in the Whitsundays. Tourism operators are understandably concerned. Resort manager Ms Sharon Dewsbury reflected the concerns of tourism operators across the Whitsundays when she said—

Airlie's had a rough time for a long time and it's very sad. I booked a tour for some overseas tourists and they didn't even want to go snorkelling and these were divers who have dived in numerous places around the world.

Another business owner, Mr Ivan Pratt, said he 'absolutely' believed the attacks would impact the local economy. Labor needs to stop treating the people of Whitsundays as second-class citizens and needs to act now to ensure tourist safety across all of Queensland. The failure of this Palaszczuk Labor government to listen to the genuine community concern in relation to recent shark attacks in the Whitsundays is just another example of Labor being completely out of touch. Labor's priorities are all wrong. This government needs to step up and take action rather than just commission another talkfest.

As an aside, when I told my three-year-old daughter at lunchtime that I would be speaking about the Shark Control Program, she broke into 'Baby shark, do-do-do-do' in the Stranger's Dining Room. I apologise to all those members who were having important meetings with stakeholders. I commend the motion to the House.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (5.43 pm): What I have heard tonight from those opposite is that everybody who has an opinion different from theirs must be wrong. There was a very important meeting last Friday where people expressed their opinions. Those opposite do not agree with them and what they have said about them has been quite appalling. Let's talk about damaging tourism, because they have said a lot about that so far tonight.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mrs GILBERT: You should move into your own electorate. Let's talk about—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Mackay, you will put your comments through the chair. Members to my left, I believe that members have been listening to my directions and listening to members in relative silence until this current speaker. I ask you to hear the member who has the call.

Mrs GILBERT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to quote from the *Gold Coast Bulletin*. The article states, 'Mr Langbroek said his family had ruled out a Whitsundays holiday and would look at Bali or Fiji.' The LNP prefers to talk down tourism rather than talk up Queensland, yet the shadow 'anti-tourism' minister went further, alleging that the government 'may look to reduce the net program over time at the Gold Coast because surely the same principle applies'. How terrible! What an absolutely disgusting and disingenuous statement to make about the Gold Coast.

There has never been a suggestion of removing the Shark Control Program from the Gold Coast or from anywhere else in Queensland, yet the LNP has no hesitation in spreading fear among tourists and locals alike. What is so very surprising is that the LNP has politicised this tragedy. The program has been a success at 86 beaches across Queensland, and this government has been and will continue to be supportive of the program. What we need to hear clearly from those opposite is genuine support for the program, because when the government backed in the program at estimates in 2015 and 2018 the LNP said nothing.

Mr Costigan: You've got it in your own electorate.

Mrs GILBERT: I will take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday, who likes to live in Mackay. We do have shark nets and drum lines and the locals know where they are. They are at patrolled beaches and everybody is safe. If you don't get how it works, then we will have to say it slower.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mackay.

Mrs GILBERT: When the government increased its funding to the program by \$2.1 million earlier this year, the LNP said nothing.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Mackay, I remind you to put your comments through the chair.

Mrs GILBERT: Yes, Mr Speaker. Sorry. When the government—

Mrs Frecklington: The member is already speaking pretty slowly.

Mrs GILBERT: Has she finished? Okay. When the government increased the total number of beaches protected from 85 to 86 by adding one on Stradbroke Island, the LNP said nothing. When the government said in September that it was too dangerous to swim in Cid Harbour what did the LNP say? Nothing! Now that the LNP is wanting to make the program political, it is making up its own facts. The member for Broadwater should be supporting the government's approach on the recent attacks rather than playing politics through the media.

When we had tourism operators and scientists in the room listening to the facts, the member for Broadwater was self-promoting rather than being positive about the tourism opportunities in Queensland. At the summit we had Tourism Whitsundays, Whitsunday tourism operators, Whitsunday Marine Advisory Group, Whitsunday Charter Boat Industry Association, Whitsunday Bareboat Operators Association, commercial fishermen, police, the University of Queensland, James Cook University, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Maritime Safety Queensland and Surf Life Saving Queensland. Apparently all those sitting opposite know more than these people.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mrs GILBERT: It is really appalling that these people will hear the way that you are talking about them, and they are in your electorate. The tourism experts, scientists and lifesavers have already listened and we have acted. If we listened to the LNP we would not talk to locals, we would not talk to the experts and we would not talk to the tourism industry. We had scientists say that Cid Harbour was too dangerous to swim in—

(Time expired)

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (5.49 pm): Imagine a Queensland where every Queenslander was treated equally. Imagine a Queensland where the government took seriously their primary duty to keep the community safe. I am going to table this map because it shows very clearly why the people of the Whitsundays deserve more action than an education campaign, more action than signage and more action than another study.

Tabled paper: Liberal National Party map, undated, titled 'Queensland's Shark Control Program' [[1899](#)].

The Whitsundays are unlike most other communities from Cairns to the Gold Coast, which have had a level of protection dating back over half a century. Over 400 shark protection devices, whether it be nets or drum lines, protect communities represented by both sides of politics. The people of the Whitsundays want the same thing not just in Cid Harbour but also on beaches, where industry relies on goodwill, reputation and protection. For the minister to stand up and quote science as the reason for not putting these in is really duplicitous, because the same science that allows them to protect residents right up and down the Queensland coast should be applied to the people of the Whitsundays.

I also want to briefly pull up the minister, who somehow accused me of making personal attacks on her because I questioned her 'vision' and follow-through on this issue. That is not a personal attack; that is the art of accountability. Let me contrast that with someone who calls somebody a 'big mouth' and a 'big kahuna'—somebody who on the floor of estimates called me 'mate' and the member for Burleigh 'darl'. Let us stop all this fake outrage when someone is held to account, because talking about a lack of vision, a lack detail or a lack of follow-through is respectful debate. I will never engage in personal attacks.

While I am holding people to account, may I ask the members for Cairns and Barron River to go back to their communities and tell them that science is under threat in this House. I encourage the members for Townsville and Thuringowa to go back to their communities, where there are 50 shark control devices that have provided protection for that community for many years. The member for Keppel stood up and gave the most incredible performance. While I am calling members to task, can I say to the member for Redlands that your contribution—

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, member for Broadwater.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I found the member for Redlands' contribution about a member who was absent for a day appalling, and the member for Mackay followed up. If they feel no great connection to the member for Whitsunday's electorate, may I suggest to them that he continues to prove them wrong time and time again.

Mr Whiting: What about my contribution?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bancroft, that was a somewhat unusual interjection.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank whoever that was.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Broadwater, it is members to my left who are not allowing you to have the call again.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The absurdity of all of this is that, for some reason, after a non-lethal attack the government acted to put drum lines in and the science will show that it was effective, yet after a lethal attack they will not act. Let me surmise what may have happened. There may have been a conversation where some groups of very hard-line environmentalists said they would campaign ferociously if more of these went in, so a deal has been done. Despite the community needing protection, they will put politics over people. It sounds a lot like that.

The minister asked why I would want to be at that round table. I would have loved to put across the point of view that I was given when I spoke to business owners in cafes and restaurants in the Whitsundays, the local member and the local community. Do you know what they said? 'I do not know a great deal about science, but I do know about a community vibe. My community wants the same level of protection as everywhere else, and we need a circuit-breaker now.'

(Time expired)

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (5.54 pm): I rise to join my colleagues in opposing this motion. I do so in terms of the great privileges—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, I have been clear about my expectations during this debate. I ask that you give the member with the call the courtesy of being heard before interjecting.

Mr FURNER: One of the great privileges of being the Minister for Fisheries is working with the men and women of Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol. They do a great job out on the waters of Queensland. I also commend the hardworking contractors in the Shark Control Program, our program volunteers and our staff in Fisheries Queensland and the department. These staff and contractors work long hours to support our fisheries sector and promote and preserve swimmer safety.

I had hoped that this debate would provide an opportunity for a respectful discussion of the government's ongoing response to the Cid Harbour attack. I do join with the member for Whitsunday in offering my condolences to the family of Daniel Christidis regarding this tragedy. During the debate over the past week we have seen the LNP try to politicise a tragedy. Our government's approach to this tragedy and this event was straightforward. We wanted to listen. We wanted to get the facts. We wanted to take action that reflected the needs of local people—local operators—that would benefit all Queenslanders, and that is what we have done. We travelled to the Whitsundays with some of Queensland's leading scientists and operational experts, local leaders and tourism operators to have a real discussion about what we could do next. Our five-point plan promotes swimmer education, science and research and represents an ongoing commitment to local people.

The tender documents for the research will be issued today. The research will aim to answer a number of questions relating to: the behaviour and prevalence of sharks in Cid Harbour; whether sharks are resident in the area or transit through; whether they have become habituated to boats; and to better understand what species was likely responsible for the attacks. Our five-point plan has been worked through and endorsed locally as a result of the government working side by side with the community. I commend every person in that room for attending last Friday, having their say and being willing to work through the options at such an emotional time. I especially want to thank Mayor Andrew Wilcox and his staff for their assistance in bringing the community together.

With any tragedy there is always a chance that the facts of the matter can be lost. As minister, I want to speak to the myths that have been disseminated in the past week. The most concerning commentary came from LNP members on the Gold Coast, who suggested that Shark Control Program equipment has been removed or is about to be removed. We just heard the contribution from the member for Broadwater. The facts are simple: there are 86 beaches protected by the Shark Control Program and not 85, as the member for Gympie indicated. It is simply a case of going onto the internet and seeing what applies in the area.

The beaches that are patrolled cover 0.1 per cent of our wonderful Queensland coastline. There has been no deal done with respect to this outcome. In fact, as I just indicated, the number of beaches protected has increased from 85 to 86, and we promoted the program by putting in \$2.1 million at the last estimates. If there was a deal done I ask why the Palaszczuk government would wind down this program and spend that sort of money on it. These beaches are largely patrolled and accessible by contractors. There have been at least five reviews into the program. It is regularly reported upon proactively through the DAF website, monitored by a scientific group and covered in the budget.

There is no secret plan, except perhaps the one cooked up between the members for Broadwater and Whitsunday last week. I am not sure of the position of the member for Surfers Paradise, because his only response was that he was going to holiday in Fiji or Bali instead of the Whitsundays. Perhaps he got the idea from the member for Broadwater, the crisis fuelled opposition leader in waiting, who circumnavigated the good people of Thuringowa for the canals of Hope Island. My advice to him would be the same as to anyone: do not swim in the canals, do not swim at dusk, do not swim at Cid Harbour and do not swim in the murky waters of the LNP's politics. Unlike the member for Burleigh, our shark nets and drum lines do not take unscheduled leave. There has been an unfortunate attempt by the LNP to conflate the tragic events at Cid Harbour with Queensland's Shark Control Program. Let us put the facts on the record. Let us make sure the facts are heard loud and clear, once and for all.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 41:

LNP, 37—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 47:

ALP, 46—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Pair: C. O'Rourke, Sorensen.

Resolved in the negative.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Further Answer to Question, Transmax

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (6.05 pm): I rise to update the House on an answer to a question asked of me this morning by the member for Chatsworth. I am advised that the document tabled by the member was received by the Premier and referred to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet sought advice from the Crime and Corruption Commission and, as per usual practice, the matter was referred by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to the appropriate person to deal with the matter, in this case the director-general of my department.

One of the allegations relates to electrical safety issues. I am advised that an electrical safety audit was undertaken by the Office of Industrial Relations on 31 October. The audit noted 'a high level of compliance with electrical standards and indicated no concerns'.

In relation to the other allegations, I am advised that my director-general has met with the ethical standards unit of the Department of Transport and Main Roads and instructed that an external independent audit be undertaken into these matters. The managing director has voluntarily stood down while the audit is undertaken. I would like to assure the House that the Department of Transport and Main Roads takes these matters seriously and they will be examined fully.

MOTION

Order of Business

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.06 pm), without notice: I move—

That government business orders of the day Nos 3 to 10 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Resumed from 13 November (see p. 3443).

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (6.07 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the address-in-reply of the 56th Parliament. In doing so, I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your election.

I congratulate the member for Cook on being the first person of Torres Strait Islander descent to be elected to this House. I recently had the great honour of visiting her home island, Yam Island, with her. It was a wonderful occasion. It makes you appreciate the great diversity and rich cultures we have

in our beautiful state. We should never forget how rich our state is and how great our people are. We are all connected as Queenslanders and we all strive for the same things: good education and great health services. I thank all of my ministers who go to the Torres Strait from time to time and make sure they are making a valuable contribution and are working with the member for Cook.

I am immensely honoured to be returned as the member for Inala. I am proud to continue to represent this culturally diverse community in this House. I am also extremely honoured to be elected as the Premier of Queensland to represent all Queensland communities. At the last election Queenslanders once again put their faith in my government, electing us for our second term. They put their faith in our plans to grow Queensland, our promise to continue to put Queenslanders first and our commitment to maintain stability and certainty.

In our first term of government we worked alongside Queenslanders to clean up the mess left by the former government. Together we reunited our great state and we restored front-line services—delivering more doctors and nurses for our hospitals, more teachers for our schools and more police, ambulance officers, firefighters and child safety officers for our communities. We also made record investments in health and education—new and improved hospitals, healthcare centres and schools. We worked with business and industry to build a strong economy, boost exports and deliver jobs. By being measured and responsible we delivered, and we continue to deliver, budget surpluses. I pay tribute to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, who this year handed down her first budget, one which was very measured and once again focused on the needs of Queenslanders.

In our second term we are continuing to deliver for Queensland—giving Queenslanders access to quality health care and decent education no matter where they live and delivering key economic and social infrastructure such as roads, schools, hospitals and the transport network. We are continuing to create jobs in a strong economy. We are focused on our Queensland energy plan. We are making sure that we are putting downward pressure on power prices. We are doing this without selling our electricity assets.

Since we came to office over 170,000 jobs have been created in Queensland. Our merchandise exports have grown from \$44 billion in 2015 to \$77.6 billion over the year to September 2018—more than that of New South Wales and Victoria combined for the same period. This year's budget will support the creation of 75,000 jobs, more than half of those from our record \$45.8 billion infrastructure program. We will continue to fight for our fair share of infrastructure funding from the federal government. We will make our voices loud and clear. We will be heard in Canberra and we will continue the fight until the Morrison government continues to give Queensland our fair share.

We are investing more than half a billion dollars to create the jobs of the future in our state through our signature \$650 million Advance Queensland program. When I travel overseas to our export markets it is not unusual that many questions are being asked about our Advance Queensland program. Many other countries and regions are looking at how they can also help transform their economies in terms of the way that these policies are being put into practice in precincts such as Fortitude Valley and regional centres, and earlier today in the House the Minister for Innovation spoke about that up and down the coast. Innovation can happen and is happening right across our state. We have also developed new industries like advanced manufacturing, biofuels, biomedical and life sciences. Manufacturing is moving to Queensland. We are Australia's new capital of automotive engineering with Volvo opening its national base at Wacol, we are the biggest base of Boeing's drone research outside the United States and we are about to start making \$5 billion worth of Rheinmetall Boxer tanks right here in Queensland.

My government also recognises the potential for our state to become a future powerhouse in the renewable energy market. While we continue to see uncertainty—continued uncertainty—at the federal level, our renewable energy target is giving the sector the confidence to invest. It is also lowering power prices and protecting our iconic Great Barrier Reef. While we are proactively encouraging investment and innovation across a range of industries, we are also focused on preparing for the jobs of the future. That is why we are delivering free TAFE courses to school leavers. Some 160 courses in high-demand industries like hospitality, automotive, mining, construction and child care will give year 12 graduates skills that will lead to jobs.

Our investment in training—more than \$1.1 billion—is supporting job-creating initiatives that make a real difference to people's lives like Skilling Queenslanders for Work and Back to Work. We are also backing business through our jobs and regional growth, investment attraction and innovation funds. Through these programs we are doing everything possible to support business and employers so that they can get on with doing what they do best—build their business and, in doing so, strengthen

Queensland's economy. I want to particularly mention the fact that my government continues to put key investment into Health and Education with their record budgets. We understand how important they are. Our key issues during the campaign were focused on jobs, education and health, and we will continue to do that. We also know how important our signature programs like Back to Work and Skilling Queenslanders for Work are. These are programs that are really at the front line helping people to not only get jobs and help small business but also bring down the unemployment rate, which is sometimes high for young people living in some of the more regional areas of our state.

I am very proud to represent my local community of Inala. Given the support that the people in the community provide me each and every election, I am absolutely humbled to be their member in this parliament. Very few people get to walk in these doors and take a seat and it is something that every single member of parliament should be incredibly proud of, but at all times no-one should feel any greater than the people whom they represent. From where I stand and the caucus that works with me day in and day out and my cabinet, we treat everybody equally, and that is a signature hallmark of the government—good, decent government, hardworking government working with people, treating people as equals, because that is the way that everyone should be treated.

Last night I mentioned in this House that I attended the awards night at Glenala State High School and I reflect on the transformation of this school over many years from the first time that I was elected to now. The students who go through those halls have so many more opportunities than students had 10, 15, 20, 30 or 40 years ago. The world is changing, but we are linking the skills that they need to get a job. We know that families right across our state go through incredibly tough times. People are faced with all sorts of challenges, and we see that in our western communities with drought. We also know that we get through things by working together and looking after each other and helping those most in need.

The people in my electorate are some of the most giving in Queensland, but they also face some of the most difficult challenges. I pay my respects to all of the hardworking families out there. They do battle. They do go through a lot, but at the end of the day it is a government that delivers the vital services that help make their lives a little bit easier. Every single person in my electorate and every person across Queensland wants the very best for their families, and that comes about by having a good decent job, knowing that if one of your family is sick they can go to a doctor to get the health care they need no matter where they live and the fact that their children can go to the best schools around, and that is what we are delivering. We are delivering a world-class education and we have a world-class health system.

We have such a big state. We are delivering the transport networks that we need and we are working so hard to transition our economy. This is a huge job. Other countries are grappling with this and they do not know how to do it, but we are focused—we are incredibly focused—at seizing the opportunities of the new industries, and I know that when we work together we can seize all of those opportunities and really take Queensland to that next level.

In closing, I want to pay tribute to a few local people who worked for me during the election campaign. I want to pay special tribute to Melanie Wedgwood and Susan Bourne in my electorate office, to Barry McIntosh, to Val and Ern and to Graham Hastie. I want to pay special tribute to the late Evie Wolffe, who sadly lost her battle with cancer. I also thank Ethel Murray, who is also going through her own personal battles. This is a woman who used to work with the Salvation Army going door to door visiting people who were sick and taking them to health appointments. She is now going through her own personal battles and she is always asking about everyone else. They are the type of people who live in my community. To Penelope Webster, to Don, to Nayda and to Tony Cook: thank you very much for all of your hard work. I would love to be in my electorate more often, but the people of my electorate understand that the needs of the state take me right across the state and they are incredibly understanding.

I want to thank all of my wonderful caucus team. They are an amazing bunch of people. There is a richness in this caucus that I know will stand the test of time and together we are going to do great things for this state because, at the end of the day, everything we do is fundamentally about improving people's lives. That is what governments should be focused on—improving people's lives.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (6.19 pm): It is indeed a great honour to rise in this place to finally give my address-in-reply speech, albeit almost 12 months since the last election. Firstly, as the re-elected LNP member for Whitsunday, I acknowledge the traditional owners of the country that I continue to proudly represent: the Yuwi, Gia and Ngaro. I pay my respects to elders, both past and present.

Mr Speaker, I congratulate you upon your election as the Speaker of the 56th Parliament and all other members on their electoral success whilst also pledging my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II via His Excellency the Governor of Queensland, the people of this state, the people of this nation and last, but not least, the good people of the Whitsunday electorate. Of course, I am biased, but I say that I represent the best slice of Queensland in the best state in the nation in what is still by far the best country on earth.

On the mainland in the south, the Whitsunday electorate runs from the tip of Slade Point, named by Lieutenant James Cook in 1770—nowadays a suburb of the great city of Mackay—north to Cape Gloucester, which was also named by arguably the world's greatest explorer after the *Endeavour* sailed through the Whitsunday Passage. Along the coast, my electorate takes in Mackay's magnificent northern beaches of Seaforth, Cape Hillsborough, Midge Point, Airlie Beach—the heart of the reef—Shute Harbour, which was once the second busiest passenger port in the nation behind Circular Quay, Dingo Beach, Hydeaway Bay and Cape Gloucester.

Along the Bruce Highway there are all of those close-knit, wonderful cane-farming towns and villages between Farleigh and Proserpine—places such as Kuttatubul, which is home to World War II veteran Monty Edmonds and the McGill family, whose forebears saddled up 101 years ago in the charge of the Light Horse Brigade at Beersheba. Then there is Mount Ossa, where Nicole Pratt grew up before taking on the world in tennis and attending school just up the road in Calen, which was once home to my late mother, my sisters and where my relatives to this day still live and farm the land. Further north there is Bloomsbury, which is another place where cane and cattle is king thanks to more hardworking local families who have toiled away, in many cases for decades, and on to the great sugar-milling town of Proserpine, which is also home to my office. It is certainly a fantastic community. I should not forget the islands of the Whitsunday electorate—from Keswick and St Bees in the south through to Hamilton and Hayman in the north—that are home to real people, not just palm trees. All up, my electorate covers 6,000 square kilometres and encompasses an incredible part of the world. Is it any wonder people still call me the 'member for Paradise'.

As we all know, politics is a tough game. Without being schooled up many years ago, I would not have won one election, let alone three. On that note, I acknowledge my three political mentors: former meatworker, the late Alby Schultz, the former federal member for Hume whom I served way back in 2001, and subsequently North Queensland based senator Ian Macdonald and then federal sports minister, senator George Brandis QC, whom I was proud to advise on sport policy at the back end of the Howard government. Between them, across local, state and federal governments, they served their constituents for 82 years. Clearly, I learned a thing or two from them along the way.

Speaking of politicians, I especially want to thank the member for Broadwater, the first shadow minister to come to the Whitsunday electorate after the election, which also marked his return to this place. I welcome back my friend. We go back to 1995 when he was a schoolboy in Ingham and I was reading the news on television across North Queensland and called the first-ever Cowboys name. I might add that the member for Broadwater is the same member of parliament who was responsible for bringing me back to Queensland more than a decade ago, after having the time of my life calling the NRL on Fox Sports and living my childhood dream. The now member for Broadwater brought me back to Queensland through his old boss, senator Macdonald. The member for Broadwater truly recognises the importance of tourism in my part of the world. From memory, the shadow minister has made no fewer than five visits to my region since taking on that job. Tourism is so critical to Airlie Beach and the Whitsunday islands, hence my concerns about public safety in my community after last week's terrible tragedy in Cid Harbour.

Many people do not realise that the Whitsundays is now the No. 1 entry point to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. I mean no disrespect to the Far North, but my area has achieved that without an international airport. That is something that I hope to change one day, which will perhaps lead to a casino resort development in the Whitsundays, possibly even one of the Whitsunday islands, to generate jobs and prosperity for the locals of my area. Since Cyclone Debbie hit more than 18 months ago, those islands have done it tough. That is why I cannot believe the government has this \$50 million fund to rejuvenate our Great Barrier Reef islands, yet half of that money is going to Great Keppel Island. Where is that island located? In the Labor held seat of Keppel. What about the Whitsundays?

It is no surprise that the tourism minister said nothing about this funding when visiting Airlie Beach last month for the tourism awards, where local businessman Kevin Collins told me face to face about his concerns for the future of local seafood in our restaurants should Labor bring in new regulations that will only undermine tourism, small business and more. I say to the minister to come back up to my area and listen to the locals, KC and the gang and people like Kelly Morgan from Morgan's Fish Market

on the northern beaches and David Caracciolo from Mackay Reef Fish Supplies. They are all scared that these new regulations will send the little bloke in commercial fishing to the wall and lead to more imports of seafood—something that I am totally against.

I also ask the minister: what happened to that prediction that she made here in the parliament last year? For those who are unaware of it, on 22 August last year the member for Cooper stood in this place and told the House—

You are d-e-a-d, dead.

Guess what, member for Cooper? In the words of Sir Elton John, I'm still standing. As for the bikini-bashing member for South Brisbane, I say thank you for picking a fight with yours truly, because it was thanks to 'bikinigate', sponsored by the member for South Brisbane, that I was able to promote the Whitsundays to the world. I got a whole new audience and for free. In fact, one of the British tabloids picked up the story and even referred to me as the Deputy Premier. Perhaps that is an omen. Who knows? Despite the damage caused by the tragic—

A government member: By that statement.

Mr COSTIGAN: I was going to touch on a very sombre topic, because I was going to talk about the tragic events of the last few weeks. I ask members to stop laughing. Despite the damage caused by those tragic events to my electorate's reputation and by Cyclone Debbie, I think there are some exciting things coming out of the Whitsundays, with the redevelopment of Daydream Island progressing well. I know that the member for Mackay is not sure where Daydream Island is. I look forward to joining Dawson Tang, Mark Fletcher and their Chinese based investors for the reopening of that resort next year. Likewise, I eagerly anticipate the reopening of the Hayman Island resort under the Intercontinental brand.

Thanks largely to the Oatley family, there has been some amazing post-cyclone work done on Hamilton Island. Although we lost Bob a couple of years ago, the family's passion for tourism and giving people an incredible experience in paradise has not waned one iota. On that note, I salute the man who we call the 'Governor', Glenn Bourke, who heads Hamilton Island Enterprises, and all his staff who do a superb job. I also recognise people such as Helen Scott and Caroline and Dexy Murray and company on Long Island for their work on the Palm Bay Resort, which is also doing well.

Back on the mainland, my electorate has seen the emergence of the award-winning Northerlies, which overlooks Woodwark Bay. Across the water, there is the multi-award winning Abell Point Marina, where owner, Paul Darrouzet, has invested big coin. He has transformed that place. Unlike Labor's tourism minister, he is not just talking a good game, but playing one as well.

I will continue to fight for tourism projects such as the visitor information centre that my electorate needs on the Bruce Highway coming into Proserpine. That was an ironclad commitment from me and the LNP going into the last election, compared to a big fat zero from Labor. My electorate also needs an RV park for Proserpine, which was another pre-election commitment from the LNP last year. I also want to see Proserpine get that regional export distribution centre that the government is funding. Frankly, Proserpine should be in with a good chance to get that centre. My area grows all of these fruit and vegetables just up the road in Bowen and it has the airport at Proserpine where there is plenty of room for expansion. I know that the chamber of commerce is well aware of this issue. I thank the president, Bob Bogie, Karen Vloedmans and others for their support.

Recreational fishing plays a big role in attracting tourists to my area. I am proud to have secured an upgraded boat ramp for Dingo Beach, as opposed to Labor's crazy plan to put one on Blackcurrant Island against the wishes of my community. My electorate needs more marine infrastructure, including in the southern part of my electorate—places such as Murray Creek, near Mount Pelion. After all, it is along that stretch of the coast that there is the net-free fishing zone, but there has been very little marketing of that from Tourism and Events Queensland. In fact, I cannot even get Labor to completely seal the Mount Ossa-Seaforth Road, which would surely attract more tourists off the Bruce Highway to places such as Seaforth and Cape Hillsborough.

Speaking of roads, I will continue to maintain the rage to fix the Bruce. Yes, members have heard it before, but I will not rest on this: specifically, flood mitigation at Goorganga Plains; more broadly, of course, improving the surface of the road between Pindi Pindi and Koolachu. Fair dinkum, that section of the Bruce Highway probably has more cracks than Humpty Dumpty after the fall. Enough is enough. We also need to finally fix Hamilton Plains just outside Proserpine. That is that flood prone section of Shute Harbour Road. Last year I set up camp there and campaigned to fix it, knowing again we had an LNP funding commitment. What did we get from Labor? A big fat zero—well, a business case at best

which must be, I dare say, collecting some dust here in Brisbane. People do not want a business case. Even the year 1s at Cannonvale understand that Airlie Beach and Cannonvale get cut off from Proserpine where the hospital is when we have a decent wet season. That is hardly acceptable in this day and age. The wet season is always unpredictable but what we do know is that it rains in North Queensland.

We need to build key water infrastructure such as dams. I have said many times before in this place the first cab off the rank should be my pet project, the Urannah Dam. Only a few weeks ago we had National Water Week. Where was Labor's announcement of new water infrastructure for the north? Not only do we need Urannah Dam on the western side of the Clarke Range to boost food and fibre production, to facilitate new mining projects and to deliver long-term water security for the Whitsundays, we also need energy security for the north and, specifically, cheaper and reliable electricity. Hence I continue to fight for a state-of-the-art coal-fired power station at Collinsville. I am not against renewables, but we have to get the balance right. With copious amounts of coal just over the range we should be burning it, albeit cleaner and smarter, just like other countries do. Many traditional Labor voters agree with me. They cannot believe 21st century Labor has gone so far to the left that they now see coal as a dirty word. We even saw Mike Brunner, aka Moscow, doing a backflip on this in the lead-up to the poll. Fair dinkum, with that sort of form he should be off to Tokyo in 2020 for the Olympics with the Australian gymnastics team.

Our farmers continue to do it tough under the high price of power to irrigate their crops, remembering that along with tourism sugar is an economic driver in my part of the world. In fact, in Queensland it is a \$2 billion industry and it needs help more than ever before: help with the cost of power, help with the cost of water, help with increasing red tape under Labor, and help with these de facto trade wars. As the Minister for Trade, the Premier should have gone to India by now to put the acid on the Indian government, which is subsidising its farmers resulting in five million tonnes of sugar flooding the world market. What happens as a result of that? A 10-year low in the world price of sugar. Farmers in my patch, certainly from Farleigh to Foxdale and from Coningsby to Crystalbrook, need that like a hole in the head. We need more funding for sugar research, remembering that we had record funding under the LNP in this space but, typical of Labor, it has shunned the industry. Not only do I want R and D funding restored to those old levels, I tonight call on government—state and federal—along with industry to work together to bring Sugar Research Australia to Mackay, Australia's sugar capital, remembering that Mackay was previously home to the internationally acclaimed Sugar Research Institute.

The city that I represent also serves our multibillion dollar coal industry with many coal workers and contractors in my electorate, current and former. On that note I call on Labor to hurry up in establishing the Mine Safety and Health Authority in Mackay in keeping with the recommendations of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee which included me. The problem in Central, North and Far North Queensland is that pen-pushers and pollies in Brisbane, more than 1,100 kilometres from my little office, are making decisions about people and places they know very little about. It is these people who are increasingly frustrated. If we do not get our fair share, not just in terms of finance but in terms of respect and responsibility, we will see the calls for separation from the rest of the state become louder and louder and from more credible sources. Am I calling for separation? No, I am not, but I will say it again: if things do not change those calls to break away will become more vociferous than ever.

That brings me to the issue of representation. It is dead-set embarrassing that, in this House, I am just one of only two LNP members north of Bundaberg. Let us not beat around the bush. We only have ourselves to blame. I am not going to stand up here and say otherwise. I stand by my comments in the *Sunday Mail* after our latest defeat when I famously declared, 'We could not sell ice to an Afghani camel driver.' Our primary vote in Central, North and Far North Queensland was diabolical: one only has to look at the neighbouring seat of Mirani, held by the LNP or the Nationals for 70-odd years until 2015. Since then there have been two defeats, the last one no surprise, our candidate winning just two booths—embarrassing! It is worth remembering the same candidate tried to roll me four years ago before the current member for Mirani did a job on him. I congratulate the member for Mirani on his win, also acknowledging him as the first person of Australian South Sea islander descent to be elected to this place.

It is true we have some amazing people in the LNP in the north; people like Peter Lindsay, for example, who I have known since 1992. He will always put Castle Hill ahead of Spring Hill. He should be commended, not castigated. It is my view that the former member for Herbert, who won 10 elections between local and federal government, should be back in the fold. Ditto my good mate from the west,

long time mayor, John Wharton. Wharto tells it straight, always has, always will, and he should be back in the tent too. This is why other political parties are doing well at our expense and the bleeding has to stop otherwise we might as well pack up north of the Tropic of Capricorn. I know these communities so well, from Capricorn to the cape and Carmila to Cardwell, and it is a crying shame we are not in a position to try to rehabilitate our vote in those communities.

I mention the vanquished in Whitsunday—firstly the Labor candidate, a serial pest and a three-time loser. He did not even have the decency to ring us and say ‘well done’. I say that in contrast to the former Labor member for Whitsunday who was all class. Then we had the One Nation candidate. He was the poorest performer of his mob in North Queensland. He did not take the advice of my old mate Sam Cox, who told his mates to leave me alone. They failed to listen. Then we had the Katter’s Australian Party candidate, the former mayor of Whitsunday, who jumped out of a plane at Hamilton Plains. We do not want stunts; we want the road fixed. What happened to her? She was the worst performer for her team in the state. On primary votes she could not even beat the GST—not that the Premier would get that.

I do not stand here without help. I want to salute the many people in Whitsunday who did their bit to make sure I was returned to this place. What a great honour and privilege it is. I want to thank my SEC executive in Whitsunday—all of them volunteers, of course: chairman Richard Filewood—Tricky Dicky—one of the greatest men in Airlie Beach; ably backed up by Deon Attard, aka the Maltese Falcon. Then we have our secretary, Ange Nixon. I call her Wonder Woman. She might be a bit embarrassed back in Bucasia hearing that, but without Ange it may well have been a different story. To Ange I give my sincere thanks.

Our booth workers were incredible, as were our helpers in general: Fred Reinke; Lillian Orr; Manuela Liesch; Barry Humphries; Marvin Deicke; Andrew Jeffrey; Annie Judd; Les Durnsford; Neil Pratt; Trudy and Graham Roberts—Graham the grandson of the former, in fact the original. member for Whitsunday, the late Lloyd Roberts; Kaye and Doug Peterson; John Powell; Dave Young; Dave McInerney; Karen Tickle; Tony and Josie Perna; Adrian Zarb; Peter Byers; Len Fehlhaber; Tracie and Jason Newitt; Angus Newitt; Robyn Halls; Maxene Bassett; Pauline Ogilvie; Peter Lewis; Joan Hughes; Margo Stanley; Sonja Keoskie; Gloria Demartini; Maren Matthew; the late David Matthew who only died a few days ago; Craig Bethel; Ralph Cox; Margaret Cox; Tony Brosens; Christine Allen; Dee Middendorp-Hacking; John Hacking; Pete Coulson; Mick Selmes; Marie Murray; Graeme Cumming; Trevor Jenvey; and on it goes. I apologise to anyone I have left out. My sincere thanks from the bottom of my heart.

I especially want to thank the Cox family in my electorate, in particular sisters Jennifer and Bonny-Ruth. They rode up the main street of Proserpine with me the day before the poll. They deserve a medal. They even put up with those stinky green protesters who invaded my office. Apparently that day Faust’s IGA ran out of Rexona. That is how much they stunk.

I also want to thank my staff: Claire Nixon, the daughter of Wonder Woman—she must be Wonder Girl; Zach Davis-Hancock, aka Zulu Zack—he is the brains behind the operation; Jacqui Spruce; and Theresa O’Regan. One of the great masterstrokes of the campaign probably was enlisting the help of a well-known business identity and a decent man. I am referring to the former One Nation member for Whitsunday, Harry Black, who in that final week of the campaign publicly declared his support for me, calling on One Nation voters to back me and disregard One Nation’s preferencing of Labor. To Harry and wife, Vonnie, I say thanks. Likewise to Harry’s old boss in this place, former One Nation leader and member for Caboolture, Bill Feldman, who also backed me in that final few days of the campaign after his farewell from the Police Service in Whitsunday.

It is a privilege to be back in this place. I come back to what I said in my maiden speech in 2012 when I touched on the famous words of Sir Robert Menzies, who always promised to stand up for the forgotten people. To them and everyone else back home, as a proud fifth-generation local with family roots going back to 1865, I say I will continue to be their real voice for the North.

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (6.39 pm): I begin by acknowledging that we meet on traditional land and pay my respects to elders, both in this place and in my community of Pine Rivers. I offer my congratulations to honourable members on their re-election and election to this chamber. I congratulate our leader, the Premier, on leading the great Australian Labor Party to majority government, along with her leadership team. I am proud to be a member of the Queensland Labor caucus, which has been a reformist government through our first term, sewing back the fabric of a community torn apart by the Newman LNP government and delivering on our values of fairness, equality and social justice.

I return to this place with a renewed confidence from my community. I am humbled once again by the faith that they have placed in me and humbled by the swing towards me at the 2017 election. The result at the recent election makes me the first member for Pine Rivers in 29 years to serve more than one term in this place.

Knowing that my time is finite, at the start I want to say my thank-yous to all of my wonderful volunteers—all 280 of them. Thank for your faith, your motivation, your dedication and your determination. Together we doorknocked, called and high-vised our way through 500 square kilometres of the electorate, having fun all the way. Over the last term, we worked hard to reshape the structures of our party's membership through Pine Rivers and, as a result, we have diversified, democratised and grown a grassroots activist force to be reckoned with.

Thank you to my SEC president, Rae Ellis, and my leadership team. Thank you to Elvis Vic, who endlessly kept on trucking. First to work and often last to bed, you could guarantee that Vic would be at the first stop of a morning, usually about two hours before the rest of us. Vic, nothing was too much for you. You paid a central part in keeping our spirits high and everything tightly occy strapped down. Thank you my friend.

On election day, our election booths ran with military-like precision. Thank you to our roster champion, Yara Jabbour. We were so fortunate to have you with us every day of the campaign. Thanks to my money man, Jason O'Connor, for your advice, your vigilance and your support. Thank you to Darren and Kerry White. Darren, I could not think of a better way to spend your annual leave than on the campaign trail. You are a champion, backed in with growing team of legends. Thanks to my mountain stalwart, John Halse. Whether up the mountain or down the range, your committed assistance was very much appreciated. Thank you to the mighty White family: Caryn, Steve, my fan boy Jared and our great friend Ashlea. You are a tribe to be reckoned with and we love having your support.

Vic Carr, I do not think there was a single thing that we asked you to do that you turned down. You are such a kind and loving soul. It was a delight to campaign with you. Thank you to Mick Gillam, particularly for the early starts and standoffs on Warner Corner. Thank you to Paul McNair, the king of Closeburn. I am very appreciative to Bernie Brown for all of his assistance. He got us out of a jam more than once with his seemingly bottomless toolkit.

Shane and Louise Buckney street-stall like no other, with style and humour. They helped me get through many hours on prepoll when their wonderful kindness saw every booth sustained for election day. You were wonderful. Thank you. Thank you to Nicole Maloney; my favourite woman in construction, Alison Price; and her loyal stand-in, Mikayla Bennet. Thank you to the 'doot of the Pine', Keith Belding, for your flea-market service and your truck adventures. Thanks also to Jacqueline Moore for the laughs. To our Maltese mate Mick and the wonderful Leonie Calleja: thank you for your commitment and for providing lots of humour along the way.

To Pam and Greg Hand, thank you for your many hours of assistance. Rosemay de Chavel, one of our many volunteers who joined our campaign after we doorknocked you at home, thank you for your commitment. Thank you to our Bunnings regular, Bill Bourke. Thank you to my Lawnton crew: Jen Morrissey and Col and Sharon Harris.

My youngest campaign volunteer was then 10-year-old Jemima Wylie, who was in year 5 at one of our local schools. Jemima wanted to be a part of the election process and we loved welcoming her onto the team with community and campaign events. We even co-opted some friends along the way. Keep looking at the world with hope, Jemima, and being a part of the change you want to see. We love having you on our team.

Lovingly dubbed 'Mr Dayboro', Cameron Crouch joined our team during the campaign but sadly lost his life earlier this year. He left far too soon. In the short time we spent with him, it was obvious that he was a true gentleman and loved by many. For Team Pine, Cameron is legend, helping us to win the Dayboro booth on primary votes for the first time in 14 years. To Cam I say: rest easy, mate. To anyone out there doing it tough, please reach out and seek help.

My office staff are absolutely exceptional. It has taken a few misses to get the staffing mix right, but you could find no women more committed, loyal and dedicated. Thank you for going above and beyond for me and our community. I know it is often tough on the front line. You are exceptional employees, strong women and wonderful friends. You are the gravity that keeps me grounded, particularly during election campaigns. Thank you from the bottom of my heart, Nolsey and Leigh.

Forever in solidarity, thanks to Chris Moore, who is living the dream every day. To conversationalist extraordinaire Kelly Bush: thanks for the laughs and perspective, Kips. To Larissa Louise Flannigan: muchas gracias, Flanno. Thanks to our el presidente and resident decorator, Emma

Holmes, and her fearless mum, Yvonne Tregonning. Thanks to Jimmy Jam Jar, James Gartry. Thanks to the wonderful Selina Young; the queen of the Pine, Zac Balfour; working-class hero Damien Davie; Mick McKewon—I still only catch every third word you say, mate, but thank you—Natasha Hoole and Jared Marks. Thank you for your dedication and commitment

Thank you to my trade union, United Voice. Gary, Sharon, Shiela, Heather, Jeanette, Scott and Matt, thank you for your support. Representing the members of United Voice, some of the lowest paid and under-recognised people in our community, has been a great honour throughout my working life. Those wonderful people, often forgotten and discarded under conservative governments, remain front of my mind as we reform into a modern, inclusive and dynamic state.

I thank my southern Misso comrades, Mark Butler and Lisa Chesters, for their assistance on the campaign trail with doorknocking, high-vis, events or just a message to check in on days when I needed it most. It was enormously appreciated. The might of the Missos is very prevalent through my volunteer base from cleaners, teacher aides, manufacturing workers, early educators and health professionals. All are working class heroes and I love that we campaign always with shared values: fair jobs, an inclusive society, stronger communities and a sustainable future.

I would like to thank my good mate and former Queensland Labor state secretary, Evan Moorhead. He is a calming influence to the many hotheads in our party, myself included. I know we will miss him in the party office, but he is still only a phone call away. He has shown great wisdom in ensuring a clear succession plan and a very capable successor, who nonetheless has giant shoes to fill. I am forever grateful to my loved friend David Malley, not just for the support that you give me every step of the way but also for giving me the great advice to take on your partner in life to work alongside. To our resident bookie, barbequer and all-round best guy, thank you for always having my back. Thanks for the many hours of assistance and support from my godmother, Minnie Cole, who is always there for me.

These speeches are often an opportunity to thank our partners for all that they endure. Awkwardly for me, this is someone I am often very guilty of forgetting to acknowledge. I pay tribute to the enormous contribution of my husband, Reece Pianta. The sacrifice that he has made for my career is insurmountable. Not only did he give up his job to work every day on my campaign; he ran every imaginable facet of it. He designed all of my communications, corflutes, website and printed materials. He ran the mini campaigns, the doorknocks and the phone banks, even though I think secretly he does not enjoy them. He ran a stellar campaign that I am so incredibly proud of and I hope he is, too.

It takes a special kind of person to give everything they have to something knowing that the full reward goes to another, and Reecie is certainly that. While the member for Capalaba may joke that I only married Reece to get him to run my campaigns instead of his, I want it on the record that that is certainly not the case. However, I am glad that he is trapped on the north side and not the bayside. Thanks, Toots, for bringing the pizazz to the Pine. Your support is endless, your contribution great and your love abounding. I am so happy that we are in this together and so excited that next year we will welcome a daughter into the world, hopefully only comprising the best bits of us both.

Thank you to my wonderful family who are always there for me when I need them. My parents, now both retired, have gained new piecework engagements thanks to me. My dad, Jimbo, is my best office volunteer and my mum, Gerri, is my resident sewing lady. Between their grown kids, our husbands and wives and six grandchildren, mum and dad are there for whatever we need and no ask seems to be too big. They juggle grey nomading with full-time parental and grandparental duties, and for that we are all terribly thankful.

Thank you to my wonderful siblings and their partners who are such a wonderful support to me, particularly Lisa and Steve and Matt and Nicole who donate, attend my fundraisers and pitch in every bit they can spare on my campaign. Thank you also to the Piantas—Chris, June and Caitlin—for your backing and support.

In the first term of the Palaszczuk government my community saw the restoration of front-line services, our schools saw an investment of 40 extra teacher aides and teachers and our health and hospital services saw 837 extra local nurses, 208 extra local doctors and 350 local health practitioners. Our hardworking community sector saw funding reinstated and gag orders lifted.

There is now no denying that the Campbell Newman LNP government left a devastating impact on the lives of people in communities like mine. While it does not take much time at all to tear things down, the task of rebuilding is painstakingly longer. I thank my community for sticking with the Palaszczuk Labor government on this journey and for ensuring we can continue with the good work we

commenced in the last term of government. The majority that has been bestowed upon us is an act of faith and it is our responsibility not to break that faith, to continue on as we have been and to comply with expectations conveyed through the ballot box.

This term sees a significant change in the electoral boundaries to the seat of Pine Rivers—change that is bitter sweet with the loss of many great suburbs such as Lawnton, Joyner and Ocean View and great community organisations, which I continue to love and miss very much. My electorate is now more diversified and there are new opportunities for me to meet and engage in the new areas. The redrawn Pine Rivers community is now a mix of suburban, rural, semirural, mountain living and industrial hubs. The 500 square kilometres of diversity brings with it a unique mixture of people, businesses, community groups and history. The core of representing Pine Rivers remains the same. People in my community want opportunity. They want to be connected. They want confidence that their government cares about them. Through my first term in this place I focused heavily on rebuilding and investing in schools, front-line services and jobs and infrastructure, particularly in the transport space.

Southern Moreton Bay is growing into a vibrant destination. The opening of the Moreton Bay Rail Link, commonly known as the Redcliffe Peninsula line, was more than a century in the making, but has been delivered thanks to Labor state and federal governments. The base of the line, and particularly rail bridge infrastructure, saw significant investment, including the North Pine rail bridge and the South Pine and Tributary Creek bridges, to open up the new capacity. Strathpine station is undergoing a full accessibility upgrade and Lawnton park-and-ride will see its capacity more than double in coming months. While we want people to use public transport where possible, the reality is the vast majority of my community rely on their cars. Transport was also a focus in terms of road congestion with many bottlenecks and safety hotspots being addressed.

In my community we are delivering \$2 million for a detailed design for a new interchange at the Strathpine Road-Gympie Arterial Road overpass and \$2.3 million for an on-ramp extension at the Linkfield Road-Gympie Arterial Road overpass—terrible bottlenecks for commuters in my community. We are delivering the long-awaited Petrie roundabout upgrade, removal of the Dixon Street roundabout and consolidation of two sets of traffic lights, safety upgrades to the Kremzow Road-South Pine Road intersection at Brendale, the long-awaited pedestrian crossings in Main Street, Samford and safety upgrades at Eatons Crossing Road and Samford Road-Dayboro Road. There is \$2.5 million for safety works on Mount Glorious Road and Samford Road-Mount Glorious Road—a matter often raised with me by locals up the mountain. There will be a new turning lane on Dayboro Road at the Dayboro Transfer Station—again, a safety black spot and an accident waiting to happen. My community has told me loud and clear: they want roads that work. There is still a lot to do but over the last three years the roadworks that have been everywhere in Pine Rivers are finally starting to bear fruit.

I campaigned hard for a university for my community. It is not right that we have some of the lowest uptakes of tertiary and further education simply because we do not have a facility nearby. My team and I knocked on 5,000 doors, rolled out dozens of community information stalls and engaged thousands of locals through our petition. There is now bipartisan support for stage 1 of the Petrie university, as we were able to drag the LNP federal government to the table with some funding.

I note that Labor has again led the way with a commitment to fund the next stage of the university project, along with placements and changes to university education that will facilitate those with limited means from unlocking the education they will need for their future. The Petrie mill university project, led by council and USC, demonstrates the type of exciting opportunity the future holds for my community.

There is a place in my heart that is branded Dayboro. The little town of yesteryear is the place my husband, Reece, and I wed. Once a dairy, pineapple and timber town, this is a place that absolutely personifies community. I am pleased to have helped secure new classroom facilities, water treatment plant upgrades, supported the showgrounds upgrade and helped trail riders gain access to land around Lake Samsonvale.

During the campaign I personally phoned every person in the greater Samford community coming into the Pine Rivers electorate, doorknocked the village and held numerous listening posts. Getting to know the Samford community even better is something I look forward to over the coming term. It is a unique place with warm welcoming people. I warmly welcome them to the electorate of Pine Rivers. Many groups have honoured me by asking me to be their patron. Thank you to Act 1 Theatre, Dayboro Pony Club, Pine Central Holy Spirit Hornets Rugby League Club and Lake Samsonvale Water Sports Association.

There is a stereotype that the environment is an inner-city issue, but I tell members now that the kind of world we leave to our kids matters to us in the suburbs too. Through the campaign I made it clear to all in my electorate that I would be active on tree clearing, that I would support a low-carbon

fuel future and that I want us to protect and conserve our natural habitats and wildlife. We could not continue clearing 1,000 football fields worth of vegetation every day. I am proud we acted as soon as we were re-elected to stop broadscale, unrestricted clearing in Queensland again.

In our last sitting week Bray Park State High School held its first year 12 graduation in its own multipurpose school hall. They were able to do this for the first time because a Labor government invested in upgrading it to make it a fully functional performing arts and multipurpose space. I was very proud to open that hall less than two weeks ago.

I believe, and the party I am a member of believes too, that education is the great leveller. It is the thing that gives every person in our community the opportunity to pursue whatever dream they have. We believe that state schools are the doors that unlock this reality. That is why we invest in facilities and the staff that bring them to life.

Before I close, I want to say something about two historic reforms. All over the world we are seeing ultraconservative and neofascist forces threatening moderate progressive democratic institutions. In our society in the last 12 months we have seen two giant reforms—marriage equality and reproductive rights. Many hundreds of new electors enrolled in Pine Rivers to have their say in the marriage equality poll. Many hundreds contacted me to express a view either way on reproductive rights. Both of these reforms were delivered and, with only a few notable exceptions, with a mature, community conversation where the community's will was democratically expressed through the institutions of its parliaments. This fills me with hope. It is a clear demonstration that for our society the institutions of our parliaments and governments continue to function as they were intended at their inception over a century ago.

Finally, in closing, I congratulate my neighbouring colleagues: the member for Kurwongbah, Shane King, on his re-election; Steven Miles on his election as the member for Murrumba; Mark Furner on his re-election as the member for Ferny Grove; and our new member for Aspley, Bart Mellish, who has already been an energetic colleague and campaigner on the Linkfield Road overpass. A long-term branch member remarked to me recently that, under the conservatives, things stagnate and under Labor things get built. Certainly in Pine Rivers we are seeing long-awaited projects delivered one by one thanks to a Labor government building things and getting things done.

Debate, on motion of Ms Boyd, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Whitsunday Tourism Awards; Mackay Region Tourism Awards

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (6.58 pm): With the Queensland Tourism Awards on the horizon this Friday on the Gold Coast, it would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the great excellence in the industry in my part of the world that makes places like Airlie Beach, and places right across Mackay and the Whitsundays, tick. Last month we had the Whitsunday Tourism Awards and I want to recognise all those who were feted on the night, particularly our gold award winners. There are so many of them, starting with the Hall of Famers Abell Point Marina, who won the gold in the Major Tourist Attractions category. Paul Darrouzet and company, take a bow.

In the category of Festivals and Events, gold went to the Whitsunday Clipper Race Carnival. The Steve Irwin Award for Ecotourism went to Tall Ship Adventures for the *Derwent Hunter*. In the Specialised Tourism Services category, the gold went to the Whitsunday Regional Council for the Whitsunday Coast Airport. In the Major Tour and Transport Operators category, the gold went to Red Cat Adventures. Asher and Julie Telford have done remarkably well in such a short time with Red Cat Adventures. They won the gold and they also took out the gold in the Adventure Tourism category. Well done to them and their team.

Congratulations to Whitsunday Jetski Tours for picking up gold in the Tour and Transport Operators category. The Wedding Planners Whitsundays picked up gold in the Destination Marketing category for 'Joshua's Whitsunday Wedding Campaign'. Gold in the Tourism Restaurants and Catering Services category went to Hemingway's—a fantastic place for fine dining at Abell Point Marina.

The McKinnon family—well done to Greg, Naomi and the team—from Big4 Adventure Whitsunday Resort won gold in the Caravan and Holiday Parks category. Gold also went to Magnums Backpackers in the Backpacker Accommodation category. In the Unique Accommodation category, I congratulate Cumberland Charter Yachts for their gold medal performance.

Gold also went to Mirage Whitsundays in the Deluxe Accommodation category. They are also now in the Hall of Fame. Gold in the Luxury Accommodation category went to Jeff Aquilina and the team from Heart Hotel. Marcia Hines stays there, and so do I and plenty of others. We love it. It is a great place in the heart of Airlie Beach.

Gold in the Excellence in Sustainable Tourism category went to Zak Kelly and his wife, Vhari, and company from Whitsunday Segway Tours. Northerlies Beach Bar and Grill picked up gold in the New Tourism Business category. Inspired Impact won gold in the Best Non-Tourism Business category. Big4 Adventure Whitsunday Resort also picked up the People's Choice Award. Chloe Autridge from Red Cat Adventures won the Young Achievers Award. The Bob Porter Award for an Outstanding Contribution by an Individual went to Damien Head from the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service—rare for a public servant. Well done to Damien for his work post Cyclone Debbie.

I also want to acknowledge the gold medal winners from the Mackay Region Tourism Awards this year. Michele and Dwayne Shea from the Old Station Teahouse won gold in the Tourism Restaurant and Catering Services category. The Feathered Nest—Luxury Wildlife Retreat, with Gordon Lochie and Carol Forbes, are Hall of Famers. They won gold in the Unique Accommodation category. Gold went to Cape Hillsborough Nature Tourist Park in the Caravan and Holiday Parks category. Well done to Ben and Renae Atherton. Last but not least, in the northern beaches—a great part of Mackay—Twenty50 Nice Cream won gold in the New Tourism Business category. Well done to all.

Redcliffe Electorate

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (7.01 pm): On Sunday, 11 November the Redcliffe community paused for a moment of silence to commemorate the centenary of Armistice and remember the sacrifice of Australia's diggers during the First World War and in conflicts and operations since. I want to congratulate and thank the RSL sub-branch for what was a wonderful service. They always do such an incredible job in putting that service on. Not only was it a very moving Remembrance Day and service at Redcliffe; the day before the Redcliffe RSL sub-branch organised a centenary of Armistice at Redcliffe. In the lead-up to the Remembrance Day service, the Redcliffe RSL held a re-enactment event on Saturday, 10 November at Scarborough commemorating Australia's role during the Great War. The day was filled with activities and demonstrations conducted by historical groups, recreating aspects of life in the trenches including a field barracks, a light horse demonstration and flyover of period aircraft.

The event also featured a showcase of contemporary military capabilities, with the 20th Explosive Ordnance Disposal Squadron, RAAF working dogs and 2nd/14th ASLAV crew in attendance. On behalf of the community, I would like to thank the hard work and dedication of the Redcliffe RSL's sub-branch and the World War I Centenary Commemoration Subcommittee in organising these very important events.

I thank the Minister for Health, the member for Murrumba, who recently joined me at the new Pathology Queensland laboratory at the Redcliffe Hospital and opened it. It is an excellent improvement on their previous site. The \$1.3 million lab will not only improve workflow but also meet future growth in pathology services. I want to congratulate the dedication of staff who worked tirelessly throughout the project and site transition.

I recently had the opportunity to do a water tour of Moreton Bay hosted by the Moreton Maritime Alliance. This not-for-profit industry organisation draws together South-East Queensland businesses with an interest in positioning Moreton Bay as a maritime industry powerhouse. The group are taking proactive steps to engage key stakeholders in discussions about progressing a maritime strategy for Moreton Bay. As a member representing a bayside electorate, I will continue to have a keen interest in their plans and work with them to advocate not just in my backyard of Moreton Bay but the whole of Moreton Bay, stretching right down to Redlands. I want to thank them for organising this event and showcasing Moreton Bay to businesses across the whole area so we can see a boost in tourism and jobs going forward.

JPs in the Community; Ashmore Men's Shed

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (7.05 pm): I rise this evening to speak about two excellent community programs in my electorate of Southport. The first is the JPs in the Community program at Australia Fair Shopping Centre in Southport. The JPs in the Community program gives the public consistent and easy access to witnessing services throughout Queensland at a variety of different locations. At Australia Fair the program is run by Karina Page and her dedicated team of volunteers in

an office suite kindly provided by centre management at Australia Fair. The service is run solely with volunteers who work in shifts of two and it operates for 41 hours a week across six days. It was volunteer Ken Cowan who approached me at one of my recent mobile offices to tell me more about the service.

Last week I had the opportunity to visit Karina and her busy team to see the service they provide to our community firsthand. Karina told me that in September their site serviced more than 2,000 individuals, making it the busiest site on the Gold Coast. It is appropriate that the Attorney-General is here in the chamber tonight because they have asked me to place a special request for more volunteer shirts, pens, stamp pads and ink because they constantly have trouble getting enough to keep up with demand. I am on the record now. I can say that I have asked the Attorney-General personally for that favour. With an active roster of around 30 volunteers, I am told that the pens run out within a few days, or they disappear within a few days, and, sadly, some of their volunteers are still waiting for shirts. I would like to place in *Hansard* my gratitude for the service they provide to our local community and congratulate Karina and her team on their dedication to continuing the operation of the JPs in the Community at Australia Fair.

I would also like to talk about the recent opening of the Ashmore Men's Shed. As many members would know, men's sheds provide a safe and friendly environment for men to talk about their mental health and enjoy some easygoing company. The Ashmore Men's Shed is a project of the Ashmore Rotary Club with support from the Southport Rotary Club and was formed as a result of a public interest meeting held by both Rotary clubs on 15 July 2017.

After over a year of activity, the Ashmore Men's Shed, located on Currumburra Road, Ashmore, was officially opened on Saturday, 3 November 2018. The shed was also recently awarded a Gambling Community Benefit Fund grant of \$35,000 for the installation of a dust extraction system. I want to congratulate Rock O'Keefe, the chairman of the Ashmore Men's Shed Committee—yes, that is his name—and the rest of his committee, as well as the committees of Ashmore Rotary Club and Southport Rotary Club for all of the hard work they have put into making the Ashmore Men's Shed a reality. The new facilities are incredible, and I have every confidence that their efforts will be rewarded and every confidence that the activities of the shed will be nothing but a success.

Caboolture Hospital

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (7.08 pm): I would like to talk about a wonderful milestone for our local hospital in the Caboolture region—the Caboolture Hospital. On 25 October this year the Caboolture Hospital celebrated its 25th anniversary, a great celebration of 25 years of outstanding service to the people of the Caboolture region and beyond. It is really important to pay tribute to our hospital and, of course, the people who make our hospital the outstanding place that it is. There are over 1,100 staff at the Caboolture Hospital now. About 600 of those are nurses and midwives, and that number continues to grow. In the last financial year, the hospital saw more than 31,000 patient admissions. They had 53,000 emergency department presentations, 7,500 surgical operations and almost 100,000 specialist outpatient appointments for adults and children.

The wonderful thing about our hospital is, of course, the people: the nurses, the doctors, the allied health professionals, the wardies and the administration staff—everyone who supports the delivery of high-quality health care for our community. I was really pleased to join with the member for Glass House and other community representatives at the recent hospital auxiliary AGM to pay tribute to their support of our hospital. The hospital auxiliary predates the hospital. It is a unique situation because it was the hospital auxiliary that was part of a community campaign over 25 years ago to get a hospital in Caboolture. It was the Goss Labor government that delivered that hospital and Labor governments over the last 25 years which have invested in that hospital. I am really excited that our Palaszczuk Labor government will be investing further in our hospital in an expanded emergency department with construction starting early next year.

We have recently opened the new outpatient facility, a \$7 million facility that is already providing outstanding enhanced services to the people of the Caboolture region. The detailed design work for the \$253 million redevelopment of the Caboolture Hospital will start early next year. This is an exciting time for the Caboolture region. It is an exciting time for the Caboolture Hospital. I wanted to place on record once again my admiration and thanks to all the staff at the Caboolture Hospital for what they do for our community. They are true heroes of our community. I really appreciate everything they do to provide high-quality healthcare services to local people.

Lung Cancer Awareness Month

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (7.11 pm): I rise today to talk about Australia's biggest cancer killer. This year more than 12,000 Australians will be diagnosed with lung cancer. Even more alarmingly, more than 9,000 Australians will lose their lives to lung cancer in 2018. To put this figure into perspective, more Australians will die from lung cancer this year than from colorectal xx cancer, breast cancer and melanoma combined. Lung cancer also has a low five-year survival rate, with only 17 per cent still alive after being diagnosed. Lung cancer really is the forgotten cancer.

November is Lung Cancer Awareness Month, and it provides us with an opportunity to highlight the burden and challenges facing Queenslanders diagnosed with lung cancer. It also provides us as a community with an opportunity to help end the horrible and unfair stigma that has traditionally been associated with lung cancer—that is, if you are diagnosed with lung cancer you probably deserve it because you are or have been a smoker. To be crude, you smoked and you deserve to die. This stigma needs to end.

While it is acknowledged that smoking does significantly increase the likelihood of being diagnosed with lung cancer, around 20 per cent of people with lung cancer are lifelong nonsmokers. This is particularly true of women. It is estimated that three in 10 women diagnosed with lung cancer have never smoked. This goes to show that anyone can be diagnosed with lung cancer, not just those who smoke. If you have lungs, you can get it. You can develop lung cancer due to your genetics, if you have a history of lung disease or through exposure to air pollution or asbestos fibres.

I would like to acknowledge and commend Lung Foundation Australia, which is based in Brisbane, for its advocacy to support Australians with lung cancer and to eliminate the horrible stigma associated with this disease. Just last month Lung Foundation Australia released a wonderful report titled *Making lung cancer a fair fight: a blueprint for reform*. I commend this report to the House and encourage all members to read this document to ensure that they can fully appreciate the burden and challenges faced by Queenslanders living with lung cancer.

The report highlights that the economic burden associated with lung cancer in 2018 is \$292 million. It also notes that less than 12 per cent of people with lung cancer are diagnosed early, increasing the likelihood of death. But there is hope. New medical treatment such as a new wave of immuno-oncology medicines will allow many Australians with lung cancers to live longer lives. We need to do more to support those diagnosed with lung cancer, not demonise them or make them feel guilty about their condition. These Australians and Queenslanders and their families deserve our support, and they should know that they do not have to go through this alone.

Task Group Taji; Armistice Day

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (7.14 pm): On 19 October this year I attended a farewell parade for the 7th Combat Brigade troops from the Gallipoli Barracks at Enoggera in my electorate of Ferny Grove. The troops are taking part in Task Group Taji in Iraq, an operation that is providing essential training to Iraq's security forces in their fight with Isis. Australian Army personnel who have previously served as part of Task Group Taji have contributed to the training of more than 32,000 Iraqi troops. These troops were instrumental in regaining control over Mosul from Isis in 2016 in some of the most brutal and bloody fighting of the last 15 years.

Today, Isis no longer controls any urban areas in Iraq, and that is in no small part because of the work and sacrifice of the Iraqi security forces trained by Australian Army soldiers. Iraq is still a long way from being at peace, but it is a much more stable nation today because of the contributions by serving and retired Australian Army personnel. Because of the support provided by the Australian Army, Iraq will soon be in a position to set its own destiny as a nation.

Active Defence Force personnel and their families make up a significant proportion of my electorate and I am proud to have them. Defence families go through a special kind of strain that few of our families ever experience. Their loved ones are often serving in difficult and dangerous locations overseas for months at a time, and they live with the very real prospect that they may not return home at all. Sometimes when they do return they are never the same again.

On Sunday we observed the 100th anniversary of Armistice Day. More than 1,000 people assembled in my electorate at the Gaythorne RSL near the Gallipoli Barracks to mark the occasion. More than 60,000 Australians gave their lives in service to their country in World War I. It is right that we should honour their memory, but we should never forget the thousands more who returned to Australian shores but never truly came home.

Today there is still a real problem faced by our returned veterans and their families. I would urge all members in this chamber to get behind organisations like Mates4Mates, Wounded Heroes, their local RSLs and other groups that provide support. Too often we mouth the words of support for our troops but fail to recognise the price they pay for that service when they attempt to return to civilian life. We can all choose to remember those we have lost, and we can all choose to do better for those who come home.

Coolum Local Animal Warriors

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (7.17 pm): I am proud to announce to the parliament tonight that as of last week I am now a fully fledged patch member of a group called CLAW—Coolum Local Animal Warriors—and I have the badge to prove it. Last week I was invited to take the pledge promising to uphold the mission of CLAW and be an animal welfare advocate. In doing so, I have joined a select group of Coolum State High School students, mostly year 7s, sharing a vision to raise awareness of animal welfare issues and to support local animal charities.

The group was born through the commendable culture at Coolum State High School that encourages students to get involved in community minded activities. CLAW coordinator and teacher Ms Jen Pierson said she wanted to engage those students with a passion for animals and wildlife in particular. So far the group has raised around \$500, which will be donated at the end of the term to Wildlife Rescue Sunshine Coast for its animal ambulance.

The Sunshine Coast is home to a number of animal welfare and support groups including the 4 Paws Animal Rescue, the Sunshine Coast Animal Refuge and the Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre at Eumundi to name just a few. Like many community groups, these groups are run on the smell of an oily rag and rely heavily on volunteers. Thanks to an unwavering commitment to their cause, there is a strong awareness and great community support for the tremendous work they do.

It is in our schools where the passion of these same volunteers is instilled and fostered. CLAW coordinator Jen Pierson summed it up perfectly when she said, 'It seems critical to me that we engage our young people with the environment so they can become its proud protectors.'

CLAW is yet another initiative of one of the fantastic schools in my electorate, Coolum State High School. It is not the first time this year that I have had good reasons to speak about this school in parliament. The school boasts five academy of excellence programs including instrumental music, cheerleading, touch football, basketball and surfing, but that is just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to success. Next year the school will extend its excellence programs. The Academic Learning Program for High Achievers will target gifted and talented year 7s while the Young Entrepreneurs Academy will inspire the next generation of entrepreneurial thinkers.

Again, it is within the supportive environment of our schools that our future leaders and community stalwarts are nurtured and encouraged so that one day they too will foster that sense of passion in the younger generation and continue their proud legacy of helping others. Congratulations to Coolum State High School and the student cohort, along with principal Troy Ascott, the teachers and support staff, the P&C and the school community for laying the groundwork. Undoubtedly, CLAW members will further strengthen their commitment to looking after the environment and become passionate advocates, mentoring the next generation in a similar way.

Sunshine Coast, Transport Infrastructure

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (7.20 pm): The \$550 million Sunshine Coast rail duplication and future Bruce Highway widening to and from the Sunshine Coast are important priorities for a fast-growing region. I can report to the House that last week I met with Mr Andrew Wallace, the federal LNP member for Fisher, to discuss these projects. It is a fact that the Palaszczuk government has submissions for urgent Bruce Highway upgrades, including one for the rail, awaiting federal government approvals.

A submission made in July to the then Turnbull government included a request for funding to complete planning for a 10-kilometre section between Deception Bay Road and Caboolture-Bribie Island Road. The Palaszczuk government also requested the federal LNP government to unlock funding for widening and upgrading an 11-kilometre section of the Bruce Highway between Caboolture and Steve Irwin Way, which also still awaits a response. This request was sent to the federal

government in September. Not only does the Beerburrum to Nambour rail duplication continue to be underfunded by \$230 million by the federal government, but the now Morrison government simply need to release federal money they have already committed to the Beerburrum to Nambour duplication project so that we can accelerate work on this Sunshine Coast project.

While Queensland's view remains that Canberra need to allocate their fair share and top up their original commitment to meet the cost of \$780 million, we just need them to unlock the money they have already agreed to for this project. These requests have been gathering dust on Canberra desks—with their internal turmoil, leadership changes and divisions—but Mr Wallace fortunately committed to lobby his federal minister to get these three matters unblocked at our recent meeting. With so much turmoil in Canberra in the last few months and a new Prime Minister and ministers, it is clear that these Sunshine Coast projects have been forgotten about, including during the recent ScoMo bus trip by the Prime Minister where he bussed into the Sunshine Coast but flew out on the federal government's private jet.

I am very pleased that the federal MP for Fisher, Mr Wallace, has agreed to shake out these already made commitments from a shambolic Morrison government to get things moving. I look forward to hearing positive news in the future. It is very frustrating to say the least, as the Minister for Transport, to see these projects ignored by Canberra. Sunshine Coast residents deserve to see infrastructure funding already committed by Canberra flowing to build the transport infrastructure Sunshine Coast residents need and to create the Sunshine Coast jobs that local workers want.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I note the interjections from the member for Glass House, who sat for three years at the cabinet table in the Campbell Newman government and did not even get the business case commenced for the rail duplication. We have more than half a billion dollars flowing and we want to see them start.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hill, I ask that in future you remain in your seat until it is time to seek the call. Members should not be standing in their place unless they are speaking.

Agriculture Industry

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (7.23 pm): I wish to raise the continual destructive and senseless attacks on the Queensland agriculture industry. The recent cut to the School to Industry Partnership Program—which educated Queensland children on the importance of agriculture in this state and where their food comes from—is just the latest in this government's sustained attack on the state's agricultural industry. Refusal to apply common-sense policies to write down the cost of electricity assets and infrastructure, inequities in electricity pricing tariffs, the failure to build dams and water distribution infrastructure, the cutting of funding to the river trusts and unsustainable vegetation management laws are strangling an industry that already has to fight weather and market conditions.

The cancellation of funding for the School to Industry Partnership Program will mean future policymakers will grow up without knowing the importance of our agricultural industry to our economy and our quality of life. After 15 years of hearing debate in this House on what is best for our farmers, I am almost certain that many members past and present do not realise that food is not grown on the shelves of Woolies and Coles. This ignorance leads the government to treat our farmers like the enemy and restrict their ability to practise sustainable land care through unworkable vegetation management laws.

Our primary producers are the ones with the experience and knowledge to create the best strategies for vegetation management, not government. On top of funding cuts, there are measures the government refuse to take to cut down energy costs. There are solutions available that would fix regional electricity prices tomorrow: write down the infrastructure valuation, fix the inequities built into regional tariffs and stop applying south-east network costs to the Ergon system.

There is no point blaming the weather for the suffering of our agricultural industry at the moment. Both major parties have failed to deliver outcomes and fulfil their responsibility to facilitate the growth and prosperity of farming in this state. State governments have done nothing in the last 30 years regarding water infrastructure, except spend millions on feasibility studies while our farmers continue to suffer from drought because there are no new dams or irrigation schemes. These endless studies clearly show that we would be in a much better position if one more dam had been constructed in the last 10 years. This is not a weather problem; it is a policy problem. It is wilful ignorance of the value and necessity of our agricultural industry.

It is senseless, crippling legislation, false election promises and a lack of political will to back up the lip-service by both major parties to the agricultural and primary industries in this state. It is imperative that we change the direction and start to acknowledge, not just with words but with action, that our agricultural industry is here to stay, that we support our farmers and that we value them as the backbone of our economy, food source and way of life.

Nudgee Electorate, Schools and Community Groups

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (7.26 pm): As term 4 fast draws to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to wish all the graduating students of Earnshaw State College, Mary Mackillop College and Nudgee College in my electorate of Nudgee, and Wavell State High School just over the border, the very best as they embark on this next chapter in their lives. Just last week, I attended both Nudgee College and Earnshaw State College awards nights and spoke to students about their feelings of gratitude for the friends and shared experiences they have had over the past 13 years of formal schooling and for the investment made by their families and teachers in their journey. Equally, they spoke of excitement for what lies ahead.

There are also hundreds of year 6 students across my electorate getting ready to graduate and take their next step to high school in 2019. I also take this opportunity to wish them every success as they in most cases move to new schools to make new friends and embark on new adventures. I know that our local schools have prepared them for success.

It is also that time of year when tireless local community and sporting groups work so hard to organise community events to wish everyone a merry Christmas and thank volunteers for their efforts over the past year. Over the past few weeks in the normal course of being an MP, attending events and meetings or just dropping by to say hello, I have caught up with members and volunteers of the Virginia United FC, Banyo RSL Citizens Auxiliary, Toombul District Cricket Club, Zillmere Eagles, Nundah P&C, Nundah Now and others. There is one thing that all of these conversations have had in common. Yes, many of them raise requests for assistance, financial support or infrastructure issues, but all of them did so for the benefit of others. What these groups share—as indeed do community and volunteer groups generally—is the wonderful value of altruism. Whether to grow a sport for the enjoyment of the community or to make a community festival more welcoming, to raise awareness of a health concern or money for a school community, they do what they do for the benefit of others.

I want to dedicate my last adjournment speech for the 2018 parliamentary sitting year to thanking all of the community and sporting groups, the P&Cs, the P&Fs, healthcare and disability advocate groups, social enterprises, neighbourhood centres, RSLs, and church and senior groups across the Nudgee electorate and the volunteers who run them. Thank you for your service and for the energy, time and heart you put into your activities and our community. May I take this opportunity to wish you and your families a very safe and happy Christmas season. I look forward to seeing many of you at upcoming local events, including the Neighbourhood Watch Family Fun Day at Northgate and Boondall, the Orchid Society Christmas party, the Toombul Croquet Club birthday, the sixth annual South Pacific Islander Christmas in the Park, the Lodge Youth Support Service supporters lunch, the BDCG Christmas in the Park and Nundah Markets inaugural Christmas markets in the coming weeks.

The House adjourned at 7.29 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson