




Speech By
Michael Crandon

MEMBER FOR COOMERA

Record of Proceedings, 28 February 2019

FISHERIES (SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES STRATEGY) AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (4.38 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the debate on the Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Bill 2018 and report No. 17 of the 56th Parliament for the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee tabled in November 2018. Having had quite a bit of experience both in the previous parliament and in other parliaments before that, I want to talk about the committee process. In the 55th Parliament the minister was the chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. He also knows the committee process and how hard the members of committees and the secretariat work to put together committee reports. I did a bit of a search and I see that, in the last parliament—the 55th Parliament—the minister was responsible for 45 reports from the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee coming to this parliament. Knowing what goes on, and knowing that the minister knows what goes on, I ask: why is he ignoring the evidence? Why would the minister completely ignore the bipartisan recommendations of a committee?

Mr Pegg interjected.

Mr CRANDON: Some would say that it was a promotion. The minister knows that, in the last parliament, many times he could not table a report that recommended that a bill be passed but, from time to time, a report tabled by him recommended that the bill be passed. The member knows the work that is involved in a committee report. There is one particularly infamous report—report No. 42 as a matter of fact—that relates to—

Mr Pegg interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Member for Stretton, if you want to engage in the debate, you will need to be in your own chair.

Mr CRANDON: Most of the then chair's forewords to those reports amounted to no more than a quarter to half a page but, in one particular case—the infamous case of report No. 42 relating to organised crime—the then chair's foreword went for a page and a half in which he made a terrible attack on one of the witnesses.

Mr FURNER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is on relevance. We are here today talking about the sustainable fisheries bill. The member for Coomera is discussing matters relating to previous reports of the previous parliament. I ask you to draw the member for Coomera back to the content of this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I remind the member for Coomera to stay within the long title of the bill.

Mr CRANDON: As I said, I am speaking to the Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Bill 2018 and referencing report No. 17 of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee of the 56th Parliament. I draw to the attention of the parliament the fact that the minister knows how much work goes into committee reports. Therefore, the

minister would be very aware of how much work has gone into this report. In fact, I commend all members of the committee for their hard work. I also acknowledge the time taken for those who provided evidence to the committee.

The committee made five recommendations. The first recommendation, which is a requirement, is, 'The committee recommends the Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Bill 2018 be passed.' The minister has ignored completely the three other recommendations. This bipartisan committee heard evidence from so many people. Clearly, they have given evidence that supports these recommendations. The fifth recommendation states—

The committee recommends the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries provide the committee with an update on the implementation of Vessel Monitoring Systems 18 months after the Bill is passed.

If the minister accepted that recommendation, it would mean that this parliament would receive an update on this bill. But no, the minister has decided that he is going to push out that review to three years. That is really unacceptable. The committee made five recommendations, of which one has been accepted, which is that the bill be passed. Of the other four recommendations, three have been thrown out completely regardless of the evidence that supports that they should be accepted. An update on this bill will not be considered until the next parliament. I think it is so sad that the minister has decided to go down that road.

I have had contact from fishermen in my electorate—in fact, three generations of commercial fishermen. They are very concerned about the vessel monitoring system compliance requirements—the costs associated with it for each vessel, the potential penalties and the fact that they had to be brought in on 1 January even though we were not really ready for it. They were also concerned about the potential for their intellectual property to be released somehow into the marketplace. We have seen hacking occur across governments. In recent times we saw hacking occur in the federal parliament in Canberra. This data would be kept on a system and it is possible for people to get into that system. How safe is that data? Those fishermen have reasonable grounds for concern.

The member for Greenslopes, who is currently the Deputy Speaker, mentioned in his speech that an evidence based approach should be used in formulating legislation. We have bipartisan support for the need to give consideration to the recommendations of the report that resulted from the evidence that was given to the committee. I note a press report issued by the LNP shadow minister for fisheries, Tony Perrett, which states that 'the amendments were based off advice received from industry stakeholders during the recent committee process'. On that basis I ask the minister to give further consideration to these recommendations from this bipartisan committee, to accept them as they stand in the report and do the right thing by the fishermen of Queensland, the people who came and gave evidence to the committee. That evidence caused the recommendations to be made on a bipartisan basis. The government has a majority on this committee. Therefore, the committee was able to simply say no to those recommendations, but that committee thought it important for those recommendations to be made. I ask the minister to take heed of the recommendations and, in that regard, to please reconsider his position.