

TO BE IN TIME FOR CORRECTION
PROOFS MUST BE RETURNED
BY 12 noon TO THE
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

ISSN 1322-0330



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS (PROOF)

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 25 May 2016

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	2015
School Group Tour.....	2015
Aboriginal Flag.....	2015
Speakers' Corner	2015
Application of Same Question Rule to Bills	2015
Questions without notice.....	2016
TABLED PAPERS	2016
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2016
Aurukun	2016
Legal Indemnity Guidelines.....	2017
Aurukun	2018
South-East Queensland Regional Plan.....	2018
Economy.....	2019
Sexual Health Initiative	2021
Queensland Redistribution Commission, Appointments	2021
Queensland Police Service.....	2022
Elder Abuse, Prevention.....	2023
Road Infrastructure.....	2023
WorkCover.....	2024
LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE	2025
Office of the Information Commissioner, Report.....	2025
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 4 of 2015-16—Compliance Review: Council of the City of Gold Coast: Review of the Council of the City of Gold Coast's compliance with the Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld) and the Information Privacy Act 2009 (Qld).....	2025

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 25 May 2016

NOTICE OF MOTION	2025
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument.....	2025
Level of Crime.....	2025
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS.....	2025
Dairy Farmers	2025
Asset Sales	2026
2018 Commonwealth Games	2026
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Front page of the <i>Gold Coast Bulletin</i> , dated 25 May 2016, with the headline	
'Bludgers—Working flat out for Commonwealth Games success'	2027
Asset Sales.....	2028
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Government: The Strongest and Smartest Choice, Queensland's	
Plan for Secure Finances and a Strong Economy.	2028
Aurukun; Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance.....	2028
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2029
Queensland Economy.....	2029
Queensland Budget.....	2029
Queensland Budget.....	2030
Budget, Superannuation.....	2030
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Treasury Corporation: Half-Yearly Report, December 2015.....	2030
Infrastructure.....	2030
Budget, Superannuation.....	2031
Asset Sales.....	2031
Budget, Superannuation.....	2032
Queensland Economy, Ports.....	2033
Commonwealth Games, Industrial Action	2034
Gold Coast Community Cabinet.....	2034
Commonwealth Games, Transport Operations Plan.....	2035
Sexual Health.....	2035
Aurukun, Economic Development.....	2036
Police Service, Specialist Training Exercises	2037
Commonwealth Games Federation	2037
Defined Benefit Scheme.....	2038
Mount Cotton Driver Training Centre.....	2038
Small Business.....	2039
Aviation Safety Standards	2040
Regional Queensland, Jobs.....	2040
PUBLIC HEALTH (WATER RISK MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL.....	2041
Second Reading	2041
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transportation and Utilities Committee: Report No. 15—Public Health (Water	
Risk Management) Amendment Bill 2016, government response.	2041
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Articles from ABC News Online and The Guardian online, various dates,	
regarding cases of Legionella bacteria and Legionnaires' Disease.	2051
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	2060
Rule of Anticipation.....	2060
MOTION	2060
Level of Crime.....	2060
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2067
Resolved in the negative.....	2067
MOTION	2067
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders.....	2067
NORTH STRADBROKE ISLAND PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL; NORTH STRADBROKE ISLAND PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY (RENEWAL OF MINING LEASES) AMENDMENT BILL.....	2067
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	2068
<i>Tabled paper:</i> North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment	
Bill 2015, amendments to be moved by Hon. Dr Stephen Miles.	2068
<i>Tabled paper:</i> North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment	
Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Stephen Miles amendments.....	2068
<i>Tabled paper:</i> North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment	
Bill 2015, erratum to explanatory notes.	2071
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 4 January 2016, from Mr Richard Bingham, Queensland Integrity	
Commissioner, to the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy, Hon. Leeanne	
Enoch, regarding potential conflicts of interest.	2078
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-Government Members Statement of Concern in relation to the Inquiry into	
North Stradbroke Island Bills and proposed economic transition strategy and workers assistance	
scheme.	2080
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 5 May 2016, titled 'Stradbroke Island sand-off	
costs \$1b'.	2081
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document by Dr Robert Anderson OAM, dated 25 May 2016, regarding North	
Stradbroke Island legislation.	2098
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photographs of Electrical Trades Union staff.	2101
Division: Question put—That the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and	
Other Amendment Bill be now read a second time.....	2116
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2117

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 25 May 2016

Speaker's Ruling, Same Question Rule	2117
Consideration in Detail	2117
North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill	2117
Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.....	2117
Clause 5—.....	2117
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	2117
Resolved in the negative.....	2117
Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) negatived.....	2117
Clause 5, as read, agreed to.....	2117
Clause 6—.....	2117
<i>Tabled paper:</i> North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill, explanatory notes for Hon. Dr Steven Miles' amendments.....	2118
Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.....	2118
Clauses 7 to 12, as read, agreed to.....	2118
Clause 13—.....	2118
Dr MILES (12.41 am): I move the following amendment—.....	2118
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	2118
Resolved in the negative.....	2118
Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) negatived.....	2118
Dr MILES (12.44 am): I move the following amendments—.....	2118
Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.....	2119
Insertion of new clause—.....	2119
Dr MILES (12.45 am): I move the following amendment—.....	2119
Amendment agreed to.....	2119
Clauses 14 to 17—.....	2119
Dr MILES (12.45 am): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.....	2119
Clauses 14 to 17, as amended, agreed to.....	2120
Clause 18—.....	2120
Dr MILES (12.46 am): I move the following amendment—.....	2120
Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.....	2121
Clauses 19 to 35—.....	2121
Clauses 19 to 35, as amended, agreed to.....	2122
Clause 36—.....	2122
Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.....	2123
Insertion of new clause—.....	2123
Amendment agreed to.....	2123
Clause 37, as read, agreed to.....	2123
Third Reading	2123
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.....	2124
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2124
Long Title	2124
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT	2124
Mount Cotton Driver Training Centre, Clarification	2124
ATTENDANCE	2124

WEDNESDAY, 25 MAY 2016



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

School Group Tour

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I am pleased to inform you that in our gallery we have student captains from Saint Michael's College in the electorate of Mudgeeraba, observing our proceedings.

Aboriginal Flag



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, the parliamentary by-laws prohibit the display of any banner, sign or other thing that is or contains matter associated with a political cause or campaign. This includes an item of clothing. Yesterday, a parliamentary security officer prevented a person wearing a T-shirt with the Aboriginal flag by itself, with no protest words associated, from entering without the T-shirt first being covered. That should not have happened. The Aboriginal flag is proudly flown on the precinct and in this Chamber. The Clerk has spoken to the person involved and apologised for the incident, and is providing a written apology.

There was an error of judgment on the part of the security officer. However, I stress to all members that applying the by-laws necessarily involves an instantaneous judgment call by the authorised officer. This task is not always easy. All authorised officers have been advised of the correct interpretation of the by-laws with respect to wearing official flags on their own.

Speakers' Corner



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members may have noticed the appearance of a mobile hut with advertising that has been placed immediately in front of Speakers' Corner, located in the George Street forecourt just outside our Parliament House. The Speakers' Corner was a legacy project for the people of Queensland to mark their parliament's 150th anniversary. Speakers' Corner was to encourage the people of Queensland to come to their parliament and have their say, to engage in vigorous debate and to gather for peaceful protests. It has been a great success.

It appears that the temporary structure now appearing was granted a permit by the Brisbane City Council. The permit ends today. There have been discussions between representatives of the parliament and the council about the appropriateness of such permits for this space into the future, as it is not unusual for large crowds to want to use Speakers' Corner. Council representatives have been cooperative on this matter and I thank them for their assistance.

Application of Same Question Rule to Bills



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have ordered that a ruling regarding the application of the same question rule to cognate bills be circulated. I seek leave to have the statement incorporated in the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

APPLICATION OF SAME QUESTION RULE TO COGNATE BILLS

The Member for Dalrymple introduced the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015 on 27 October 2015.

On 3 December 2015, the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection introduced the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015.

Both Bills seek to amend sections 2 and 11E of the *North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011*.

Standing Order 87(1) provides that unless the Standing Orders otherwise provide, a question or amendment shall not be proposed which is the same as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative. A number of Speaker rulings in relation to this issue have been made in recent years. In summary:

- The matters do not have to be identical, merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form;
- There is no rule preventing the presentation of two bills on the same subject, or indeed opposite intent. However, if a decision of the House has already been taken on one bill, the other is not to be proceeded upon; and
- An amendment cannot be moved to a bill that has already been moved to another bill and defeated or is substantially the same as a bill that has been defeated.


The proposed amendments to sections 2 and 11E in both bills deal with the same issue but in different ways.

In accordance with the cognate motion agreed to on Tuesday, the second reading question for the government bill will be put first. Should the second reading question be agreed to, the same question rule will then be enlivened.

At this point, I will make a ruling in relation to the application of the same question rule for the private member's bill if the government bill passes its second reading. Specifically, that the private member's bill will be discharged from the Notice Paper, as the ruling would not allow any further decisions to be made on the bill.

As there will have been no decision taken in relation to the private member's bill, members can move amendments to the government bill to deal with the matters contained in the private member's bill.

Questions without notice

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, standing order 115 provides the general rules that apply to questions without or on notice. These rules include that questions shall not contain inferences or imputations. In the parliamentary sense, Speakers will generally not intervene where the imputation is directed to philosophy, viewpoint or policy, but are likely to intervene where the imputation is a phrase imputing, attributing, ascribing or charging someone with a personal motive, crime, misconduct, negligence or other fault.

An inference is the action or process of making a conclusion from a premise either by induction or deduction. In a parliamentary sense, it is essentially an assumption or supposition. Often it will be difficult for the Chair to assess whether a fact is being stated or an assumption or proposition is being made. Again, in the parliamentary sense, Speakers will not generally intervene where the matters relate to philosophy, viewpoint or policy, but are likely to intervene where the inference is about personal motive, adverse action, crime, misconduct, negligence or other fault.

Members are reminded that they should be able to authenticate facts in their questions. It is in order to ask a minister whether an allegation or charge is correct. It is also in order to ask a minister what action they will take in respect of an allegation and whether, if some allegation is correct, what action they will take. However, questions should not be phrased so as to state as fact that which is not fact but assumption or supposition. Questions should also not directly impugn another member with a crime, misconduct, negligence or other fault.

TABLED PAPERS


MINISTERIAL PAPER

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport (Mr Pitt)—
National Injury Insurance Scheme (Queensland) Bill 2016: Erratum to explanatory notes

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Aurukun

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.06 pm): A fundamental right for children in Queensland is to access education. The priority of my government for the children of Aurukun, is their continued access to education. Overnight, we have seen further threats to the safety and wellbeing of our teachers in Aurukun. The safety of our teachers is essential, as is the safety of all community workers in Aurukun.

On Monday this week, my director-general and other senior government officers met with leaders and community groups in Aurukun to discuss how best to bring about lasting calm to the community. There has been further unrest overnight and, following this, our teachers have again expressed

concerns about their safety. The incidents overnight were on top of several difficult weeks during which there have been several alleged offences committed against them.

Today we have made the serious decision to withdraw the teachers until the end of this school term and this will be effective immediately. Consideration of when the teachers will return to the community will be made closer to the start of the new school term in July. This will be subject to assessment of the situation in the community at that time.

School staff are being relocated out of Aurukun and into Cairns from today. From there we will facilitate their return travel to their own homes and will offer them our full support, as well as counselling. I want to ensure each teacher leaving the community has the appropriate support. I thank them for their dedication and their service.

In Aurukun, the PCYC will be providing activities for the children who would be at school. In addition, we are making arrangements to have an education program provided. We want those children to have the opportunity to access education at this time. I will be working with my Minister for Education to make arrangements for distance education to be provide from Cairns. We will continue to work with the community to engage children and young people through school and employment pathways.

The police will ensure that the PCYC is open, fully staffed and safe for Aurukun's children to attend. Our focus remains on the immediate safety of our teachers, members of the community and the workforce in Aurukun. We have an enhanced police and security presence in Aurukun, including 17 police officers and another four additional officers to be deployed in coming days. They will be operational by the weekend bringing total police numbers to 21. A 24-hour police presence is being maintained.

A short time ago I met with my ministerial colleagues and their directors-general to develop and implement a whole-of-government plan. This plan will developed with the community and it will initially focus on the safety of community workers and members of the community. The plan will seek to restore calm to the community. This latest incident highlights the challenge ahead for the Aurukun community and the government in ensuring calm.

Following Monday's meetings between senior government officers and the community, and given the continued unrest, I am expediting a joint action plan—a coordinated government approach to ensure community safety. It is critical that initiatives be community led to bring about real and sustainable change. Recent discussions with the community will assist with the development of a plan. A clear path forward is needed—one that is based on the community being central to the actions needed and ensuring they receive strong and ongoing support.


As part of the action plan, a new position of senior government coordinator is being established. This role will coordinate collaborative government and community efforts in addressing the problems of disengaged young people, violence and unemployment in Aurukun. Senior Sergeant Brendon McMahon has been appointed to this new role of senior government coordinator for six months. Senior Sergeant McMahon has extensive experience working with the Aurukun community as the officer in charge and has been responsible for establishing and coordinating multiagency responses during major events, natural disasters and very serious community unrest.

This new role will have a whole-of-government focus, will report directly to the director-general of the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and will support the mayor in his crucial role as community leader. Senior Sergeant McMahon will be travelling with me to Aurukun on Friday. Mr Michael Schaumburg, Director-General of the Department of State Development, is the government champion for Aurukun and will be hosting a round table next week to further support community action.

I spoke to the mayor, Dereck Walpo, at length earlier today. I would like to thank the mayor for welcoming these officers and facilitating productive discussions. I want to pay tribute to the mayor for his dedication and leadership on behalf of his community.

I have faith in the strength of local government, and we are in agreement with council and the community in addressing these issues. As I said yesterday, the immediate safety of the community and the workforce is critical. By doing this, we can engage children and young people through school and employment. I am hopeful that we will be able to very quickly provide the safety and security needed. We will continue to work with the Aurukun community to support and make change.

Legal Indemnity Guidelines

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.11 pm): My government is determined to ensure that we get the best value for money for taxpayers. Whether that is in day-to-day expenditure, long-term investments or exposure to risk, it is incumbent upon all of us to put an absolute premium on every single taxpayer dollar. It is with this in mind that a week and a half ago I asked my director-general to provide cabinet with options to revise the guideline for the grant of indemnities and legal assistance to ministers and assistant ministers.

To be clear, there is no question around maintaining indemnity provisions for ministers. It is important to ensure ministers can fulfil their duties on behalf of the government with legal protection. However, as we know, defamation claims against ministers or former ministers have the potential to expose the state to significant legal costs and damages. I am concerned about this exposure.

I am of the firm view that ministers of the Crown should be extremely careful with the language they use in the public domain. In cases where claims are made, I am also of the view that, where possible, every effort to mitigate damages paid by taxpayers should be made.

Cabinet has endorsed the inclusion of a new section in the guideline. This new section states—

Where a Minister is granted Legal Assistance or Indemnity for a civil proceeding involving a claim in defamation, the decision-makers make it a condition of the grant that the Minister obtain appropriate legal advice about any necessary steps, including to mitigate any damages the State may be liable for if the statement is ultimately found to be defamatory.


If a Minister does not take appropriate steps, the decision-makers may take that factor into account in considering whether to amend or withdraw the grant or the conditions of the grant under this Guideline.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, if you persist with your interjections or comments while the Premier is speaking you will be ruled on.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My government will maintain the offer of legal assistance or indemnity to ministers, but the stipulation in the guideline will be clear. Where a grant of assistance includes a condition that legal advice be sought as to whether damages might be mitigated by taking certain actions—for example, by issuing a statement of regret, apology, or a retraction—if that advice is not followed, the grant of assistance could be withdrawn. I think taxpayers will see this is a reasonable step forward.

Ministers who are granted an indemnity have always had an obligation to act reasonably in the way that they deal with taxpayers' money. They have always had a duty to mitigate the loss to the state. These changes are to put at the forefront of the minds of ministers when they speak in their official capacity that they should be mindful of not making comments that might be seen to be defamatory. Ministers need appropriate legal protections, but they also need to be responsible for their actions. If their actions look like costing taxpayers a hefty bill, they need to be willing to take action in order to minimise those costs.


Aurukun

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (2.14 pm): Today we will begin to relocate teachers from Aurukun. Following further community unrest last night teachers have expressed serious concerns for their safety. The director-general of education has today made a decision to close the Aurukun campus of Cape York Aboriginal Australian Academy for the remainder of this school term. Our government's priority has always been, and will continue to be, the safety and wellbeing of our staff. From this afternoon staff will begin to leave Aurukun for Cairns before travelling home.

In regards to education, we are putting in place options for Aurukun families and students. Cairns School of Distance Education will make available an education program through the PCYC for students in Aurukun. The Aurukun PCYC, as the Premier has said, will also continue to provide additional activities for children during the school closure.

I want to thank our teachers and staff for their dedication and commitment to education in remote Queensland. I want to assure all members of this House that the department of education will continue to provide all the assistance and support our staff need for as long as they need it.

South-East Queensland Regional Plan

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.16 pm): Queenslanders are fortunate to live in a place with vast open spaces, pristine beaches, rich bushland and an enviable climate. As we look to the future, we know our population is changing. We are growing and our

demographics are shifting. We are seeing a shift towards a new knowledge economy, which is changing the way we live and the types of jobs in our regions.

To have the future we want, we need a strong plan. That is why regional planning is important. It ensures we maximise the opportunities that come with our changing and growing populations across our diverse regions. This is why we are working on a new plan for South-East Queensland and will soon commence the first regional plan for North Queensland.

One in seven Australians live in the great south-east. We need a world-class regional plan to shape and create the places where we can work, live and play. That is why the Palaszczuk government is committed to delivering a new regional plan for South-East Queensland that does just that. The regional plan also needs to preserve and protect the essence of South-East Queensland, our unique identity and precious natural assets.

Earlier this month I joined with mayors and councillors to launch a six-week conversation with the community for our new regional plan. It is just the beginning, but it was great to see the community and our local government leaders enthusiastically sharing their ideas. Just over a week into the consultation, there has been a great deal of interest at community events and via the shaping SEQ website. There have been more than 1,400 visits to the website and around 200 people have already shared their great ideas for the south-east.

Most people have responded to the connect and grow themes, indicating that they want to see more local jobs and further improvements to our public transport network. People are also saying they want a better mix of housing options to suit the community's changing needs.

Last weekend, around 50 Sunshine Coast residents had their say at a community consultation event at Kings Beach in Caloundra. Public transport and the environment were key themes in these conversations. The project team also met with 54 people at an event in Logan to hear their great ideas for the region. The feedback from residents centred on improving public transport and infrastructure and supporting jobs, economic growth and environmental sustainability.


The new ideas will only continue to grow as we keep engaging with the people of South-East Queensland. This weekend the project team will be at Burleigh Heads and Chermiside to hear what residents have to say about shaping the region. In June the project team will visit Toowoomba, Noosa, Gatton, Esk, Cleveland, Beaudesert and Ipswich.

A thought leadership series will also be presented as part of our conversation with the community. This series will see prominent Australian and international planning and design professionals share their expertise, including: Brent Toderian, a former chief planner for the city of Vancouver; Ethan Kent, a leading place maker from New York; and Stephen Yarwood, a former Lord Mayor of Adelaide.

These events are a key part of an ongoing conversation around what is important in regional planning by using global expertise that can help generate the best ideas for the South East Queensland Regional Plan. The first workshop will be focused on community participation and planning and place-making and will be held in West End on 2 June 2016. The speaker will be Jessica Christiansen-Franks, an Australian urban designer and landscape architect whose expertise lies in public space activation, the social impacts of urbanisation and community engagement.

I am looking forward to listening to what the people of South-East Queensland have to say about how we can build a prosperous and sustainable region that we are all proud to call home. I encourage everyone to join the conversation because the decisions we make and the plans we develop are going to shape our future like never before.

Economy

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (2.20 pm): The value Queenslanders place on keeping government owned corporations was made clear at the ballot box last year. That is why we are keeping our GOCs in public hands and keeping the revenue streams the LNP still wants to offload in a fire sale. We are investing in Queensland rather than selling bits off cheaply. We are backing Queensland. We are backing jobs.

While the LNP talks down Queensland, we are talking up economic opportunities and backing business—and our approach has worked. Unemployment is down under Labor. The LNP left us with a trend jobless rate of 6.6 per cent; it is now 6.2 per cent. Since the election, 51,000 new jobs have been created in Queensland, including 18,100 full-time jobs. By comparison, the member for Clayfield was the economic manager when the Newman government created only 7,400 jobs in their first 15 months.

It was the member for Clayfield who saw Queensland shed 12,000 full-time jobs on his watch—or 80 jobs lost every week. That is his and the LNP's legacy. If he had spent less time pushing asset sales and more time developing a sensible economic plan, as we have, the outcome may have been different. Job losses have never worried the LNP, as was proved when the Newman-Nicholls government deliberately cut the jobs of more than 20,000 government workers. That was one plan they hid from voters.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Ministerial statements in this House are supposed to be about the ministers that make up the executive government reporting to the parliament about their activities. If the minister seeks to attack opposition members then we cannot be expected to sit here and not respond.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Callide. I call the minister.

Mr PITT: We are putting the facts on the table today. It is obviously very important. We saw proof yesterday when the member for Clayfield deliberately misled Queenslanders and members of the defined benefits super fund. He wrongly yet very deliberately says the government is 'raiding' or 'stealing' what he claims is 'someone else's money'.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask you to rule on the content of ministerial statements. There are plenty of opportunities in the House for amateur theatrics later in the day. This is ministerial statements. We expect to hear from the ministers that make up the executive government about the government's achievements or policies, not to use ministerial statements as an opportunity to attack opposition members.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Callide.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I know you are all willing. I like a bit of silence while I am taking advice from the Clerk. Members, I will quote from our rules. Standing order 62, headed 'Ministerial statements' states—

(1) A Minister during the time allotted by Sessional Orders, or any time during Government Business so as to not interrupt a debate of a matter, may make a statement relating to matters of Government policy or public affairs.

Member for Callide, I have not refused anyone the opportunity to make an interjection during the contribution by the minister. If an interjection is reasonable, I will allow it, but I will not allow members to simply talk over the top of the person who is making a ministerial statement.

Mr PITT: This is a very important ministerial statement because what we are doing is putting the facts on the table. We heard terms like 'raiding' and 'stealing' being used yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that 'raiding' and 'stealing' happened in the previous budget too—which is absolutely untrue. Statements by current and former QSuper officials—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr PITT: You may wish to hear this. Statements by current and former QSuper officials and others have made it clear that the surplus in the defined benefit scheme—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members of the opposition, if you want to make an interjection that I can hear, I would urge you to allow one person to make the interjection instead of everyone talking so I do not hear any interjections but simply a lot of gabble.

Mr PITT: It is organised chaos. I will say that again: statements by current and former QSuper officials and others have made it clear that the surplus in the defined benefit scheme is not members' entitlements. The defined benefit scheme is overfunded and the scheme members will receive their entitlements in full as and when they want them in accordance with legislation.

The member for Clayfield must admit to being an incompetent who should know the facts. This is about peddling untruths. I call on him here today to withdraw and apologise for his deliberately misleading the House. The member for Clayfield was also the architect of the worst economic growth under any Queensland government in the last 30 years, with an annualised rate of 1.6 per cent.

Opposition members interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! The member for Clayfield has not raised an interjection or a point of order, so I do not think he needs your assistance, member for Nanango.

Mr PITT: I was referring to the economic growth, the annualised rate, under the former treasurer which was 1.6 per cent. We are looking to lead the nation in economic growth under the Palaszczuk government.

Despite the rejection of asset sales at the last election, it continues to be part of the conversation. We know that they want to sell 49 per cent of Powerlink. We on this side of the House as government policy are continuing to keep our assets in public hands and we are unequivocal about that. That is what this statement is about today, making sure that people understand the facts, that there is no raiding and no stealing and such inflammatory language is not on. We are about ensuring that we keep our assets in public hands. We will use all of our assets, including our financial assets, to deliver good outcomes for Queenslanders, including regional Queenslanders, and jobs.

Mr SPEAKER: Treasurer, I urge you to refer to the member for Clayfield as the Leader of the Opposition in future contributions.

Sexual Health Initiative

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.26 pm): One of the fundamental tenets of our society is equality before the law. Queenslanders should not face adverse health outcomes because of laws based on prejudice. In Queensland, there has been a disparity between the ages of consent for sexual activity for many years. On 16 May this year I convened an expert panel to consider standardising these ages. The panel found that the inconsistent approach to the age of consent is a barrier to young people accessing sexual health services and health information.

As health minister, I find it unacceptable that some Queenslanders are banned from discussing safe, consensual sexual activity with health professionals—it is archaic and it is dangerous. By the end of 2016, the Palaszczuk Labor government will legislate to amend the Criminal Code, standardising the age of consent for all lawful sexual activity in Queensland. Making this change addresses a longstanding case of legislative discrimination against gay men.


Good sexual health and good reproductive health are fundamental to our overall health and wellbeing. Today I am also pleased to be delivering on another Palaszczuk government election commitment by releasing for public consultation a draft sexual health strategy for Queensland. I am pleased to advise the House that Queensland, under the leadership of the Premier, is again leading the way nationally. This is the first time any state or territory has developed a comprehensive sexual and reproductive health strategy.

This strategy aims to combat the rising rates of sexually transmitted diseases and promote the importance of positive relationships by prioritising prevention; improving community awareness and information; supporting healthy ageing by providing quality, non-discriminatory health care; improving education and support for young people; and responding directly to the sexual health needs of specific populations. The strategy will be supported by real funding delivered through action plans to address specific issues.

I am pleased to announce today that this includes the North Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Sexually Transmissible Infections Action Plan 2016 to 2021. The action plan will address deeply concerning rates of syphilis infection among North Queensland's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. The amount of \$15.7 million has been provided over the next three years for this plan. Funding will support eight jobs and deliver a program of screening in Cairns and regional and remote locations such as Doomadgee and Kowanyama.

This government is implementing a comprehensive, well-considered package of measures designed to improve the sexual health of Queenslanders. It is all part of Advancing Health 2026, our 10-year vision to build a healthier Queensland. I encourage all members of this House to talk to their communities about these strategies and encourage them to participate in the consultation.

Queensland Redistribution Commission, Appointments

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.29 pm): I can advise the House that the Queensland Redistribution Commission has been established. Section 6 of the Electoral Act 1992 requires that the redistribution commission be chaired by a current or retired judge, a non-judicial appointee being a chief executive of a department or a holder of office equivalent to chief executive of a department as approved by Governor-in-Council and the Electoral Commissioner.

The Queensland Redistribution Commission will be chaired by retired District Court Judge Hugh Botting. Mr Botting was appointed to the District Court bench by former attorney-general and member for Redlands Paul Clauson in 1989. Ms Liza Carroll, the Director-General of the Department of Housing and Public Works, has been appointed as a commissioner. Ms Carroll and Mr Botting will join the Electoral Commissioner, who is the third member of the commission.

His Honour Judge Botting has had extensive experience travelling to and presiding over regional circuit courts across the state during his 26 years on the bench of the District Court. He enjoyed a well-deserved reputation for fairness and integrity.


Ms Carroll was formerly the head of Indigenous affairs under former prime minister Tony Abbott, with Indigenous affairs being moved within Prime Minister Tony Abbott's department. Her position included extensive work with regional and remote Queensland communities. Ms Carroll also spent time working as a Queensland teacher and received her Masters from and lectured at James Cook University. I congratulate both of them on their appointments.

A fundamental aspect of the redistribution is to ensure effective representation of the people of Queensland. Section 38 of the Electoral Act 1992 mandates that an electoral redistribution is to occur either one year after the third general election which was held after the last electoral redistribution or 7½ years after the last electoral redistribution was finalised, whichever is the latter. Three general elections—21 March 2009, 24 March 2012 and 31 January 2015—have been held since the last electoral redistribution was finalised on 20 August 2008. In accordance with the requirements of section 38 of the act, the next electoral redistribution should have commenced on 12 March this year. Due to the holding of quadrennial local government elections and a referendum on 19 March 2016, it was necessary to delay the constitution of the Redistribution Commission.

It is expected that the redistribution process will take approximately 12 months to complete. The redistribution will consider not just the current boundaries of the 89 seats but also the additional four seats that have recently been included in the Electoral Act as a consequence of amendments before this parliament.

I encourage all of those in the community to get involved in this redistribution process. They will have the opportunity to put submissions, as will members of the parliament. As I say, I encourage members to do that and their communities as this is an important process for our democracy and our electoral system going forward for Queensland.

Queensland Police Service

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.32 pm): I am pleased to advise the House that, as of last Friday, the number of officers in the Queensland Police Service was above the headcount required to achieve the targeted commitment of an additional 1,100 officers. With more officers graduating in June this year, the Queensland Police Service will end the financial year comfortably above the 1,100 growth target. Thirty-eight new recruits are expected to graduate in Townsville in mid-June. There are also 144 new recruits in other intakes across the state.

I am also pleased to report that the Police Commissioner's aspirational target of 50 per cent female recruitment was achieved in recent recruit intakes. In the March intake, 52 per cent of the new recruits were female, followed by 50 per cent of female recruits in the May intake. I know that the Queensland Police Service has been actively encouraging more women to consider a career in policing, and I commend the commissioner for initiating and taking on this challenge. Both the Queensland Police Service and the community stand to benefit from an increased presence of women on the front line. A more balanced and diverse police organisation means a more reflective service for Queenslanders.

Not only is the Palaszczuk government delivering more police; we are giving them the resources and equipment they need to get on with the job. We have rolled out 300 body-worn video cameras to front-line police on the Gold Coast ahead of a broader statewide rollout. Under the previous government, police were forced to buy their own body-worn camera devices. When the LNP was in government they obscured the release of annual crime statistics. As a result, no-one really knew the level of crime in their local community.


Opposition members interjected.

Mr BYRNE: It is a fact. In the interests of transparency and accountability, Labor reinstated the annual statistical review so that Queenslanders would have a clear picture of what is going on in their community.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BYRNE: They do not want to hear the truth. These statistics speak volumes about the efforts of hardworking police in targeting crime and keeping our communities safe.

Elder Abuse, Prevention

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (2.56 pm): I am pleased to announce today that our government has stepped up the fight against elder abuse by launching a new campaign to target this scourge in our community. Our new campaign, 'There's no excuse for elder abuse', focuses on the most common types of elder abuse and calls out the excuses often made by perpetrators. I encourage all members of the House to support and promote the campaign.


We know older people can be vulnerable to abuse and, sadly, many cases continue to go unreported. Unfortunately, these can also be committed by a family member. With more than 1,350 new elder abuse notifications in Queensland in 2015, up from around 1,280 in the previous year, we know actions need to be taken. While the increase in reported instances of abuse shows that more people are coming forward, as I said earlier, many cases still go unreported. That is why we have stepped up the fight against elder abuse with this new campaign encouraging family members, friends, neighbours, community members and organisations to come forward.

This campaign focuses on the most common offences, which are physical and emotional intimidation, financial abuse and transfer of assets. It was developed after a key recommendation from the landmark *Not now, not ever* report which highlighted the need for government to step up to the fight. Throughout June this important campaign will be promoted in shopping centres, in licensed venues, in medical centres, on buses and via digital and social media to make it absolutely clear that there is never an excuse for elder abuse.

We have also appointed a new dedicated elder abuse officer within the Queensland Police Service. Acting Senior Sergeant Kerry McKay has been appointed as the elder abuse project officer and will work directly with the Queensland Police Service's Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Unit. Acting Senior Sergeant McKay will work with partner agencies including the government funded Elder Abuse Prevention Unit to promote initiatives to address elder abuse in our community. It is wonderful news that we have a dedicated elder abuse prevention officer in the Queensland Police Service.

As a government, we have also provided around \$500,000 in funding to the Elder Abuse Prevention Unit and \$2.55 million to the five Seniors Legal and Support Services across Queensland. We have also taken action on the recommendations of the parliamentary inquiry into the adequacy of existing financial protections for Queensland seniors. This includes developing a seniors strategy, appointing a task force to look at residential transition options for seniors, supporting seniors with computer literacy and technology, and promoting education and awareness of elder abuse. By us all working together, we can now empower older people and make them less susceptible to abuse.

Road Infrastructure

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (2.38 pm): The Palaszczuk government is continually working to improve Queensland's vast road network. The 2015-16 to 2018-19 Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program, or QTRIP, as most of us know it, outlines \$18.8 billion in investment to deliver a safe and reliable transport network across Queensland.

QTRIP supports an average of approximately 15,000 direct jobs over the life of the program, not only delivering improved roads but providing jobs and boosting our regional economies. The Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme, or TIDS as it is fondly known around local government circles, provides targeted investment in local government transport infrastructure, bringing together councils and my department in a fifty-fifty program funding regional roads.


As part of the previous Newman-Nicholls government, \$600 million worth of cuts to transport funding was instigated by the now opposition leader, the member for Clayfield, and of course his close compadre, the member for Indooroopilly. TIDS funding was reduced by 37 per cent, a \$23.3 million cut. That was against the strong objections of local governments right across Queensland of all political stripes.

In contrast, before the last election, the Palaszczuk government increased TIDS based funding by \$30 million per annum for two years starting from 2016-17. When we got into government, we accelerated this increase and brought forward our election commitment by one year to deliver much more regional jobs sooner to the widespread support of mayors and councillors right across Queensland. There has probably not been a single issue where I have had more positive feedback from local government than our boosting to TIDS funding to boost our regional road program. We have increased the TIDS funding from \$40 million per annum to \$70 million per annum in Queensland.

It is estimated that in 2015-16 the TIDS program will support 461 jobs in regional communities right across Queensland. In November last year I wrote to the former deputy prime minister, the Hon. Warren Truss, outlining Queensland's submission to the five-year \$600 million Northern Australian Roads Program. Queensland's submission focused on key freight routes, including the Flinders, the Landsborough, the Gregory, the Peak Downs and the Capricorn highways and the Gregory Developmental Road as high priorities for funding. It also included regional roads connecting communities across Northern Queensland, including the progressive sealing of sections of the Hann Highway over the next five years.

In all, Queensland put forward 25 projects seeking federal contributions of around \$590 million on the appropriate 80-20 funding split. We have been expecting the federal government to announce these successful projects for the past several months and we are still waiting. The Turnbull government has also failed to reveal its \$1.6 billion worth of spending decisions as part of the federal budget that happened weeks and weeks and weeks ago. Queensland roads are too important to become a political football in the federal election campaign. I call on the Prime Minister and the federal Treasurer to release their hidden funding decisions so Queenslanders can get on with the job, get on with these projects and get regional jobs going in Queensland. They should not have to wait because of the longest federal election campaign in our history.

WorkCover

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.42 pm): Queensland's workers compensation scheme, WorkCover, is the envy of the nation. Not only does it provide workers with nation-leading coverage; it also has the lowest average premiums of any Australian state or territory. I am pleased to inform the House that WorkCover Queensland's premiums will continue to be \$1.20 per \$100 in wages paid in 2016-17, unchanged from the previous financial year. This is significantly lower than South Australia and Western Australia, which have announced average workers compensation premium rates of \$1.95 and \$1.48 respectively for the next financial year. It is also lower than Victoria, which announced their premium would remain at \$1.27. This is a testament to the Palaszczuk Labor government's fair and sensible management of Queensland's workers compensation scheme.

WorkCover maintains a strong financial position. WorkCover is required by Queensland Treasury to have a funding ratio of 120 per cent. The financial results to the end of the quarter ending 31 March 2016 show its current funding ratio is 160 per cent and projected to be 156 per cent at the end of the financial year. In addition, the latest national comparative data released by Safe Work Australia shows Queensland recorded a 22.5 per cent reduction over the five years to 2013-14 in the incident rate of serious work related injuries. We have been able to achieve all of this without stripping away injured workers' rights and entitlements.

By way of contrast, in 2013 the Newman-Nicholls LNP government rammed through unfair common law amendments restricting injured workers' rights and entitlements. These actions put financial pressure on injured Queensland workers and their families—

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Callide, I cannot hear the minister's contribution.

Ms GRACE: These actions put financial pressure—

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. If ministers are going to use the opportunity in ministerial statements to attack this side of the House, you cannot expect us not to respond.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Callide. I will respond appropriately. Resume your seat.

Ms GRACE: These actions put financial pressure on injured Queensland workers and their families at a time when they were most vulnerable. WorkCover's low average premiums are yet another sign that Queensland is a great place to do business, particularly for small business. This is good news


and the Palaszczuk government will continue to work with WorkCover. We will ensure that it remains the best workers compensation scheme in Australia for both workers and employers.

Mr Cramp interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, you are warned under standing order 253A for your unnecessary interjections.

LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Office of the Information Commissioner, Report


 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (2.46 pm): As chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, I lay upon the table report No. 4 of 2015-16 by the Office of the Information Commissioner titled *Compliance review—Council of the city of Gold Coast: Review of the council of the city of Gold Coast's compliance with the Right to Information Act 2009 (Queensland) and the Information Privacy Act 2009 (Queensland)*.

Tabled paper: Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 4 of 2015-16—Compliance Review: Council of the City of Gold Coast: Review of the Council of the City of Gold Coast's compliance with the Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld) and the Information Privacy Act 2009 (Qld).

The committee chair is required to table the report under the Right to Information Act 2009. I commend the report to the House.


NOTICE OF MOTION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (2.46 pm): I give notice that I shall move—

That part 15 of the Transport (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2016, subordinate legislation No. 49 of 2016, tabled in the House on 24 May 2016, be disallowed.


Level of Crime

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (2.47 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this house notes the rising level of concern regarding unaddressed levels of crime in our community and condemns the government's failure to act to restore law and order and ensure the safety of all Queenslanders.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Dairy Farmers

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (2.47 pm): Today Queensland dairy farmers brought their voices to George Street to say enough is enough, to say that dairy farmers can no longer accept prices lower than the cost of production, to say to the milk processors and the marketers that if you do not support local Queensland dairy farmers and renew contracts at decent rates we will not have a dairy industry in this state. I want to add my voice to those of the dairy farmers and say unequivocally here today that I stand shoulder to shoulder with them and all the other hardworking dairy farmers around the state on this important issue—as do all my LNP colleagues on this side of the House.

As a Queenslander I want to drink Queensland milk. As the dairy farmers' slogan at the rally today said, 'Do you like your coffee black?' I for one want to see our dairy industry develop so that the next generation of dairy farmers can look forward to a future on the land. My mother and father operated a dairy back in the fifties and sixties and I understand the work that goes into running a dairy. It is a 365 days a year job. Rain, hail or sunshine, it does not matter if you are crook, you still have to get up and milk the cows. Whilst we might take for granted that going into a supermarket and buying milk off the shelf is a simple process, I appreciate the work that goes into putting that milk on those shelves. What a disgrace that I can purchase a litre of milk cheaper than a litre of water. Is it any wonder that our dairy farmers are going broke.


There is a growing anger out in the community, and rightly so. We have a shortfall of fresh milk in Queensland. That is right—we actually truck milk into Queensland from interstate to meet our demand. If we do not start supporting our local dairy farmers, this will only get worse. Our dairy farmers

have been taken for granted by the big corporates. If our dairy farmers keep leaving the industry at the rate they have, we will not have the option of purchasing local milk.

I want to add my support and acknowledge all those mums and dads out there—all the people in Queensland—who showed their support by only purchasing branded milk at Coles and Woolworths. We have all seen the images on TV and social media of Coles branded milk being left on the shelves and we need to keep up this fight. We need to send these companies a message, and that is, 'If you don't start paying our dairy farmers a fair dinkum price, we will take our business elsewhere.'

I will be talking to the CEOs of Coles and Woolworths later this week to reaffirm our position here today that when contracts are renewed they reflect sustainable returns to our dairy farmers. We have enormous scope to develop our dairy industry here in Queensland and this is being stymied by a ridiculous price war between the corporate giants of the supermarket world, Coles and Woolworths. I say, 'Stop playing games, stop taking our dairy farmers for granted and pay them what they deserve so that we can retain our farmers and develop this industry.'

Asset Sales

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (2.50 pm): Yesterday we saw the latest flip-flop from the opposition leader on asset sales. We heard him say 'watch this space' on asset sales, yet look at the chronology. How could we possibly trust the member for Clayfield and Leader of the Opposition on assets sales? Let me talk honourable members through the history. Before the 2012 election the LNP said that they would not have any asset sales without a mandate. That was their clear policy. Yet once they were elected they secretly spent \$100 million preparing for asset sales and contestability throughout government—\$30 million in Transport and Main Roads alone. That is what they did.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister, I apologise for stopping your train of thought. Members of the opposition, I cannot hear the minister. There is too much interjection. The next speaker will have a chance to make their contribution.

Mr BAILEY: They told Queenslanders that they would have no asset sales without a mandate, yet there they were with a secret branch in Transport and Main Roads preparing for contestability and privatisation—\$100 million in documented asset sales. When they lost the election, the biggest and most catastrophic election loss in political history in Queensland and this country, they said, 'There will be no asset sales. We've learnt our lesson.' They said they had learnt their lesson, but they flip-flopped again with the member for Clayfield in October last year saying, 'We should be the regulator only.' Let me outline what he said on ABC about the inherent contradiction between the government being the owner of a business and also a regulator. He said—

My very firm view is that governments should be regulators.


It cannot be any clearer than that. Yet to get the votes for the leadership—to get the National Party votes—he again said asset sales are off the agenda; he flip-flopped again. I note the National Party members sitting right up the back in exile. We know that the National Party members have concerns about asset sales and yet yesterday we saw the opposition leader saying 'watch this space'.

How can we trust Tim Nicholls on asset sales? He has had six different positions in five years. In his book, his best mate 'Can-do' Campbell Newman, whom he was spruiking back in the Brisbane City Council, reveals that his position was more hard line than Strong Choices; the Newman package was actually the more moderate package. Tim Nicholls wanted the whole Commission of Audit. If he gets the chance, he will do it again.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not need your assistance, member for Callide.

2018 Commonwealth Games

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (2.53 pm): I want to speak today about the 2018 Commonwealth Games to be held on the Gold Coast, the biggest sporting event in Australia this decade, and in opposition we supported it when Anna Bligh went over to St Kitts and won the games. What we did not know then is that they were not funded by that Labor government. On coming to government we then had a \$2 billion black hole that had been added to the \$85 billion of debt that was bequeathed to Queenslanders by Anna Bligh and Labor.

What did we set about doing? We had the then deputy premier, the treasurer and the minister for the Commonwealth Games who set about getting the finances right, because that is what we do on this side. We made sure that we were getting right the planning, the finances, the facilities and the sports, not like the current Premier who had a suggestion that we should make beach volleyball a demonstration sport when the Commonwealth Games Federation did not even support it and now beach volleyball has had to be added to the games at a significant cost.

We all know that transport and security are amongst the most important issues for the games. When it came to the roads network the member for Indooroopilly, our transport minister, came down and promised significant road upgrades, at Royal Pines and at Bundall Road. That is happening now, affecting the electorates of the members for Southport and Mermaid Beach, my own electorate of Surfers Paradise as well as all Gold Coast members. That is what we were doing. We were planning, making sure that we had an increased sense of confidence on the Gold Coast, which we still see because of the property boom that is happening in the south that is also coming to Queensland. That is also due to the infrastructure spend of this government which was because of the promises that we made. We are not seeing that in other parts of Queensland. Labor are doing their utmost to undermine confidence on the Gold Coast by winding back bikie laws and by doing everything they can to stymie a cruise ship terminal.

When it comes to the construction of the Commonwealth Games precinct, today we are seeing that whilst we are looking for a thousand people to work in various parts of the Commonwealth Games on the administrative side and on the promotion side, we have union workers, as promoted in the *Gold Coast Bulletin*—and I will table a copy of it—

Tabled paper: Front page of the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, dated 25 May 2016, with the headline 'Bludgers—Working flat out for Commonwealth Games success'.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. Just table it, please. You know the rule in relation to props.

Mr LANGBROEK: I am, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: No, you will table it or you will sit down. Table it and proceed.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Speaker—

Mr WATTS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr LANGBROEK: Can you stop the clock, please?

Mr SPEAKER: Okay. What is your point of order?

Mr WATTS: I would like to have the prop that was used by the Minister for Main Roads also tabled.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order. I make the point that the Minister for Disability Services had a prop earlier in her ministerial statement and it was not tabled, either. So we are having inconsistency—

Mr SPEAKER: I am not going to have an argument now. I have made a ruling in relation to—

Mr LANGBROEK: All we would like is some consistency, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Surfers Paradise, resume your seat. You either table the document you were using as a prop—

Mr LANGBROEK:—which I have.


Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. You can now continue with your contribution. Member for Surfers Paradise, kindly withdraw the inference on the chair.

Mr LANGBROEK: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. You can now continue.

Mr LANGBROEK: This week we have a thousand workers being sought in various aspects of the Commonwealth Games. We have a thousand CFMEU workers having a prawn and crab bludge for two hours a day, twice a day at the Commonwealth Games precinct site. Peter Beattie, the hand-picked chair, says he cannot do anything about it. The Treasurer says he cannot do anything about it. It is up to Anastacia Palaszczuk, the Premier, to ask these union workers to stop having a nap, stop coming the raw prawn and get on with the job.

Asset Sales

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.57 pm): After hearing the Leader of the Opposition say yesterday he would make a decision about asset sales 'in due course'—

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. The inference and the allegation are both untrue. I find them offensive. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you know the requirement. Will you kindly withdraw unequivocally?

Mr DICK: I withdraw. One thing we know about the Leader of the Opposition is he is back. Mr 'Strong Choices', Mr 'Asset Sales', the loyal sidekick of—

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. I do not believe I heard the Minister for Health withdraw. You asked him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I believe I heard him withdraw.

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order. I refer to standing order 244(7) in which case the member needs to refer to another member by his title, not by Mr 'Strong Choices' and whatever else he used.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Surfers Paradise. I would urge all members to refer to the appropriate member by the appropriate name.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DICK: They do not like it. They do not like it over there. One thing I will say is that the Leader of the Opposition never saw an asset he did not want to sell.

I will give him credit: he is not easily discouraged. Notwithstanding Strong Choices swung like a wrecking ball through the last government and took a government with a record majority in this House and turned it to rubble, notwithstanding Strong Choices wiped out the careers of 31 members of his parliamentary team, he will not be discouraged. Inside his heart the dream lives on.

It reminds me of the story of the frog who carries the scorpion across the river. They get halfway across and the scorpion stings the frog, and as they are both drowning the frog says, 'Why did you do that?' The scorpion says, 'It's in my nature.' There is one thing I will say about the Leader of the Opposition: it is in his DNA to sell assets; it is simply in his nature. The 33 per cent of those members opposite—a third of them—who voted for the Leader of the Opposition must feel betrayed that this radioactive policy that they thought was dead really was only just resting. Here we have it, and I will table the Strong Choices plan.

Tabled paper: Queensland Government: The Strongest and Smartest Choice, Queensland's Plan for Secure Finances and a Strong Economy.


Or, as the Leader of the Opposition calls it, 'my precious'. He is sticking by it; he will not give up. It is the most expensive—it cost \$70 million—collection of scrap paper in Queensland history, and of course that includes Can-Do's autobiography. The smartest and strongest choice the Leader of the Opposition can make is to use the next three minutes to get up and apologise to the people of Queensland for betraying their trust. Use the next three minutes to get up—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, I cannot hear the minister. You are now warned under standing order 253A. You have had a pretty good go and it is only early. I call the minister.

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for her encouragement. The Leader of the Opposition has three minutes. Will he say to the people of Queensland, 'I heard you last January. I heard the message that you do not want to sell assets.'? Has he heard the message from Queenslanders that they do not want asset sales? Now is the time. He has three minutes; we will hear from him soon.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Caloundra and member for Chatsworth, you are now warned under standing order 253A for shouting across the chamber. The minister has finished his contribution. I now call the Leader of the Opposition.

Aurukun; Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.02 pm) As I said in Townsville last week, the situation in Aurukun is one that defies a simple or straightforward answer. Can I simply say also to Senior Sergeant McMahon, who has been appointed to the coordinator's role, that we wish him the best in dealing with an extremely difficult situation which I think has lasted for far too long and

undoubtedly will take a considerable amount of work to solve. There are more important things that transcend the games and cheap political attacks of the Labor Party in this place which deserve far more time and effort than the efforts of the member for Yeerongpilly and the lamentable effort of the member for Woodridge. On that basis, let us all hope that the situation is swiftly reversed and that the children there can get the education and hope that they deserve.

If ever anyone was in doubt that this government is asleep at the wheel, the events of the last 48 hours have proved that. We have seen they are asleep at the wheel in Townsville, where the crime rate is skyrocketing. We have seen they are asleep at the wheel on the Gold Coast, where they are paying people a full day's pay and only getting a half day's work. We now know why they appointed Peter Beattie to chair the Commonwealth Games board, and that is because they need someone to go down there and gloss over the failure that is rapidly emerging and deliver a Commonwealth Games of which all Queenslanders can be proud.

We also know about their failure to deliver a budget without raiding the funds which have been set aside to meet the entitlements of Queensland government employees. We know that they have run out of options. Revenue is flatlining because business confidence in this state is down. They have run out of options because resource projects are not being built. They have run out of options because they are forcing farmers and landholders to comply with more and more red tape, and they are then not to be able to deliver the agricultural bounty of this land across the nation and across the country. We know that they are now bankrupt of ideas and are contradicting themselves. The Treasurer's own report on state finances states—

It is Queensland's policy that the funds are set aside *exclusively* for employee entitlements. They cannot be set aside exclusively for employee entitlements and also be available for debt servicing/repayment.


They are asleep at the wheel and they are not waking up any time soon.

(Time expired)

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 4.05 pm.

Queensland Economy

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.05 pm): My first question is of the Premier. I refer to Labor's planned raid on the defined benefit fund and I ask: can the Premier guarantee that Queensland's credit rating will not be subsequently downgraded?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Our budget will be delivered next month. As I stated yesterday in the House, it is focused on getting people back into work. We have had a downturn in the commodity markets, regional Queensland is hurting, and my government is clearly focused on jobs. There is nothing more important than creating jobs for Queenslanders. Everywhere I travel—it does not matter where I go—there is nothing more important. Whether it is to do with young people and youth unemployment, or people who have lost their jobs through circumstances recently as we saw in Townsville with Queensland Nickel, it is at the forefront for all of my ministers and all of the members of my government to make sure that we deliver for communities right across the state. Yes, Mr Speaker, that does transcend politics as well because I said that we would govern for all Queenslanders no matter where they live, and rural Queensland has been hit very hard by the drought as well.

What we know very clearly is that Malcolm Turnbull and his government have cut massively into health and education: that is the problem. The challenges for the Minister for Health and the Minister for Education are to make sure that we deliver to communities right across our state because of what Malcolm Turnbull is doing to Queensland. Perhaps those opposite could pick up the phone, talk to your mate down there and say, 'It is about time you stumped up and delivered for Queensland,' because we have not seen much of him during this federal election campaign and we hope to see a lot more of him.

Queensland Budget

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question is also of the Premier. Will the Premier today come clean and tell Queenslanders precisely how many dollars Labor plans to raid from the defined benefit fund?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said very clearly, the budget is coming down next month and the amount will be in the budget.

Queensland Budget

Mr BROWN: My question without notice is of the Premier. With preparations underway for the next state budget, will the Premier explain the implementation of the 2015-16 budget and how it compares with previous budgets?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Beaudesert, you are warned under standing order 253A. Those interjections were totally inappropriate and were of no relevance to the question at all.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Capalaba very much for that important question. In our very first budget we chose to restore services that were savagely cut by those opposite. The priority of the former government, under the leadership of the now Leader of the Opposition—as his colleagues like to refer to him, 'Mr Strong Choices'—was to cut jobs and to cut services. That is their legacy. What we cannot yet see from the Leader of the Opposition is their position on asset sales. We on this side of the House know what our position is, because we listened to the people of Queensland. Those opposite are incapable of listening to the people of Queensland because they are always talking over them. Our budget next month will be focused on creating jobs, promoting innovation and getting the infrastructure we need right across the state.

In our first budget we provided record funding for Health of \$14.2 billion—an increase of \$2.3 billion. We provided 400 new nurses and made provision for 4,000 graduate nursing placements and \$180 million of hospital upgrades.

What happened under the treasurership of the member for Clayfield? Let us not forget that he was the treasurer. He was in charge of the books. What did he do? He removed \$120 million in funding for community groups in Queensland health. In its first budget the LNP—

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, you are warned under standing order 253A.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—sacked more than 4,000 health professionals. That is the legacy of those opposite. They want Queenslanders to forget it, but we will never let Queenslanders forget it—never, ever. Let us not forget the sacking of 14,000 workers—that represents 14,000 families—who lost their jobs under the former government. We also provided a record Education budget, providing for 875 additional teachers and 45 additional guidance officers. We restored Skilling Queenslanders for Work. What did they do in their first budget in terms of employment? They slashed Skilling Queenslanders for Work and they sacked workers.

The record of the Leader of the Opposition is disgraceful. Today he has every opportunity to clarify, once and for all, his position on asset sales. Are you intending to sell our state's assets? You have no policies. You have no plan for this state. All you do is criticise. What are you going to do? What are you going to do when your history—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I urge you not to use the word 'you'. Before I call the next question, Leader of the House and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you have both had a pretty good go. I do not want to warn you, but if you persist you will be warned. The next person to be formally warned is the member for Burleigh. You are warned under standing 253A. You have had ample opportunities.

Budget, Superannuation

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Premier. I table the QTC half-yearly report, dated December 2015, which shows the defined benefit fund actually made a loss of \$855 million.

Tabled paper: Queensland Treasury Corporation: Half-Yearly Report, December 2015.

I ask: how can the Premier justify Labor's proposed raid on the fund when it has already lost almost half a billion dollars?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will have to look at the report the shadow Treasurer has referred to. The actuary report is very clear about the fund being in surplus. As I said, it will be clearly detailed next month in our budget and the actuary's report will be released.

Infrastructure

Mr PEGG: My question is for the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on how the government is delivering infrastructure in Queensland and whether she is aware of any alternative policies?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Stretton for his question. I know that he is deeply interested in infrastructure delivery in our state and in his electorate. Yesterday in this House I outlined how the Palaszczuk Labor government was getting on with the job of delivering infrastructure without having to sell assets. In fact, our State Infrastructure Plan outlines an additional commitment of \$2 billion worth of projects that this government has already committed to. In addition to this, we have outlined our State Infrastructure Plan. We have already released information about \$300 million worth of economic growth projects right throughout the state. We will be talking about our regional significant infrastructure projects, which will be released soon.

We have achieved all of this without selling assets—unlike those opposite. I know that my colleague the Minister for Health has already referred to the Strong Choices plan. I have a copy of it with me and I will refer to it. It says ‘How we have listened’. This plan outlines that the previous Newman LNP government, of which the current state leader was the treasurer, was not going to sell assets. We had a whole range of positions from the Leader of the Opposition when he was treasurer in the former government and even before he was elected by his party room. Now that he is the Leader of the Opposition he has had a few different positions, as the Minister for Health and Minister for Main Roads have already outlined.

If you go to page 30 of the Strong Choices plan you do get a sense of all of the assets the previous government wanted to sell: the Gladstone port, the Port of Townsville, SunWater, Stanwell, CS Energy, Powerlink, Energex, Ergon—all of these assets to fund their infrastructure spend. We on this side of the House will build the infrastructure without selling our productive assets.

The Leader of the Opposition had a very clear, simple task today. He had three minutes in which to get on his feet and rule out selling assets under a new LNP government led by him. He promised before he was elected by the party room that he had heard the message from Queenslanders, but now we know differently.

(Time expired)

Budget, Superannuation

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier now confirm that she has not read the QTC report before raiding the defined benefit fund?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The government will rely on the advice of the State Actuary and Queensland Treasury, unlike those opposite. When the Leader of the Opposition was the treasurer of this state, who did he rely on for advice? Peter Costello and the Commission of Audit. That is who they relied on.

Mr EMERSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was very clear. The question was: can the Premier confirm that she has not read the QTC report? She has not answered that question. I urge you to encourage the Premier to answer that question.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier has answered the question.

Asset Sales

Mr KING: My question is directed to the Treasurer. I refer to statements by the member for Clayfield, who said his position on asset sales would be known in due course, and I ask: will the Treasurer outline the government’s position on asset sales and is he aware of any other positions?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for Kallangur for his question. I know he is very passionate particularly about keeping our energy assets in public hands. When it comes to asset sales, this side of the House received a verdict of the people in 2012. We received that verdict and we were reduced to a very small number of members in the parliament and we then said that we would never go there again. We have had some kind of a journey. I am not sure if it is a conversion on the road to Damascus or whatever it may be from the member for Clayfield, but he says that he is going to reveal his position in due course. What does that mean? Why not today? Why will he not reveal that position today, because he has been very clearly quoted in the media? Let us just run through really quickly the recent history of the member for Clayfield. Before the 2012 election he opposed asset sales and after the election he was strongly in favour. He spent three years telling Queenslanders exactly why we had to do it. He pushed asset sales every day. He certainly talked Queensland down. He tried to scare people. He spent \$100 million of Queensland taxpayers’ money trying to flog off assets in our state and then he declared that there were only three choices: significantly increased taxes, fees and charges; drastically cutting services and cutting jobs; and of course asset sales. They were the only choices we had according to the member for Clayfield.

People did not buy what he was saying about Strong Choices and they did not buy the campaign he was trying to sell them. Suddenly, just before the 2015 election, guess what? They were no longer called asset sales; they were then called asset leasing. He tried to claim that a 99-year lease was not actually an asset sale yet in opposition he said that it was as good as selling the farm. He even claimed that a 50-year lease plus a 49-year lease did not equal a 99-year lease. He obviously can do the numbers in the LNP party room, but he cannot do them as the treasurer. Yesterday he left the door wide open. He left the door wide open after only one month ago saying that he had heard the people's verdict in Queensland. This does not fill anybody with any confidence whatsoever that the member for Clayfield has anything other than asset sales on his mind, because he has had more positions on this issue than anyone else on that side. Is he having memory loss? Is he a goldfish? It is like he has swum to the edge of the bowl, had a bit of a nibble and then he has gone around the bowl again and suddenly thought, 'Oh, asset sales! There's a good idea! I might do that.' It is not the way it should be done. He is now in a position where he must tell Queenslanders what his position on asset sales is. We know that he is the man responsible for the position that those opposite took to the last election. People only credit Campbell Newman with it. I know it keeps the member for Clayfield up at night that Campbell Newman got all the credit for ruining our state, but really he should make sure he takes some of the credit. He should take it because it was the Newman-Nicholls government. The decisions were clearly made by the member for Clayfield. He has another opportunity today to let all of us know—in fact let all Queenslanders know—his position on assets sales. We on this side are clear. We will not be selling our income-generating assets.

Budget, Superannuation

Mr LANGBROEK: My question is directed to the Treasurer. Was he aware of the \$855 million QTC loss before he decided to raid the super fund?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. I would like to know what the page reference is, because we have been trying to find 'defined benefit scheme' in this report and have not been able to locate it in the short time I have had it back in my hands. If the member could actually refer to a page, that would be very helpful. In the meantime I will reiterate the statements that we have made previously. We have said—

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order. I am happy to give the information to the honourable member.

Mr SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr LANGBROEK: It is page 2. It is not very far in. It is page 2.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat.

Mr PITT: Let us be clear about what our fiscal principle is. Let us start at the start—

Mr Nicholls: But isn't that your document though? It is your document—QTC!

Mr PITT: Let us start at the start for the member for Clayfield, who is still bitter that he is no longer doing this job. Our fiscal position is clear. We said that we would target—

Mr Nicholls: The Treasurer doesn't know his own document.

Mr PITT: If you want to listen, we will actually tell you our position, member for Clayfield. We said that we would target fully funded long-term liabilities including superannuation and WorkCover in accordance with actuarial advice. As the member for Surfers Paradise maybe during his short time as shadow Treasurer should have known—or, otherwise, the member for Clayfield can tell him—the state actuary gives us a triennial report.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr PITT: Do you want to hear the answer? The state actuary gives a triennial report—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, you are on the verge of leaving the chamber.

Mr NICHOLLS: On a point of order: the Treasurer pointed directly across the chamber and said, 'Do you want an answer?' He was inviting a response from the opposition and seeking an interjection. Mr Speaker, in terms of your rulings—and we respect the rulings that you make in terms of interjections; we have always done so—I just make the point that when we are directly challenged by the Treasurer in respect of this matter I think it is not unreasonable that there is a response.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. It is a valiant effort on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition to try to deflect the transgression of the Leader of Opposition Business, who indeed is someone who should know better once he has been warned. While I understand and note what the Leader of the Opposition said about the Treasurer's gesticulating across the chamber, clearly he was responding to the person who was asking the question. The Leader of Opposition Business was not the questioner and should have known to respect your warning to him, Mr Speaker, and I suggest that you should take action.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. The member for Callide is aware of my position. Treasurer, do you have anything further to add?

Mr PITT: Yes, I do, Mr Speaker. As I was trying to explain to the questioner as it relates to how this government is taking its advice, the state actuary, before we made a decision last year, was providing a triennial review of the defined benefit scheme and making sure that we understood very clearly its position in terms of its funding. What we know is that the most recent report from the state actuary talks about seeing the defined benefit scheme being in surplus by more than \$10 billion on a funding basis. That is the fact. As members may remember, the last time the member for Clayfield tried to scare the pants off public servants—which was a real feat because they scared a lot of public servants when they sacked more than 14,000 of them—they tried to make out this raid and stealing nonsense last year when nothing happened. Guess what? Every public servant who left the defined benefit scheme last year got paid their full entitlement. That is what is going to continue to happen.

There are some other things that have been put out today. What did QSuper say? QSuper has put out documentation which says that this announcement made by the government yesterday changes in no way public servants' entitlements and that they should have no concerns whatsoever about their entitlements. They are safe; they are secure, and that has come from QSuper. This is just another example of a desperate opposition trying to scare public servants, as if they did not do a good enough job last time. This is exactly what QSuper said—

So whatever type of account you have—

with QSuper—

please rest assured this announcement will have no impact on your super, or your future retirement lifestyle.

That is from QSuper. What have a few other people said? We know that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry has said that it is a good idea, and that is because it knows our position is not to sell assets, so even it thinks it is a good idea—

(Time expired)

Queensland Economy, Ports

Mr BUTCHER: My question is directed to the Minister for Main Roads. Will the minister update the House on how our ports are driving the Queensland economy?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for Gladstone for his question because he, as much as anyone, understands the importance of ports as our international gateways to international markets and their importance in terms of jobs and growth. Queensland has 15 trading ports with more than \$47 billion in exports last financial year and they play a central role, with more than 1,000 full-time staff. They are driving local economies and they are driving local jobs, and this government is committed to our ports being in public hands—and the jobs and the workers that go with it, unlike those opposite. We are investing in our ports. In Townsville we are investing \$55 million in the Berth 4 upgrade, creating 100 jobs in Townsville—jobs going to local contractors as well. The containerisation of Berth 4 is excellent news for jobs and productivity through the port of Townsville. We are also investing \$1.9 million in the Berth 8 and 9 project at the port of Townsville, awarded to Bluewater Process Engineering, which is supporting 115 jobs in Townsville. I acknowledge the roles of the member for Mundingburra, the member for Thuringowa and the member for Townsville in their strong advocacy for jobs in Townsville.

We are also providing certainty in terms of the port of Cairns. Work on the Cairns shipping development project is progressing, with capital dredging able to occur for the project providing, of course, that it meets our Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan commitments. This is great news for Cairns, because Princess Cruises will start docking at the Cairns cruise liner terminal from June. I acknowledge the hard work of the Treasurer, who is one of the local members, and the member for Barron River for their advocacy for the Cairns port. This development follows extensive simulation activities undertaken at Maritime Safety Queensland, which demonstrated that Princess Cruises' ships

can safely pass through Cairns Harbour without any dredging being undertaken. With 2,000 passengers arriving with each ship, this is a fantastic outcome for jobs and the economy in Cairns.

I notice that the opposition leader was in Cairns recently spruiking his commitment to ports—ports that he was committed to selling off when he was the treasurer of this state. Like moths to the flame, the opposition leader returns to asset sales. That is his policy. He thinks that we should be regulators. Despite the commitment of the Newman government for no asset sales without a mandate, it spent \$800,000 preparing to sell the Port of Townsville and the Port of Gladstone. It spent \$100 million on privatisation preparations without a mandate. The Gladstone and Townsville ports are in the book as part of the opposition's privatisation plan.

Mr WATTS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I refer to your earlier ruling at 2.55 pm today about props and that they should be tabled if they are used.

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I am not using it as a prop. Let me quote from it. It states 'Campbell's impassioned plea for a political reality check'—

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Your time has expired.

Commonwealth Games, Industrial Action

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Premier. I refer to stop-work meetings holding up progress on the Commonwealth Games preparations and I ask: has the Commonwealth Games Federation been updated on the impact that industrial action by unions is having on the progress and preparedness for the Commonwealth Games?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Beaudesert very much for the question. As I said yesterday, it was great to see the member for Beaudesert on Saturday night rush up to congratulate Peter Beattie on his appointment as chair of the Goldoc games. In fact, I think he beat me. That is saying something. He beat me!

Recently, when we took the community cabinet to the Gold Coast I had the opportunity, with the Minister for the Commonwealth Games, to meet with the games federation. In conversations with them at a meeting they expressed to me how pleased they were with the progress of the Commonwealth Games, that they have been involved with Commonwealth Games before and that they were incredibly impressed with the progress. I thank the minister for the Commonwealth Games for overseeing the work, for adding beach volleyball to the program and for also ensuring that construction is happening on time.

In relation to the substantial part of the question that the member for Beaudesert asked, I am advised that the employee representative trade union is currently engaged in EBA negotiations with Hansen, who are the managing contractors for the Carrara Sports Precinct project. This matter is being managed through the appropriate process by the managing contractor under the supervision of the major projects office within the Department of State Development. I can assure the House that all of our games competition venues, including the Carrara Sports Precinct, remain on track and are expected to be completed at least 12 months before the games commence in April 2018.

In relation to those matters, as I have said to the House, the EBA negotiations are ongoing. I hope that all parties could sit down together to sort out this matter as a priority, because we know how important the Commonwealth Games are not just for the Gold Coast but for Queensland. It is a games for Queensland and we need to make sure that everything is being tracked on time. Whilst I am on my feet talking about the Commonwealth Games, I also want to draw attention to the fact that there are now 1,000 jobs being advertised for work on the Commonwealth Games. Those jobs are currently being advertised and we will in the future also be asking for people who want to be volunteers at the games as well. I encourage all members of this House to get behind the games. They are great for the Gold Coast, but even greater for Queensland.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Logan, can I indicate to the member for Albert that I have heard a lot of comments coming from his corner of the chamber. Unfortunately, I am not able to see his mouth when I can see many other members' mouths. I am not sure if the comments are coming from him. Yes, I can certainly see the member for Gaven. It may be the case, member for Albert, that in future we provide you with a cushion.

Gold Coast Community Cabinet

Mr POWER: It seems good posture is important. My question is to the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister update the House on last week's community cabinet held on the Gold Coast?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for Logan for his question. As the Premier said, last week—on 15 and 16 May—the Palaszczuk government held a community cabinet meeting on the Gold Coast. I was very pleased to join the Premier in some of the ongoing conversations we have had around the preparations for the 2018 Commonwealth Games. It was a great opportunity for the government to meet with local business owners, families, workers and residents to discuss the government's plans to create jobs and a strong and diversified economy for Queensland, particularly on the Gold Coast.

The public forum was held on Sunday, 15 May 2016 at Southport State High School where members of the public had the chance to ask questions directly of the Premier and the ministers. It was great to see the member for Southport there as well, joining with his local community in getting that opportunity to access government. Formal deputations were taken by ministers and directors-general of government departments. It was a pleasure to be part of talking to a lot of people on the coast about what is important for them.

It was a very deliberate choice of the Premier to hold this event on the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast is a region that is growing rapidly and, as a government, we are contributing to that growth in jobs and opportunity. Already today, other members have spoken of the role that the former Labor government had in successfully bidding for the 2018 Commonwealth Games back in 2011. That is another example of opportunities being delivered by Labor. As a key part of that, we are building and upgrading 18 world-class facilities for the games, making the Gold Coast region a powerhouse that will inject more than \$2 billion into the Queensland economy and support up to 30,000 jobs. That is based on the figures that we have assessed right at the moment.

There are some \$320 million in the games competition venues program that will support more than 2,500 jobs during design and construction as well as leave a lasting legacy. On top of that, there are great examples such as the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2—a \$420 million project that is providing an immediate boost to the construction industry. Anyone who knows the coast knows that light rail has been a real game changer, a real connectivity changer for the Gold Coast. It is making that area boom and zoom. That is what we heard from people who attended the community cabinet.

Gold Coast light rail is an example of something that was delivered by Labor, despite opposition from the LNP and, in particular, the member for Clayfield, who might recall his contribution in this House on 18 October 2007 in relation to the first stage of Gold Coast light rail. He said—

The proposal that the government released last week has shown once again that it does not have in mind what is best for the people of the Gold Coast and Surfers Paradise....

(Time expired.)

Mr HINCHLIFFE I know that the member for Southport—

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. You will be warned if you do not resume your seat.

Commonwealth Games, Transport Operations Plan

Mr POWELL: My question without notice is to the Premier. Premier, where is the Commonwealth Games transport operations plan which was scheduled to be released in early 2016?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Glass House for the question. I am advised that the transport model plan that he is speaking about is due to be released in September this year. That has been agreed to with the Commonwealth Games Federation.

Sexual Health

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister update the House on actions taken by the Palaszczuk government to advance the sexual health outcomes of Queenslanders and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr SPEAKER: One moment. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are now warned under standing order 253A. Member for Pine Rivers, could you repeat your question, please.

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister update the House on actions taken by the Palaszczuk government to advance the sexual health outcomes of Queenslanders and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Pine Rivers for her question. Today I have announced some significant steps to progress the sexual health of all Queenslanders. Three measures that I have announced have strong community support. I know that the member for Pine Rivers, along with so many members on this side of the House, are strong supporters of action to improve the sexual health of Queenslanders and to address problems such as syphilis in Far North Queensland.

The government is moving ahead in supporting the sexual health of Queenslanders. This is an area that was completely ignored by the last LNP government. Sexual health was another victim of the cuts imposed by the Newman LNP government in which the Leader of the Opposition served as Treasurer. As part of those cuts the largest sexual health clinic in the state, Biala in Roma Street, was all but closed down.

Government members: Shame!

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from government members, and the member for Brisbane Central in particular. It was a shame. Thirty members of staff lost their jobs. That was under the watch of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Treasurer. That clinic plays a vital role in testing for HIV and other sexually transmitted infections. It was the largest sexual health clinic in the state providing more than 13,000 service interactions before its near destruction by the LNP government.

I am proud to say that the Palaszczuk Labor government restored funding to Biala in its first budget: \$13.2 million over four years. What else did the member for Clayfield preside over when he was Treasurer? He abolished preventative health services right across Queensland, cutting 177 full-time equivalent staff in public health units across the state. The Treasurer ripped funding from the Queensland Aids Council—a community organisation in this state that is so deeply connected to the community that it serves. That is the real impact of the cuts imposed by the member for Clayfield when he was the Treasurer.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr DICK: I would not be interjecting, member for Southern Downs. You were part of this as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Please, Minister, not the word 'you'.

Mr DICK: The member for Southern Downs aided and abetted the Treasurer in these awful cuts to harm the sexual health of Queenslanders. I am calling on the Leader of the Opposition to apologise for these cuts that hurt Queenslanders, that put leaders in sexual health services out of a job. I am calling on him to apologise.

Ms Trad: Shame!

Mr DICK: It is shameful. I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. Why did he inflict these vicious cuts on people who need help? Why did he do that? Why won't he apologise, that is the question I ask. Why won't he apologise for all but destroying sexual and preventative health services in this state? If he does not apologise we know it is back on the agenda. If he does not apologise we know that is what he believes in.

Aurukun, Economic Development

Mr GORDON: My question is to the Premier. Premier, ahead of your visit to the remote Aboriginal community of Aurukun, could you outline to the House what economic development opportunities and job opportunities your government has for the community of Aurukun?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Cook very much for that question. I am quite sure that the member for Cook joins with me, the government, and I hope the opposition by the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. This issue transcends politics. The issues in Aurukun are extremely serious, they are extremely complex and we need to work on a whole-of-government solution to the complexities that are in this community. We do need to make sure that there are job opportunities for the Aurukun community. I have already been speaking with my director-general in relation to having discussions with Rio Tinto about how we can bring forward some of the training that is needed for the Amrun project that has been approved by Rio Tinto, an over \$2 billion project that will see the expansion of a new mine. I want to see communities living close to that project have the opportunity to have jobs in that community. It is absolutely imperative that we get the training. We have some people in mind who could go in there and help with those projects. I will endeavour to keep the member for Cook fully updated with progress.

Today the Deputy Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Health, the Minister for Education, the Minister for Police and myself discussed youth unemployment issues in the local community and the

need for some of the disengaged youth to get involved in some training and youth activities. My visit to Aurukun this Friday is an incredibly serious visit. This morning when I was speaking with the mayor he said that he would organise a community forum. I offer an invitation to the member for Cook to join us on our visit to the community on Friday for this opportunity to sit down and listen very closely to all of the community members about how we can work together to help build the capacity with the mayor and the council as we as a government tackle a very complex issue.

Once again I pay tribute to the teaching workforce and their support staff for their dedication and their commitment to providing the services that they did in the community. We have to remember, even though we are down here in Brisbane in the south-east, that Queensland is an incredibly large state and that is why I have made a firm commitment as Premier to travel the length and breadth of the state as much as I possibly can to be out in the regional communities and to listen to people. I am looking forward to visiting Aurukun on Friday. Some of my ministers will be accompanying me and I offer an invitation to the member for Cook to join us as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Townsville, member for Cook, that was a serious and important question but can I remind you that in asking a question you need to phrase it in the context of 'will the Premier advise' or 'will the minister advise', not 'will you advise'.

Police Service, Specialist Training Exercises

Mr STEWART: My question is of the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services and I ask: will the minister please update the House on specialist training exercises being undertaken by the Queensland Police Service.

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for the question. Most members of the House would realise that the risk of a terrorist event or attack in Australia is probable and it is timely in that circumstance to reflect on the activities of the Queensland Police Service. They regularly conduct capability preparation exercises to ensure the safety of Queenslanders in the event of a major public emergency. In recent times exercise Sailfish Takedown physically tested the capabilities of specialist units, including PoAir, Intelligence, Water Police and tactical response operators. Sailfish Takedown is one of a number of similar exercises designed to improve operational response capabilities that directly support front-line officers who respond to high-risk incidents. Up to 40 officers, four Water Police vessels and PoAir were all involved in tracking a vessel and tactically boarding that vessel.

These exercises are important in providing practical application of specific skills and they develop and maintain officers' specialist skills and capabilities. In the future many more exercises will be taking place. In particular, an Australia-New Zealand Counter-Terrorism Committee-approved counterterrorism exercise will be held in the very near future. It will be testing the counterterrorism capabilities of the Queensland Police Service in the prevention and resolution of multiple terrorism threats occurring simultaneously. The exercise will test responses to a range of different scenarios, including sieges and managing active armed offenders. Significantly, the practising of decision-making at the highest level will also be tested during these exercises.

A major part of the Queensland government's counterterrorism strategy is to safeguard the community through effective and collaborative arrangements to counter terrorism and its consequences. The Palaszczuk government remains committed to keeping Queenslanders safe and I commend the Queensland Police Service for actively engaging in exercises that continually challenge the capabilities and test the interoperability of its specialist units. I note the comments made earlier by the Leader of the Opposition regarding Aurukun. I would assume that in this space, that is, counterterrorism activity, those opposite would support the government and the Queensland Police Service in their efforts.

Commonwealth Games Federation

Mr HART: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier demonstrate accountability by undertaking to publicly table in this House all progress reports and updates that have been provided to the Commonwealth Games Federation over the past month?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. I will ask the Minister for the Commonwealth Games if he can provide the member with a briefing. I understand that some of those documents may be subject to confidentiality provisions between the government and the federation. We have to abide by those commitments, as everyone would appreciate.

Ms Jones interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Exactly. I take the interjection from the Minister for Education: the same guidelines would have existed under the former Newman government. On this side of the House we are more than happy to provide briefings to any member from the Gold Coast who would like a briefing on the Commonwealth Games. I remember when I was in opposition at times I asked for a briefing on the Commonwealth Games. During that whole three years I received zero briefings. That is very disappointing, because as a parliament we should be supporting the games.

Ms Trad: Bipartisan.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, bipartisan. I am very happy for the member to sit down with the Minister for the Commonwealth Games. As I said, there may be agreements that are subject to confidentiality and I am sure that all members of the House would appreciate that.

Defined Benefit Scheme

Mr WHITING: My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer update the House on the long-term assets operations in the QTC half-yearly report December 2015?

Mr PITT: I cannot wait. I thank the honourable member for asking me a question about this matter, which was raised earlier. One always has to look at the detail when it comes to questions from those opposite. That is something that I have learned in this place. The QTC half-yearly report states that this is not a loss by the defined benefit scheme. If those opposite had wanted to check, they would have gone to the QSuper report, which shows that it is well and truly in surplus.

We had to have a very close look at this: under longstanding administrative arrangements, the Queensland Treasury Corporation, on behalf of the state, returns the investments held to meet the state's long-term obligations. That is part of the broader fiscal principle and it is one we have had across successive governments. Primarily, superannuation is managed by QIC Limited. Therefore, this result bears no impact whatsoever in terms of the value of the returns of the long-term assets portfolio. The operating loss for the half year was due to the interest rate on the fixed rate notes exceeding earnings from the portfolio.

We have now had an opportunity to again read the report. Page 4 of the QTC report states that the investment returns from QIC in the six months to 31 December 2015 are \$319 million. QTC then pays the fixed rate note to government of just over \$1 billion—\$1.138 billion—and the management fees are \$35 million. The difference between those figures is \$855 million. That is not an investment loss; it is just the difference between the investment returns that we have seen over the six-month period for the fixed rate note paid by QTC to government.

It is no wonder that we had a hard time trying to make sense of the question. I will look at the wording of the question, but I think that those opposite may well have tried to mislead the House, because this is not related to the health of the defined benefit scheme, as we have said. I have to ask the question: if this is the best that they can do in terms of their fear campaign, if they have to get tricky and misrepresent—

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I do not want a debate about the question. Please answer the question, if you have anything further to add.

Mr PITT: I reiterate that, as we have said, the most recently published information in terms of the health of the defined benefit scheme according to the Actuary's report, as well as from QSuper, shows that it has a surplus of more than \$10 billion. Essentially, this question is trying to trick people into thinking that there was a significant loss when, in fact, there was not. It is simply operations and looking at the interest rate fluctuations.

This is a disgraceful suggestion by those opposite. I will examine the question. Mr Speaker, I may consider writing to you on whether they have deliberately misled the House. Yet again I reaffirm to all public servants that, despite the fear campaign being driven by those opposite, their entitlements are safe. QSuper has said so, the Actuary has said so and the government has said so. The only people who seem to be at odds are those opposite.

Mount Cotton Driver Training Centre

Mr McEACHAN: My question is to the Minister for Main Roads. Can the minister please advise if the funds raised from the sale of the Mount Cotton driver training centre will be put back into Redlands roads?

Mr BAILEY: As the member would know, the Mount Cotton driving centre is in partnership with the RACQ, the foremost motoring body in Queensland. The funds will go into the driver excellence centre. We are committed to working with our road safety stakeholders to ensure the best possible road safety outcomes. Over time at the centre we have seen changes. For instance, it was used by the Queensland Police Service, but they no longer do that. The centre's use has declined over time. As is the normal process of government, we buy and sell properties all the time. That is a normal part of government.

Mr Nicholls: You are selling it off. It is an asset sale.

Mr BAILEY: I take that interjection. Opposition members and, in particular, the Leader of the Opposition should know that the department of main roads buys and sells properties every week of the year and has done so throughout the history of the state.

Mr McEACHAN: I rise to a point of order on relevance. I asked what would happen to the proceeds of the sale. Will they be put back into Redlands roads?

Mr SPEAKER: I think the minister is responding to an interjection raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BAILEY: We build roads and we build highways. When we have pieces of land that we do not need any more, we sell them. Then we buy other pieces of land to build roads and highways on. That is the nature of government. For the opposition to be interjecting on their own question—fantastic leadership from the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, do not debate the issue. Do you have anything further to add?

Mr BAILEY: Yes. It is the normal process of government to do that. To suggest otherwise is a pretty base kind of interjection and suggestion. To the member for Redlands I say: we are happy to work with the RACQ, which is a very key stakeholder, in terms of this site. Every year we invest a huge amount of money into road safety. We will continue to do that. Members will have seen the recent Easter road safety campaign. It was a very effective and affecting campaign about speed and young people. I think it has been very successful. We will continue to spend large amounts of money on road safety, from an engineering point of view and an advertising point of view. We will work with the RACQ to increase driving skills on our roads. We will do the normal things that governments do in terms of assets: we will buy and sell them, as we do every week, every month, under all kinds of governments—

Mr McEACHAN: I rise to a point of order on relevance. I still have not heard whether the money will be invested in Redlands roads.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the minister has answered your question.

Small Business

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government is supporting small businesses? Can the minister outline any of the successful events held last week during Small Business Week?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for Maryborough for the question. I know that, as a small business operator with some 25 years experience, he understands the challenges that small businesses face and also the opportunities that our changing economy presents to small businesses in our great state.

Since being elected the Palaszczuk government has been focused on creating a positive business environment through our Advance Queensland innovation and jobs plan. We have concentrated on building the new, knowledge based economy and helping small businesses start, grow and employ because this government's agenda is about creating jobs now and jobs for the future.

Sadly, the former LNP government had a different agenda. As treasurer in the Newman government, the Leader of the Opposition's budget slashed more than 20 per cent of the staff from the small business department. In fact, his very first budget abolished the Queensland Small Business Commissioner and made cuts to the hugely popular monitoring for growth program.

According to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland, despite the rhetoric to the contrary, the burden of red tape on business increased while the member for Clayfield was treasurer. One in four businesses felt their growth was hindered by red tape and were disappointed that the LNP had let them down. That is the record of those opposite, yet they claim to be able to get our state moving—but in which direction?

Contrast this record with the Palaszczuk government's agenda to build confidence, to create a positive business environment and to help small business participate in the digital economy. Last week we held one of the biggest events in our state's small business calendar—2016 Queensland Small Business Week. The themes of the week included fostering innovation, improving collaboration, preparing for digital disruption and planning for change.

As I have said previously, during the week I engaged with more than 500 small business owners and operators right across Queensland. I can tell members that they are fully engaged with the Palaszczuk government's forward-looking, positive agenda for our state. Small businesses are the engine room of our economy, but, more than that, in many regional areas they are the heartbeat of local communities.

In my electorate of Algeester, as is the case in electorates across the state, small businesses not only provide important services but often put back into their community by sponsoring and supporting local community and sporting groups. The positive outlook those involved in the small business sector hold for our economy and their own fortunes gives me great confidence in our state's future. In fact, during the whole week what we heard from small businesses is that they want a government that is talking up the economy so that people feel confident not an opposition that is talking down our economy.

Aviation Safety Standards

Ms LEAHY: My question is to the Minister for Public Works. I refer to the state government's draft aviation safety standards, and I ask: can the minister advise upon what basis it shall be determined if an air charter firm's business continuity plan is acceptable or not?

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker—

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, you are warned under standing order 253A.

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for the question. I also thank the member for her hospitality a few weeks ago when I attended the electorate of Warrego to talk about things housing. I note that the question of aviation infrastructure was not asked of me then. I will endeavour to advise the member on that in due course.

Regional Queensland, Jobs

Mr FURNER: My question is to the Minister for Employment. Will the minister update the House on the government's efforts to generate jobs in regional Queensland and of any alternative policies?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have a maximum of two minutes.

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for the question. I know that he has a keen interest in jobs. He has been a strong advocate for many years.

We have had a series of regional employment forums throughout regional Queensland from Mount Isa to Rockhampton, Gladstone, Bundaberg, Maryborough, Pine Rivers and the Gold Coast. Just last week we were with the member for Barron River in Cairns. Next week we will be in Toowoomba.

These forums bring together business groups, employers, local government representatives and other stakeholders to explore opportunities for job creation in the regions. We have heard some exciting ideas from forum participants in recent weeks and months. I am very keen to include some of these ideas in the regional jobs package that will be announced in next month's state budget.

These forums have highlighted the need for the state government to work with regional communities to build more entrepreneurial skills, diversify the economy and provide greater employment opportunities. Regional communities also want more opportunities for self-employment, particularly for young people. They want more investment, like our capital works program which is worth \$35 billion over four years—an investment that supports 27,000 jobs.

We will continue to speak with those in the regions to determine from them the challenges they are facing. The forums draw this out. It asks them about the challenges they are facing. It asks them about the opportunities they see in diversifying their economies. Then it asks for examples of ways in which the government can assist them to grow their regions.


One thing that we hear constantly is that the public servants from the regions that were sacked had great beneficial impacts on the regions. We will undo this. We will work with them to provide an outcome that will be about jobs for all of those in the regions and we look forward to it.

Mr SPEAKER: Question time has finished.

PUBLIC HEALTH (WATER RISK MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 17 March (see p. 887).

Second Reading

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.05 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to speak in support of this bill which forms part of a detailed and comprehensive health reform program which will improve the lives of all Queenslanders. Two weeks ago, during our last sitting, this parliament passed the Palaszczuk government's historic nurse-to-patient ratio laws. Few in the chamber will forget the overwhelming and enthusiastic support we received from nurses and midwives in the gallery as the legislation was debated.

Last week I had the pleasure of launching *My health, Queensland's future: Advancing health 2026*, the Palaszczuk government's vision and 10-year agenda for Queensland's health system. Today, consistent with this government's commitment to improving the health of Queenslanders and our track record of delivering meaningful health sector reform, I have the pleasure of participating in this debate of yet another significant health bill.

I thank the Transportation and Utilities Committee for its consideration of the bill and for its report tabled on 12 May 2016 recommending that the bill be passed. I table the government's response to the committee report.

Tabled paper: Transportation and Utilities Committee: Report No. 15—Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill 2016, government response.

The committee recommended that I clarify in my second reading speech the meaning of the term 'person in charge', and that I also investigate options for including a precise definition of 'person in charge' in whatever legislation is considered most appropriate. I am happy to provide this clarification, and will do so shortly.

Firstly, I wish to thank those organisations that made submissions to inform the committee's deliberations, in particular the Master Plumbers' Association and Services Trades Queensland. The plumbing trades are at the forefront of the management and control of legionella and it is a topic I know they care very deeply about. I appreciate the insight and professional expertise they have contributed to the committee's consideration of the bill.

As I informed the House when introducing this bill, in 2013 Queensland's Chief Health Officer, Dr Jeannette Young, investigated two cases of hospital acquired legionnaires disease at a metropolitan private hospital. Following her investigation, Dr Young published a report that included recommendations to improve the management and control of legionella risks in hospitals and residential aged-care facilities.

Dr Young's recommendations included interim arrangements requiring Queensland hospitals and public residential aged-care facilities to develop and implement water quality risk management plans to address the risks associated with legionella bacteria. Under the interim arrangements, which have been in place since mid-2014, these facilities have also been routinely testing their water supplies for the presence of legionella bacteria in accordance with their water risk management plans. In her report, Dr Young also recommended that in the medium term the legislative framework for legionella management and control be strengthened through the inclusion of requirements in the Public Health Act 2005.

That is why, through this bill, the Palaszczuk Labor government is implementing a more robust and comprehensive legislative framework to improve the management and control of health risks associated with the supply and use of water in hospitals and residential aged-care facilities. The bill maintains a current requirement for facilities to have in place water risk management plans. However, it broadens the scope of matters that facilities must consider under their plans when assessing the health risks relevant to the supply and use of water in their facilities.

These matters include hazards relevant to water that could reasonably be expected to cause illness or injury such as legionella bacteria, other microorganisms, chemical substances or physical properties such as temperature. They also include hazardous events such as interruptions in the supply of water from events such as water main breaks, natural disasters and drinking water service provider maintenance activities, or changes in drinking water quality.

Water risk management plans are recognised internationally as the most effective method of managing health risks associated with water related hazards. They are reflected in the World Health Organization's water safety framework approach for ensuring drinking water safety as outlined in its *Guidelines for drinking-water quality*. They are also intrinsic to the risk based approach adopted in the national guidelines for legionella control in health and aged-care facilities that were approved by the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee in late 2015.

Water risk management plans have been shown to deliver tangible benefits when addressing the health risks associated with legionella bacteria. For example, a study published in 2010 in the *American journal of infection control* showed that legionella bacteria were less likely to be detected in cooling towers where risk management plans had been implemented. It has also been anecdotally reported that early adopters of the United States' guidelines for legionella detection and control saw cases of hospital acquired disease associated with legionella bacteria decline from 33 per cent to three per cent.

The comprehensive risk assessment and risk management approach to hazards used in the development of water risk management plans is similar to those which have been in place for many decades in the food and manufacturing industries to ensure the production of safe, high-quality products. We know that the risks associated with water related hazards are likely to vary between different types of health and residential aged-care facilities, and even between different locations within a facility. The use of water risk management plans provides facilities with flexibility to tailor appropriate management activities and control measures to address those hazards relevant to the facility, having regard to the level of risk to their patients or residents.

To ensure that prescribed facilities' water risk management plans are robustly designed and considered, and developed to a consistent and appropriate standard, the bill outlines the information a plan must contain. The requirements relating to the content of plans have been informed by world's best practice and also align closely with the new national guidelines for legionella control in health and aged-care facilities.

To support compliance, the bill places a number of obligations regarding water risk management plans on the person responsible for a prescribed facility. The responsible person for a prescribed facility is required to ensure that the facility has a compliant water risk management plan and that the facility operates in accordance with the plan. The responsible person must also take all reasonable steps to ensure that each person who has an obligation to comply with the plan while the facility is operating does so. Finally, the bill also provides that the responsible person must provide the chief executive of the Department of Health with a copy of the facility's plan on request and amend a plan if directed to do so by the chief executive. For public sector hospitals and state residential aged-care facilities, the responsible person is the relevant hospital and health service chief executive for the hospital or aged-care facility. For private health facilities licensed under the Private Health Facilities Act, the responsible person is the licensee for the facility.

Importantly, the bill framework also outlines requirements relating to the notification and reporting of water test results. The bill requires the person in charge of a facility to notify the Department of Health within one business day after being notified of a test result confirming the presence of legionella bacteria in water used by the facility. This will ensure that the Department of Health is aware of the legionella detection and will also enable the department to determine whether the facility is responding appropriately in accordance with its water risk management plan. Repeated positive detections will also enable the department to identify those facilities that may be facing challenges in managing their water supplies. This will enable the department to provide them with expert advice and support.

The bill also requires the person in charge of a prescribed facility to provide periodic reports to the Department of Health about the water tests undertaken for legionella in accordance with the facility's water risk management plan, including test results. It is intended that these reports will be provided on a quarterly basis. As the committee noted in its report, the term 'person in charge of a prescribed facility' is not defined in the bill. This approach was taken because there is not a single common position for each of the different facility types that can be used to precisely define the term.

It is important to note that the term 'person in charge' is currently used in a number of different contexts throughout the Public Health Act without being defined. These include a person in charge of

a hospital, a person in charge of a health service facility, a person in charge of a healthcare facility, a person in charge of a public sector health service and a person in charge of a place. In legislation, terms that are not defined take their natural meaning. The *Macquarie Concise Dictionary* defines the term 'in charge of' to mean 'having the care or supervision of' or 'under the care or supervision of'. Consistent with this, it was intended that the person in charge of a prescribed facility would be taken to mean the person who has supervisory responsibility for the day-to-day operation and control of the facility.

I have noted the committee's view that the terms 'responsible person' and 'person in charge' may be interchangeable and its concerns regarding this given that the bill applies penalties for noncompliance to both these categories of person. To address these concerns, I intend to use the regulation-making power in new section 61D(g) of the bill to require facilities to identify, by position, the person in charge of the facility in their water risk management plans. This will remove any doubt as to the identity of the person in charge of a specific prescribed facility.


Hospitals and residential aged-care facilities care for some of the most vulnerable people in our community. Therefore, it is vitally important that Queenslanders can be confident that these facilities are regularly testing their water supplies for legionella bacteria and responding appropriately to any detections. Therefore, the bill enables the Department of Health to publish data provided by prescribed facilities in periodic reports, to provide greater public transparency regarding the water-testing activities being undertaken by these facilities. It is intended that the department will publish the data quarterly, although circumstances may arise from time to time that necessitate more frequent reporting.

The bill provides for a range of offences relating to noncompliance with bill provisions by a responsible person or a person in charge. Currently, these range from \$23,560 to up to \$117,800 for the two most serious offences. These amounts will increase from 1 July 2016 in line with the government's recently approved penalty unit increase. The penalties reflect the significant responsibility hospitals and residential aged-care facilities have for providing a safe environment for their patients and residents.

The bill will initially apply to facilities currently subject to the interim arrangements—that is, public hospitals, public residential aged-care facilities and private health facilities licensed under the Private Health Facilities Act 1999. As I mentioned earlier, under the interim arrangements these facilities have already implemented water risk management plans and legionella testing regimes. The magnitude of additional costs incurred by individual facilities in complying with the broadened scope of matters that must be considered under their water risk management plans will depend on a number of variables. These include the size of the facility and the complexity of its water infrastructure, the scope of matters already considered under its existing plan, the quality of the existing plan and the extent of the facility's reliance on external contractors.

It is intended that the legislation will be implemented in the private residential aged-care sector at a later date. To enable this, the bill provides for private sector residential aged-care facilities to be prescribed by regulation. The Palaszczuk Labor government is mindful that the private residential aged-care sector comprises a variety of different providers and facilities, ranging from large for-profit providers with multiple facilities to small not-for-profit community supported facilities. Given this, implementation of the legislation in this sector will be undertaken through a phased process in order to minimise the impact on smaller providers. The Department of Health will consult closely with stakeholders regarding the potential costs to that sector as part of the implementation process.

As I stated in my explanatory speech, the proposed amendments contained in this bill will deliver the most stringent regulatory framework in Australia with regard to water risk management in hospitals and residential aged-care facilities. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (4.09 pm): It is my pleasure to rise to speak to the Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill 2016. I can indicate to the minister and the parliament that the opposition will be supporting this bill. The bill provides for amendments to the Public Health Act 2005 to give a legislative framework to improve management and control of health risks associated with supply and use of water in hospitals, residential aged-care facilities, in particular, the health risk associated with the legionella bacteria; and, secondly, to provide transparency of water-testing activities being undertaken in health facilities.

I will refer in my second reading speech to the report of the Transport and Utilities Committee, chaired by the member for Kallangur. I commend this committee and the committee secretariat for a comprehensive committee report that helped someone like me, who has taken over this portfolio for the opposition in the last two weeks, to be able to comprehensively get across a bill like this. I note that

there are a number of members on the committee, as there are on all of our committees. The member for Southport is the deputy chair. The other committee members are the member for Redlands, the member for Whitsunday, the member for Logan and the member for Murrumba. As the first person responding to the minister—and I know I will be using some material that committee members will—I want to thank the committee, committee members and the secretariat for the information they provided.

Some of the historical information is particularly interesting when it comes to this particular bacteria and how it got its name. It is something that I remember and that I will speak about in a moment. On page 12 of the committee report it states—

Clause 61A of the Bill proposes to define a 'prescribed facility' to mean:

- (a) a public sector hospital that provides treatment or care to inpatients; or
- (b) a private health facility licensed under the *Private Health Facilities Act 1999*; or
- (c) a State aged care facility; or
- (d) a residential aged care facility, other than a State aged care facility, prescribed by regulation.

It mentions clause 61A of the bill, which proposes to define a prescribed facility to mean (a) a public sector hospital that provides treatment or care to inpatients or (b) a private health facility licensed under the private 1999 or a state aged-care facility or a residential other than a state aged-care facility prescribed by regulation.

In looking back at the history, this is something I remember from when I was in year 10 at Sunnybank State High School. There was an American Legion meeting in Philadelphia to celebrate the bicentennial of the signing of the declaration of independence. It was a bit like the bird flu epidemic of 2007 in Asia that created a pandemic across Asia. Some time after the convention in Philadelphia a number of people were affected by what seemed to be some strange form of pneumonia, and 25 people subsequently died. Because they had all dispersed—as has happened at our convention centre recently where they had food poisoning outbreaks leading to the decision not to provide eggs anymore—there was basically a panic in the region because it was unknown what was causing this disorder. It turned out, some months later, that a bacteria which people thought could affect only animals affected humans. That is where the foundation of legionnaire's disease originally came from.

Fast-forward 40 years later, the Democratic Party is having its convention in Philadelphia. It is almost 40 years to the day of that outbreak in Philadelphia in 1976. Let us hope that nothing similar happens at the democrat convention. The republicans are in Cleveland, Ohio. Some would suggest it would be good if the republicans had it in Philadelphia and there was an outbreak again, given their nominee for president.

It is interesting historically that from an issue which affected people so long ago a disease was able to be identified from a bacteria that is actually very common. That is mentioned in the committee report at page 6, which states—

There are over 50 species of Legionella bacteria, some of which can cause disease in humans. The most serious disease is legionnaire's disease, which is a severe and potentially fatal form of pneumonia. Legionella bacteria from natural water sources can enter and colonise manufactured water systems, which are commonly found in commercial, industrial, health care, aged care, child care and education facilities ...

It mentions air-handling systems incorporating water-cooling towers and evaporative condensers; piped water supplies and cold, warm and hot water pipework; spa pools, spa baths and hydrotherapy pools; ice machines and chilled water dispensers; air-houses such as industrial humidifiers used in paint, electroplating and finishing shops; humidifiers and nebulisers; and decorative fountains. There are a number of sources of legionella bacteria. I will conclude my speech with a quote from the department about the fact that we need to get this information out there publicly, because it is a lack of knowledge that leads to many people asking plumbers or people involved in this industry about legionella concerns. When we get vague sorts of flus or colds, people with a little bit of knowledge will often draw the conclusion—whether it is via Dr Google or some other form—that maybe they have a disease that could be potentially very dangerous.

That is what happened in 2013 when legionella bacteria brought a Brisbane UnitingCare health facility to a standstill when a cancer patient died from a lung infection and a second patient ended up in intensive care after contracting the disease. At the request of Lawrence Springborg, the then minister for health, the Chief Health Officer, Dr Jeanette Young, was tasked to undertake a review of the prevention and control of legionella pneumophila infection in Queensland. At page 7 of the report I note that the Chief Health Officer recommended—

... the introduction of interim measures requiring public hospitals, public residential aged care facilities and licensed private health facilities to develop and implement water quality risk management plans, focusing on the management and control of Legionella bacteria risks. These interim measures have been in place since mid-2014.

The minister referred to those water quality risk management plans in his second reading speech.

In terms of the scope of the legionella species, clause 61A proposes the definition of legionella to mean bacteria belonging to the genus legionella. As I have already mentioned, there are over 50 types. The interim measures were the precursor to the amendments to the Public Health Act that we are debating here today. As I have mentioned, despite legionnaire's being uncommon in Australia, it is a type of bacteria found very commonly in the environment, as we have already mentioned. It can cause legionellosis, a respiratory disease that can affect the lungs and cause pneumonia. It can also cause less serious infections.

The likelihood that a healthy person who is exposed to legionella bacteria will develop illness is extremely low. However, patients with chronic medical conditions are more at risk than others—sadly, as we saw in Brisbane in 2013. That was also the case with elderly American legionnaires who got that condition originally in 1976. Similarly, in the flu season it is the elderly and infirm who are more likely to get the flu that becomes the most prominent strain in Queensland or Australia each winter. Dr Young noted in her report that there has previously been no recorded hospital outbreak of legionellosis in Queensland. There have only been a few very small outbreaks consisting of two or three cases of legionellosis in community settings in Queensland. Nonetheless, the need for more strident monitoring and reporting mechanisms in our hospitals was apparent.

The explanatory notes detail that the improved management and control of health risks associated with supply and use of water in hospitals will be achieved by requiring the healthcare provider to establish a water risk management plan, notify the health department of positive legionella results, provide for periodic reporting of water test results, and extends the powers of an authorised person to conduct audits.

I note that the committee report made two recommendations—the minister has already acknowledged those—the first one being that the committee recommended the Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill 2016 be passed. We are supporting this recommendation, as I have already indicated. Secondly, the committee recommends that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services clarify in his second reading speech the meaning of the term 'person in charge' and investigate options for including a precise definition of person in charge in whatever legislation is considered most appropriate. I thank the minister for clarifying this quite extensively in his speech today. I would hope that would satisfy the committee. I look forward to the presentations by committee members today which should verify that fact.

It is widely recognised, as the minister said, that water risk management plans are the most effective method of managing health risks associated with water related hazards. The bill provides that the responsible person of a prescribed facility must ensure that there is a compliant water risk management plan for the facility unless the person has a reasonable excuse. The bill outlines in detail that a water risk management plan must contain a number of different items.

I want to refer back to the issue of the clarification of the term 'person in charge' or responsible person. This is about clause 4 of the bill. I note the minister mentioned a new section 61 and it being a potential issue about compliance with the Legislative Standards Act and the FLPs, the fundamental legislative principles. That is what the minister referred to today.

As I was just saying, the water risk management plan must contain a number of different items, including the following: a description of the prescribed facility's water distribution system; identification of hazards, hazard sources and hazardous events relevant to water within the facility's water distribution system; and assessment of the risks associated with hazards, hazard sources and hazardous events identified. In addition to these, a risk management plan must state the following: what measures are to be taken to control the risks assessed, including the procedures that must be implemented for monitoring the effectiveness of the measures; and a schedule that must be complied with for testing water for legionella and other identified hazards at a frequency informed by the risks, measures and procedures. The bill also enables the government to prescribe additional plan elements in regulation. The explanatory notes set out that this approach will ensure that the legislative framework has sufficient operational flexibility for the various types and sizes of health facilities covered by the bill.

I would also like to touch on two other aspects of this bill raised during the committee's deliberations and covered in the committee's report. I notice that a number of these issues were raised by the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service. They were concerned about what the costs of the amendments would mean for healthcare facilities, and they were also concerned about the monitoring of legionella bacteria generally. Obviously, it is very important to make sure that health

facilities can identify exactly what type of legionella bacteria is there and it is imperative that this particular monitoring is done. Page 9 of the committee report stated—

... the Department advised:

- the costs for facilities captured by the interim measures. ... are not expected to be significant
- funding will have to be set aside to implement remedial measures should Legionella or other hazards be detected in the facility water supply system
- estimated costs associated with expanding existing WRMPs ... are expected to range from virtually nothing to over \$100,000
- similarly, the range of costs associated with infrastructure improvements will vary, for example, new facilities with good incoming water quality will have limited infrastructure expenditure while other facilities have identified improvements to cost in excess of \$1 million
- for State government facilities it is anticipated that these costs will be incurred over a period of years, as upgrades to infrastructure are implemented within existing infrastructure budgets
- budgeting arrangements for licensed private health facilities are largely unknown

I note that there was no resistance from those facilities. The department also advised—

- other costs to Government such as compliance, enforcement and provision of training and awareness will be funded within existing budget allocations.

That is why I referred to the fact that the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service were concerned about the considerable costs. The department responded—

There are a number of variables. ... These include the size and age of a facility, the complexity of the water infrastructure, the availability of in-house expertise and incoming water quality.

I have already referred to that. As I said, the general response was that the cost would range from virtually nothing—because many of these facilities have already got these WRMPs in place—to potentially over \$100,000. The department further added—

Similarly the range of costs associated with infrastructure improvements will, in some cases, be significant—

As I mentioned, some newer facilities have good incoming water quality and they will have limited infrastructure expenditure, while other facilities will have improvements that will cost in excess of \$1 million. I have also mentioned that for state government facilities these costs will be incurred over a period of years. We will be watching the upcoming budget process to ensure that each HHS has sufficient resources to quickly and adequately deal with any water quality issues identified as a result of their regulatory responsibilities under this bill.

Clause 61K of the bill proposes a requirement that the chief executive of the department publish, in a report, notices given by facilities about the presence of legionella or reports about prescribed tests for legionella undertaken in accordance with water risk management plans. The Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service submission raised a concern that public reporting of all legionella test results may not be in the best interests of healthcare facilities nor the public as it may result in unjustified levels of concern and anxiety amongst the public and staff and undermine confidence in a facility. I would like to put into the *Hansard* the response from the department to the risks or concerns that may be associated with public reporting. The Chief Health Officer stated—


I do not believe there are any risks. I am certain that people are concerned about it because they are concerned that people will find out information about their facility that they might prefer that people not know about, but I think it is very important and I think the public values knowledge. The more we get the information out there, the more it becomes understood. It is not necessarily that a facility has done anything wrong by having legionella in their water supply. It is ubiquitous; it is everywhere. The problem is how they respond to that. If facilities have to have that information out there publicly, then the community I think will have greater confidence in the services that are being provided to them.

On behalf of the opposition, I concur absolutely with that statement. It is important that we make sure that people have the knowledge and understand what it is in these public reports. People need to understand what that public reporting means and whether they should be concerned. They should not necessarily just hear a word or two and then be worried about what it actually means, especially given that we have already mentioned that legionella is a very, very common bacteria.

I want to finish my speech today on the part of the committee report that refers to ice machines, warm water systems and thermostatic mixing valves. We are not sure exactly how diseases like this can come about, so this is very important. The committee report mentioned that we sometimes do not think that equipment such as ice machines, warm water systems and thermostatic mixing valves could be the source of something like legionella. Submissions from the Plumbers Union and the Master

Plumbers' Association mentioned that industry standards are very important when it comes to the maintenance of these sorts of machines.

Whilst we are not necessarily speaking about the facilities in which some of these machines may be covered as part of the bill—and I am talking about hospitals and residential aged-care facilities—many of these ice machines and warm water systems are in hotels and other facilities so it is very important, as the department advised, that industry standards that are called up in legislation would be considered by the Department of Housing and Public Works. I note that the committee asked the Department of Health if they intend to alert the Department of Housing and Public Works to the matter of having licensed persons to make sure these machines are being assessed and also applying industry standards for these machines, even though they are not necessarily in the hospitals and aged-care facilities but are in other buildings and businesses around Queensland. The last thing we want is for people to not follow the industry standards—whether it is for servicing or whether it is for making sure that all of their facilities are kept up to date, and often that can be in the private sector—and for that to potentially lead to a tragic or fatal conclusion or an extremely serious case of legionnaire's disease. With those comments, as I have already mentioned, I want to indicate our support for the bill.

 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (4.39 pm): I rise today also to speak in favour of the Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill 2016. I would like to start by thanking the members of the Transportation and Utilities Committee for their work on the bill and special thanks also to the hardworking secretariat staff Kate, Rachelle, Lisa and Julie.

This bill will amend the Public Health Act to bring into legislation a framework which will improve the management of, and help control, the health risks associated with the supply and use of water in hospitals and residential aged care facilities. It will deal in particular with the health risks associated with the legionella bacteria. The bill will provide for greater public transparency of water testing undertaken by these facilities. There are already interim measures in place which address these issues and this bill will expand on and consolidate these measures.

The bill will initially apply to public hospitals, public residential aged care facilities and private health facilities licensed under the Private Health Facilities Act 1999. However, the implementation of the bill within the private residential aged care sector will be undertaken at a later date through a phased process. We will be consulting closely with stakeholders as part of this process.

Implementation of the bill will be supported by the Department of Health through a range of activities including the development of a communications strategy and a range of regulatory support tools in the form of web based fact sheets. The regulatory support tools will assist facilities to develop and improve their water risk management plans and assist them to comply with water testing and reporting requirements.

As previously stated, there are over 50 species of legionella bacteria. Only some of these, however, pose a risk of disease in humans. The most serious disease from these bacteria strains is legionnaire's disease, which is a severe and potentially fatal form of pneumonia. In general, the common manufactured water systems which provide paths for legionella bacteria to enter and colonise are: water cooling towers and evaporative condensers; piped water supplies and cold, warm and hot water pipework; spas; ice machines and chilled water dispensers; and humidifiers and nebulisers. As some of these are commonly found in health and aged care facilities, the need to manage these risks and implement a legislative framework to do so is vital.

Internationally, water risk management plans are recognised as the most effective method of managing health risks associated with water related hazards. As these hazards are not just confined to microbial hazards such as legionella bacteria, the bill will require facilities to put in place water risk management plans that address the risks associated with a range of hazards such as disease-causing microorganisms as well as chemical contaminants and other issues such as interruptions to the supply of water. As we heard from Dr Jeannette Young during our public hearing, these water risk management plans allow for flexibility, depending on the size of the organisation and the risk profile of the facility's occupants.

During our examination the committee asked for clarification on the anticipated costs of the implementation of this bill. The department advised that for those facilities that are already adhering to this through the interim measures, the additional cost to make this permanent would not be significant. Estimated costs associated with expanding existing water risk management plans are expected to range from virtually nothing to \$100,000, depending on the size of the facility. Compliance, enforcement and provision of training will be funded from within existing budgets. It is anticipated that these costs

will be incurred over a period of years as upgrades to infrastructure are implemented within the existing budgets.

The committee also requested further details on any alternative mechanisms to a water risk management plan, and the department advised that, as mentioned in the explanatory notes—and I stated earlier—water risk management plans are recognised internationally as the preferred method of managing water quality. This was supported by Mr Kelvin Slade from the Master Plumbers' Association of Queensland, who answered this question from the member for Southport at our public hearing—

Would it be more cost effective to simply mandate some sort of regular water testing, a little bit like what you see with fire extinguishers? Rather than having a water management plan, there may be a mandated half-yearly or annual water testing of risk areas. Would that be more efficient and cost effective?

Mr Slade replied—

No, in my opinion, for a couple of reasons. The infrastructure inside facilities varies from building to building. There are so many factors affecting the outbreak or the prevalence of legionella. That can be the quality of the water provided by the local entity, the age of the pipes, the material of the pipes, temperatures in the ceiling, flow rates through the water pipes within the building. The only real way to manage this is through the adoption of a water quality risk management plan.

The departmental representative also stated that prescribing a single schedule of water testing could result in an onerous level of testing for smaller facilities and prescribing generic controls could also result in unnecessary expenditure incurred for those smaller facilities. They also stated that there are a number of limitations associated with water testing, including samples taken for analysis representing only one point in time, that one point in time can take up to 10 days to analyse and that simpler water risk management plans would be entirely appropriate for smaller facilities which are likely to have much simpler water supply infrastructure.

The Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service raised a concern that public reporting of all legionella test results may not be in the best interests of healthcare facilities nor the public as it may result in unjustified levels of concern and anxiety amongst the public and staff and it may undermine confidence in a facility. At the public briefing the department responded to a question from the committee on the likely risks or concerns that may be associated with public reporting. They said—


... the public values knowledge. The more we get the information out there, the more it becomes understood. It is not necessarily that a facility has done anything wrong by having legionella in their water supply. It is ubiquitous; it is everywhere. The problem is how they respond to that. If facilities have to have that information out there publicly, then the community ... will have greater confidence in the services that are being provided to them.

Similarly, the plumbers union Queensland representative provided the following evidence—

It is something that everybody talks about, and unfortunately it is also subject to the rumour mill within the community. That is why we think it is really fantastic that there will be public reporting of this. There is no doubt in my mind—and there is no doubt in the minds of the people I talk to in our industry—that the lack of knowledge within the public on this matter is currently eroding public confidence and patient confidence in the system, so we think it is really fantastic that it is being addressed and that people will get a fair bit of knowledge, certainty and confidence in this area.

Both the plumbers union Queensland and the Masters Plumbers' Association of Queensland had concerns that many ice machines do not meet the watermark approval certification and that licensed persons must be employed to install and maintain any infrastructure related to legionella. The department's response in both cases was that the Department of Housing and Public Works would be the best to deal with these issues and they would be alerted to these matters. In relation to the ice machines, the department has in place a policy that requires these machines to comply with industry standards—that is watermark approval—when used in health facilities.

This bill will create a safer and more transparent system regarding the use of water in our hospitals and health facilities. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (4.47 pm): As a member of the committee, it is my pleasure to also rise in the House and speak in support of these proposed amendments. I want to bring to the House's attention that it was a very rigorous process that we went through in the review of these proposed changes because the risks associated with legionnaire's disease are significant and we can never afford to be frivolous or careless about issues of public safety. I should point out to the House that this review of legislation was actually initiated by the previous health minister and, thankfully, was continued by the now health minister and the department because it is such an important issue.

One of the concerns that I had through the process was, in good old LNP fashion, to make sure we got the best outcomes and that we just did not simply introduce more unnecessary red tape but came up with the most cost-effective way of delivering the outcomes that are so necessary in this process. As a result of the line of questioning—and a number of organisations and departmental staff

came and presented to us at the public inquiry into this amendment bill back in April. We had good representation from the Department of Health. We also had Jennifer Rossiter from Metro South Hospital and Health Service, and the plumbers union was also represented. As the member for Kallangur and others have highlighted, we had representation also from the Master Plumber's Association of Queensland in the form of the President, Mr Kelvin Slade, and the Executive Director, Penny Cornah.

What an education we enjoyed in that public inquiry as we explored all the intricacies and challenges and difficulties of adequately monitoring the risk of legionnaire's disease. As the member for Surfers Paradise pointed out earlier, there are some 50 strains of legionnaire's disease; however, there is only one that is of particular concern, and identifying, monitoring and tracking it to make sure that patients in hospitals, children in childcare centres and the elderly in aged care facilities are not impacted by this or exposed to this particular strain is important. We also heard from the Master Plumbers, and I would like to read a section from their submission because I think it is important. They state—

As members of the Committee are aware ice machines have been identified as a common point for legionella bacteria growth. MPAQ continues to hold concerns regarding the quality of ice machines used within our health system. We are advised that many machines do not meet certification standards—

We were surprised to learn that many machines in healthcare facilities, and even those ice-making machines in many fast-food outlets around the state, do not necessarily carry Water Mark approval as required by the National Construction Code Volume 3, the Plumbing Code of Australia. As the member for Surfers Paradise identified, this is a matter that will need further review, and we have referred that to the Minister for Housing and Public Works for further consideration.

Whenever you have heat and water together, then you have a risk of accelerating the incidence of this particular strain of legionella. In one case we heard evidence about a particular ice machine in a facility which I will not name, but it was a hospital. The intake pipe into the machine had been modified, and instead of being well clear of the condenser or the compressor, or some item in the machine that heats up, it ran a little too close to that particular item within the machine. As a result of that, before it was released into the machine or required by the machine to make more ice, the water temperature within the pipe fluctuated in and out of the safe operating temperature range during the ice-making process. Many other machines obviously comply and it is a design issue within ice-making machines, but it is certainly one that needs to be looked at more thoroughly in the future. As the legislation quite rightly identifies, it is an important issue for consideration as part of the review of all other associated equipment within public health facilities.

Throughout the course of the committee process and the public inquiry that was conducted in April there were a number of questions on notice that we raised as a committee, and I would like to speak to those briefly. The first question that I raised was in relation to cost. As the member for Kallangur and the chairman of our committee highlighted earlier, I did raise concerns about the cost and whether there were alternative ways of monitoring and checking for legionnaire's disease. I was particularly pleased with the response that we had from the department, and we also continued that line of questioning with Master Plumbers. The whole underlying principle with respect to water risk management and the need for these water risk management plans is not just about simply testing the water; it is also making sure that the equipment where these outbreaks are likely to occur is regularly reviewed. In some cases there may be a requirement for modifications to be made to items of equipment or even replacements. Not only are there requirements within the plans to monitor the safety of the water but there also needs to be a plan of action as to how that institution or organisation should respond should there be an identified outbreak of the particular strain of legionella that is of concern so that everybody involved knows what their responsibility is, they know how to respond and they know what actions to take not only to ensure the safety—and hopefully the recovery—of anyone that has been exposed to the risk but also to make sure that other members of the public who are exposed to that risk are adequately cared for.

We also heard from Master Plumbers, and we did not just speak about ice machines: we also had a presentation from them with respect to the risks associated with thermostatic mixing valves. We had a private meeting with Master Plumbers a few weeks before the inquiry, and I just could not get my head around what a thermostatic mixing valve looked like, so we asked them to bring one to the inquiry. They are real; they do exist. They are not from outer space; they are not carried into Queensland by aliens. It is a real device. Quite simply, they are a device that is installed in a childcare centre or an aged care facility where there is concern about an elderly person or a young child turning on the hot water tap and being exposed to water temperatures that are well in excess of 50 degrees. It is a very simple device which simply blends the hot water and cold water into the source tap in a bathroom or in

a sink to ensure that young children or the elderly are not accidentally burned by water that is at an extremely high temperature. The problem with this, however, is that these devices also in a sense store water within the pipes, and if they are not installed correctly there is the risk that the hot water pipe running alongside the cold water pipe, or water retained within the device itself, could not heat to an adequate temperature. If it is not maintained, checked and cleaned regularly, as the Master Plumbers identified to us in the inquiry, then there is a risk that these devices could also breed that particular strain of legionella. I was pleased that the department were able to come back and respond to us on this, and I am also pleased that these mixing valves will have to be covered by various organisations within their water management plans to make sure that they are checked and tested on a regular basis.

The other question that we had was in respect to the cost of preparing water management plans. The department replied quite thoroughly in this respect, and in their answers to questions on notice they state—

There are a number of variables that will impact the scale of costs. These include the size and age of a facility, the complexity of the water infrastructure, the availability of in-house expertise and incoming water quality. Based on responses to a November 2015 Department of Health survey of costs associated with compliance with interim measures, it is estimated that costs associated with expanding existing plans are expected to range from virtually nothing to over \$100,000. Similarly the range of costs associated with infrastructure improvements will, in some cases, be significant—some newer facilities—

—and I note that the Gold Coast University Hospital in my electorate is one of those newer facilities—

—with good incoming water quality will have limited infrastructure expenditure—

—because those risks have been well identified in the development process of these newer facilities. They further state—

For state Government facilities, it is anticipated that these costs will be incurred over a period of years, as upgrades to infrastructure are implemented within existing infrastructure budgets.

In the meantime, there is an assurance that the necessary level of ongoing testing will be undertaken. In relation to the other questions that we raised, I wanted to be thorough and I wanted to be convinced that a water management plan was not going to be some insanely onerous document or a process that was going to put a heavy impost on these health services, because I note that there is an intention in the future to implement similar plans for smaller aged care facilities and other facilities. It is important that we get this first step right so that it is fair. We need to flesh out these issues so that in the future we are not bringing into play legislation or requirements that are onerous and cost-prohibitive for other organisations.

I was pleased with the example that was provided. I was frantically looking for that example today because I thought I might be able to speak a little to the detail of it. When I rang the secretariat and said, 'I can't find my copy of the report,' I was reminded that we were required to hand back the report because it was an actual management plan prepared by a healthcare facility elsewhere in the state and that information was provided to us on a commercial-in-confidence basis. The work they did was thorough. They certainly addressed all of the concerns raised in this legislation and the proposed amendments. They certainly convinced us as a committee that what is being asked is not a ridiculous requirement but is quite achievable.

The other question on notice to which we sought a response from the department—I note that the member for Kallangur spoke to this and I touched on it briefly—related to whether there were any alternatives to water risk management plans such as prescribed testing or a schedule of routine water testing. The advice that came back from the department was that it is not as simple a matter as getting the local fire brigade in once a year to test fire extinguishers or to check the fire hose reels, that it is a little more complex than that. I had wondered if there might be of an off-the-shelf test kit you could buy—a bit like when you are testing the water in your swimming pool for alkalinity or acidity.

Mr Costigan: pH levels.

Mr MOLHOEK: Thank you, member for Whitsunday. I was assured that no such test kit is available, that it is a little more complex than that. I did go in valiantly to see if there was a cheaper way to do this without putting public health at risk. I am pleased to note that this has been a very rigorous review and that a very rigorous process will be put in place.

We did receive a submission from Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service. It raised some concerns about the cost and the requirements of the proposed amendments and inquired as to whether additional funds and resources would be provided. I note that the department has provided the committee with a response to its concerns. That is, where there are significant infrastructure costs or upgrades required, they will be factored in over time. I mentioned that an example of a water

management plan was provided by another hospital and health service. It appears that its concerns have fundamentally been addressed.


The other question we specifically raised was around the whole process of legionella water testing. I did address that briefly. I was surprised to learn that it is not a simple process. Samples need to be collected in a particular manner, in special sterile containers, from multiple locations throughout the facility. Water will be from taps that have been run, from ice machines, from cooling towers and from other facilities within the building. These samples need to be kept according to a special temperature control regime and transported to an authorised laboratory within specific time frames in order for those samples to be valid.

This highlighted for me the importance of having a water management plan, so that staff involved in making sure that this is carried out thoroughly, accurately and in a timely manner understand all of the requirements so that the quality of the information that is coming back, the quality of the testing and the veracity of that testing are such that those results can be relied on. I think that is particularly important given the concerns around public safety and the underlying motivation for us undertaking these legislative reforms.

I note also that Master Plumbers was pleased to support the recommendations. In its submission it absolutely endorsed the recommendations. It also spoke about the need for future testing to cover a broader scope of facilities. It also put very strongly the case that it is essential to have people who really understand the testing regime and who have the skills and ability to identify potential sources of risk and to undertake the testing.

The Master Plumbers also talked at length about the need for transparency. This is not something we can brush under the carpet. The general public needs to understand that we as a government are doing our best to look after public health. At the same time—I note that the member for Surfers Paradise touched on this—there are many forms of legionella that are not a risk. I think there are something like 50 different strains. In being transparent, we also need to make sure people are well informed about this. I believe that making this information publicly available and having water management plans and this requirement on our health facilities are great steps forward in ensuring really positive outcomes for the people of Queensland.

At this point I take a moment to thank the secretariat. Often when I get up to speak to the outcome of committee processes I fail to acknowledge them all, usually because I have too much else to say and I run out of time. I certainly acknowledge the great work they do. They are very thorough and incredibly helpful when it comes to running down the issues and getting the information we want. I also acknowledge the chair and the committee for their work on this review. I am pleased that we can come to the House and recommend the adoption of the amendments. On that note, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (5.06 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill. One of the most important aspects of this bill, besides the real outcomes it will deliver, will be the generation of greater confidence in our hospitals and health facilities. Confidence in our institutions such as hospitals can be undermined by continual cases. As the member for Surfers Paradise noted, we have had no real cases of outbreaks here in Queensland. As Mr Chatterton said in the submission and at the hearing, those outbreaks of legionnaire's disease are well publicised. I table four articles that show how widespread that publicity can be: 'Legionella bacteria: Brisbane's Mater Hospital water systems test positive'; 'Four people contract legionnaires' disease in Sydney after suspected CBD infection: NSW Health'; 'Three people contract legionnaires' disease in Sydney's central business district'; and 'Fifth person diagnosed with Legionnaires' disease in Sydney inner west'.

Tabled paper: Articles from ABC News Online and The Guardian online, various dates, regarding cases of Legionella bacteria and Legionnaires' Disease.

As members can see from the articles I tabled, it is publicised very quickly. A lot of people have heard about those nine people hospitalised this year in Sydney in that one incidence which resulted in one death. People also heard about the incidence in Victoria in 2000 which resulted in 125 confirmed cases including 95 hospitalisations and four deaths.

With Queenslanders well aware of the potential impact of legionella bacteria, we need people to feel confident about their care and safety in Queensland hospitals and health institutions. This bill will increase that confidence. One way this bill will do this is by making it obligatory for the chief executive of a prescribed facility to notify the department if there is a positive test for legionella. There will be a sense of confidence from knowing that the management of our health facilities cannot overlook a


positive test. They must report it. To add to that sense of public confidence, under this bill there needs to be a public reporting of that information by the department.

Following a case in December 2015 at a major metropolitan hospital, the Department of Health was prevented from publicly disclosing some information about the test due to restrictions on the disclosure of information under the Private Health Facilities Act. Under this bill the Queensland public will have more confidence in health facilities and hospitals as they will know that these prescribed facilities cannot hide or overlook any positive tests and are to make public the results of such tests.

Furthermore, under this bill there are new powers for an authorised person to enter a prescribed facility to monitor compliance with the water risk management plans. This all raises confidence by health consumers and, as the public will know, there is a public power being exercised by a public official for the public good. Public confidence is not only built by public disclosure; it is also built by public knowledge. We need people to know that a facility has not done anything wrong by having legionella in their water supply. As Dr Young said in the hearings, legionella is everywhere. The issue is how facilities respond to it. Public disclosure and confidence mean more knowledge and more education about this bacteria, and this bill helps to build that knowledge and therefore public confidence.

Another issue raised in discussion on this bill was the water risk management plans. The submissions and hearings for this bill show that these plans are recognised as the best way to manage the health risks associated with legionella bacteria, and the bill in this regard builds on current international best practice. The water quality risk management plans are the best solution because they involve more than just testing the water that comes out of the end of a pipe; they involve the investigation of plumbing throughout the facility so that the location of the real hazards and potential problem areas can be identified, and that includes examining the age of the pipes perhaps, the pipe material, the quality of the water coming into the health facility and what has been the maintenance regime of the facility.

Another issue raised in discussions around this bill was that of the cost of implementing the water risk management plans. It is clear that for many facilities that cost is already negligible, and that is because the Department of Health and our hospitals will meet the cost for their facilities from within their budget. Indeed, the cost will be minimal as water quality risk management plans are already in place in these cases. They were introduced as an interim measure in 2014 following the report into cases of legionnaire's disease in May and June 2013 at a major metropolitan hospital. Queensland public and private hospitals have already implemented these plans since 2014 and they have done it from within their current resources. It is already done, we are not introducing anything new and the cost, as we have said, will be negligible. I close by thanking the staff for the help they have provided in this instance and also commend the minister for introducing this bill in what is a rapid manner to remedy this situation in order to build confidence in our hospitals. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (5.12 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill 2016. I want to begin by thanking the committee secretariat for its hard work on this report along with that of the chair, the member for Kallangur, the deputy chair, the member for Southport, and my fellow committee members. I also want to acknowledge those members who contributed to this report under the previous committee prior to 18 February 2016.

The report handed down by this committee recommends that the bill be passed and recommends that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services clarify in his second reading speech the meaning of the term 'person in charge' and also investigate options for including a precise definition of 'person in charge' in whatever legislation is considered most appropriate, and I understand that the minister has already addressed that issue. In making the recommendations, I understand the committee's consultation had been limited due to the urgency of the proposed amendments. Key private healthcare providers and representatives for smaller healthcare providers and all hospital and health service chief executives have been notified of the proposed legislation. Consultation with the private residential aged-care sector will be undertaken during a phased implementation process.

I now turn to the amendments proposed to the Public Health Act 2005. These amendments work to achieve the objectives of the bill which are to improve the management and control of health risks associated with the supply and use of water in hospitals and residential care facilities, in particular the health risks associated with legionella bacteria, and provide greater transparency of water testing activities being undertaken by these facilities. Proposed new section 61D sets out what the water risk management plan must contain and provides for additional requirements to be prescribed by regulation. The committee received submissions with regard to the implementation of a water risk management plan. In particular, the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service raised concerns that the

implementation of the bill's proposed amendments will incur considerable costs for healthcare facilities and that there is no funding or resources being provided for this purpose. As a result of this, the committee requested further details on the implementation costs.

The department advised the committee that the cost for facilities to implement interim measures that already have water risk management plans in place are not expected to be significant. Funding will have to be set aside to implement remedial measures should legionella or other hazards be detected in the facility's water supply system. The department advised that estimated costs associated with expanding existing water risk management plans would range from zero to over \$100,000 and that, similarly, the costs associated with infrastructure improvements will also vary based on factors such as the age of the facility and incoming water quality, potentially costing several hundred thousand into the millions of dollars. The department advised that the cost for state government facilities would be incurred over a period of years in line with existing infrastructure budgets. The department also advised that budgeting arrangements for licensed private health facilities are unknown and that other costs to government such as compliance, enforcement and provision of training will be funded within existing departmental budget allocations.

In considering proposed new section 61A of the bill, the committee took submissions from the Metro South Hospital and Health Service and Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service as to the definition of a prescribed facility. The Metro South Hospital and Health Service questioned the definition of a prescribed facility and its application to public sector mental health community care units. Residents in these facilities are not classified as inpatients and are not aged-care residents, so the department clarified that the intention of the bill was that it would not apply to these units as they are not hospitals as defined by the Hospital and Health Boards Act.

The committee also considered the requirement under proposed new section 61K of the bill which proposes that the chief executive of the department publish a report, with notices given by facilities about the presence of legionella or reports about prescribed tests undertaken in accordance with water risk management plans. It was a point of some discussion for the committee on how public reporting of the presence of legionella might be received by the public, and I refer to the report in relation to that issue. The report states—

... while there are over 50 species of Legionella, the species of most concern in drinking water in a health care facility is Legionella pneumophila serogroup 1.

...

The Department acknowledged certain species of Legionella present a greater health risk than others, however, it explained:

... the conditions that allow low risk Legionella species to proliferate are the same conditions that allow for the more dangerous species to proliferate. Therefore, for the purposes of identifying hazards in a water risk management plan, and in relation to the notification and reporting requirements, the Bill doesn't differentiate between different types of Legionella bacteria.

The report states—

The CQHH—

the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service—

raises a concern that the Bill does not disclose which tests would be included in the definition of a prescribed test for Legionella. It states that there are different types of tests for Legionella and some laboratories can perform more sensitive tests than others. The CQHHS is concerned that this could place facilities that use these laboratories at a disadvantage and notes section 61H(1) also refers to the use of a prescribed test.

In response to a question taken on notice at the public briefing the department advised—

... tests for Legionella in water can be divided into two categories: DNA-based tests and culture-based tests. DNA-based tests can provide very quick results, however, they don't provide information on whether any Legionella detected is alive or dead. As a consequence, the results from DNA-based tests provide only limited information with regards to how hazardous the water is to human health. Culture-based tests, on the other hand, provide results in terms of 'culturable' Legionella. These are live Legionella cells and provide more useful information with regards to how hazardous the water is. For these reasons, it is the Department's intention to prescribe certain culture-based tests in the Regulation. Specifically, it is intended to reference the methodologies prescribed in Australian Standard AS3896 and international standard IS011731.

The bill proposes a requirement that the chief executive of the department publish in a report notices given by facilities about the presence of legionella or reports about prescribed tests for legionella undertaken in accordance with water risk management plans. The CQHHS submission raised the concern that I mentioned earlier. In its submission, it stated that public reporting of legionella test results may not be in the best interest of health care facilities nor the public as it may result in unjustified levels of concern and anxiety and undermine confidence in a facility. The department responded by stating

that it does not intend to make any revisions to the bill in response to that issue and that the inclusion of provisions allowing for the publication of legionella test results fulfils the government's commitment to greater public transparency.

At our public briefing, the department responded to a question from the committee on the likely risks or concerns that may be associated with public reporting. The departmental officer said—

I do not believe there are any risks. I am certain that people are concerned about it because they are concerned that people will find out information about their facility that they might prefer that people not know about, but I think it is very important and I think the public values knowledge. The more we get the information out there, the more it becomes understood. It is not necessarily that a facility has done anything wrong by having legionella in their water supply. It is ubiquitous; it is everywhere. The problem is how they respond to that. If facilities have to have that information out there publicly, then the community I think will have greater confidence in the services that are being provided to them.

I think that is an important point. That is one aspect of this bill and its implementation that we need to watch closely in order to monitor the impacts on facilities that publicly report incidents of legionella. A representative of the plumbers union also provided evidence. He said—

I have worked in this industry for roughly seven years, and I do not think I have gone a week without someone raising this—
legionella—

as an issue. It is something that everybody talks about, and unfortunately it is also subject to the rumour mill within the community. That is why we think it is really fantastic that there will be public reporting of this. There is no doubt in my mind—and there is no doubt in the minds of the people I talk to in our industry—that the lack of knowledge within the public on this matter is currently eroding public confidence and patient confidence in the system, so we think it is really fantastic that it is being addressed and that people will get a fair bit of knowledge, certainty and confidence in this area.

It was some comfort to the committee to hear both of those opinions. The other aspect that the committee heard was in relation to ice machines and warm water systems and, as the good member for Southport mentioned earlier, thermostatic mixing valves.

Mr McArdle interjected.

Mr McEACHAN: Thermostatic mixing valves. We asked the plumbers union to bring one in so that we could have a look. We have seen a thermostatic mixing valve. They are real. In their submissions the plumbers union of Queensland and the Master Plumbers' Association of Queensland highlight the role that industry standards play in relation to the design, operation and maintenance of ice machines, warm water systems and TMVs—thermostatic mixing valves.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr McEACHAN: I should have brought one in. For example, in terms of the quality of ice machines, in its submission the MPAQ explained—

... many machines do not meet certification standards, Water Mark approval as required by the National Construction Code Volume 3, the Plumbing Code of Australia, and this is a matter that must be rectified.

The plumbers union of Queensland and the MPAQ support an amendment to the bill to reference the need to comply with existing industry standards. In response, the department advised that the—

... potential for these industry standards to be called up in legislation would be most appropriately considered by the Department of Housing and Public Works.

In response to a question on this issue at the public briefing, the department confirmed that it will be alerting that department to the necessity for reviewing these amendments. Regarding the quality of ice machines, the department clarified that it has a policy in place that requires ice machines in health facilities to comply with the industry standard water mark approval. However, that leaves open the prospect that there are many ice machines out in the community that do not meet this industry standard.

Mr Power: Including here in the parliament.

Mr McEACHAN: Quite possibly in the parliament. I thank the member for Logan. In its submission the plumbers union of Queensland highlighted the need to employ licensed persons to install and maintain the infrastructure related to legionella. It also raised this issue at the hearing. The representative from the plumbers union said—

We are aware that the Queensland Building and Construction Commission are currently undertaking a licensing review. We think that this is a big part of what needs to occur in that review and what the outcomes need to be.

As we stated in our submission, we consider that for far too long the prevention, detection and rectification work associated with legionella has been addressed in a suboptimal way. Addressing such a harmful presence through non-skilled labour, a lack of regular checks and generally poor practices has increased the likelihood of additional issues, in our opinion. Licensed persons must be involved in the installation and maintenance of all infrastructure related to legionella, including cooling water systems,

air-handling systems and their associated duct work and pipework. They have been identified as particular areas where legionella is commonly found.

The report goes on to refer to one of the aspects that the committee covered, which was the right to enter dwellings and residential aged care facilities in the case where legionella was detected. Under clauses 5 and 6, which relate to the power to enter premises, the bill proposes to amend section 385(1) (d) of the Public Health Act to add new sections 389A and 389B to the list of sections under authority by which an authorised person may enter a place. Clause also amends section 385(3), which currently limits section 385 search powers by stating that—


... nothing in this part allows entry to a dwelling without the occupier's consent, an enforcement order or a warrant. The amendment proposed by clause 5 confirms section 389B as an exception to that general rule, as section 389B does provide for a power to enter dwellings in residential aged care facilities in certain circumstances, even without the occupier's consent, an enforcement order or warrant.

Clause 6 of the bill proposes to insert new sections 389A and 389B into the Public Health Act to confer a general power to enter a prescribed facility and a power to enter dwellings in residential aged care facilities. Proposed new section 389B(2) applies where someone at a residential aged-care facility has had a notifiable condition resulting from legionella or where the result of a prescribed test confirms the presence of legionella in water used by the prescribed facility. It allows for an unauthorised person to enter a part of the residential aged-care facility that is an occupier's dwelling for monitoring compliance with the facility's water risk management plan without requiring the occupier's consent, an enforcement order or a warrant.

The committee noted that the power to enter dwellings in a residential aged-care facility is only triggered when someone at a residential aged-care facility has had a notifiable condition resulting from legionella or where the result of the prescribed test confirms the presence of legionella in water used by a prescribed facility. When those preconditions are met, the entry powers become exercisable under (2), but there are a number of safeguards on the exercise of that power contained in (3) and (4). Given the limited circumstances in which the powers become exercisable and the statutory safeguards on the manner in which the powers may be exercised, the committee is satisfied that the entry powers are appropriate to the circumstances.

The committee also notes the response provided by the Department of Health regarding the definitions and how 'person in charge of a prescribed facility' differs from 'responsible person'. The committee is concerned that given the proposed offences will apply to either a responsible person or a person in charge, the definitions of both these terms could be easily interchangeable. I referred to that earlier and the minister has addressed that in his second reading speech.

In closing, the bill is proactively taking on legionnaire's. It minimises the risk of outbreaks before they occur and has the capacity to maintain public confidence in our health and aged-care system. I acknowledge and share the concerns raised by my colleagues in relation to the costs involved in implementing these management plans. I note particular concerns raised about the costs in rural and regional facilities. I urge the Palaszczuk Labor government to be considered in its approach to dealing with rural and regional facilities facing significant cost burdens. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (5.32 pm): One of the key functions of government is to ensure that a risk that an ordinary citizen does not normally consider or cannot quantify can be managed. We know that not all risks can be effectively calculated by the user of a service or a product in all cases. This does not, as some on the other side suggest, mean that any individual is ignorant, rather that no individual could have the specialist knowledge of all the risks involved in modern life.

The right wing market the individual as the only determinant of individual risk. This extreme ideology, as pursued by some on the new opposition front bench such as the member for Clayfield, is dangerous in the extreme. There are cases where it is clear that the risk to the individual cannot be determined without expert information. In these cases it is vital that government make it clear that we protect the individual and their families through appropriate regulation.

The Public Health (Water Risk Management) Amendment Bill is a piece of legislation where we collectively as a government—as Queenslanders—asses the risk for those who cannot and ensure that those who are vulnerable have the risk of death or serious illness minimised. We know that the legionella bacteria can lurk and multiply in water cooling systems, piped water supplies, spa and hydrotherapy pools, ice machines, chilled water dispensers, humidifiers, nebulisers and even decorative fountains. In this case the bill assesses the risk of legionnaire's disease across our state and mandates that those institutions that present the greatest risk improve their management and control of the health risks associated with the legionella bacteria. We recognise that although varieties

of the legionella bacteria can be found in a variety of places, including soil and mud, it is in man-made environments of manufactured water and air conditioning systems that they are most dangerous.

Through the advice of health professionals we recognise that those who are already weakened through sickness, have compromised breathing or damage to their lungs, are elderly or have a combination of these factors are at a greater risk. A healthy person, in contrast, is relatively unlikely to contract the disease as a healthy person's immune system is better able to fight off the infection. That is why prudently this government is ensuring that those institutions such as hospitals and aged-care homes improve their practices to ensure the safety of those who are vulnerable through the creation and implementation of water quality risk management plans in public hospitals, public residential aged-care facilities and licensed private health facilities.

Those who are most vulnerable include those who are severely immunocompromised: patients on high doses of immunosuppressive medication, people with chronic underlying disease such as diabetes, chronic liver failure, chronic renal failure, congestive heart failure, HIV/AIDS and some forms of cancer, smokers, people with excessive alcohol intake, people over 50 years of age, people who have undergone recent surgery, intubation and those on mechanical ventilation, people who have aspirated foreign matter into respiratory passages and people who have used respiratory therapy equipment such as nebulisers.

To further support those who are in no position to assess the risk they face, the bill has further provisions that there be clear public notifications of tests that are positive for legionella bacteria. The bill ensures that the person in charge of a prescribed facility notify the health department within one business day. Further, that there be increased transparency through the department, there be periodic reporting of the presence of legionella and any further information that the chief executive considers relevant to the safety of the public.

I thank the committee, especially the committee chair, the member for Kallangur, and the deputy chair, the member for Redlands. I note that the minister in his speech noted some of the suggestions and recommendations and has undertaken to put into regulation a clarification that a water risk management plan clearly identify the person directly as the person in charge for the purposes of this act. This was a bipartisan concern of the committee. The member for Whitsunday also shared this concern. I am pleased that our work will provide hospitals and other institutions with clear guidelines of responsibility.

The committee undertook hearings on the bill on Wednesday, 20 April 2016. We heard from the Chief Health Officer, Dr Jeannette Young, who informed the committee that the bill implements measures to improve the management of health risks that were highlighted by Dr Young's report in 2013 that was commissioned by the government after a concerning outbreak in our health system. Further, that without this bill the Department of Health was prevented from publicly disclosing information under the Private Health Facilities Act 1999. The committee also heard from plumbers, representatives from the Master Plumbers' Association of Queensland and the union representing plumbers who have an active role in ensuring that plumbing systems are maintained and built in a way that reduces the chance of a legionella build-up. Mr Slade from the Master Plumbers' Association told the committee that there are many factors that affect the build-up of legionella bacteria: the quality of the water entering the pipes, the age of the pipes, the material of the pipes, the temperatures of the ceilings and the flow rate through pipes. For this reason, Mr Slade asserted that each premise needs to be looked at individually when considering a water risk management plan. Mr Slade also explained that in his opinion the adoption of a water quality management plan is not a great impost on the facility owners and managers. To be clear, there is a cost to a risk management plan, but the cost of losing a loved one to a disease that is entirely preventable is so much greater. I acknowledge the member for Surfers Paradise who noted that the role of licensed plumbers and high industry standards were vital in maintaining this infrastructure to protect our health.

This bill deals with a limited part of the risk of legionella. We note the hotel outbreaks that the member for Surfers Paradise mentioned, but we can look to a more recent tragic case in Melbourne at a Liberal Party function where 35 people contracted legionnaire's disease. Some members of the Liberal Party contracted the disease and suffered very badly. At the time there were concerns for John Howard, the former Prime Minister, and the then Liberal leader in Victoria. We know that with good plumbing standards and maintenance the disease is entirely preventable. This incident was a sharp wake-up call for any who thought that high standards were not required in the plumbing industry, especially in the duct work that pumps damp air around buildings. I know that all those on this side of the house and, unfortunately through bitter experience, the Liberal Party in Victoria, understand the need for trained plumbers to keep our buildings safe. We in this place sometimes need to regulate

where the calculation of the true risk is impossible. As a government we must make decisions to keep the vulnerable safe. This legislation goes a long way to minimising the risk of serious infection from the legionella bacteria. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (5.39 pm): Tonight I too rise to make a contribution to this debate. I advise the House that I support the Public Health (Water Risk Management) Bill. In doing so, I reflect on what we all must think when we come into this place, no matter our political allegiances: we come in here to make the system better. We just heard from the member for Logan who reflected on what could have happened to former Prime Minister Howard and a lot of other people.

Mr Krause: Thank goodness it didn't happen.

Mr COSTIGAN: Thank goodness nothing untoward happened. I take the interjection from my good friend and colleague, the shadow minister for tourism, the member for Beaudesert.

Mr Krause: Imagine where we'd be without Howard.

Mr COSTIGAN: He is right in asking where we would be without Howard.

Government members interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: It is great to hear the good humour of the red army in the chamber tonight. Regardless of our political allegiances, there is no doubt that when we come in here we all want to make the system better. We can look back to what happened at the Wesley Hospital a couple of years ago. I see the member for Moggill looking on with interest, in keeping with his professional background, because that predates his arrival in this place. However, out of something bad comes something good. It goes without saying that this process was initiated by the former LNP government. It is pleasing to see that the current government is following that good work, the foundation stone of which was laid by the member for Southern Downs in his role as the previous minister for health. The argy-bargy comes in when trying to decide how we make the system better and the robust debate that goes with that.

It was very pleasing to work with my colleagues on the Transport and Utilities Committee under the chairmanship of the member for Kallangur as we deliberated on these important matters. Of course, public health is of paramount importance, but it comes at a cost. We have heard from a number of members about that cost. I come back to a point raised by the member for Redlands, that is, we do not want to see unnecessary burden—and I am being a little biased—on facilities that will be impacted by these measures in regional and rural Queensland.

I will not duplicate what the shadow minister for health said. He gave a good history lesson on the origins of the different strands or species of *Legionella* bacteria. As we all know, some of those species can cause disease in humans, the most serious disease being legionnaire's disease, which is a severe and potentially fatal form of pneumonia. The *Legionella* bacteria from natural water sources can enter and colonise manufactured water systems commonly found in commercial, industrial, healthcare, aged care, childcare and education facilities. Those include air handling systems incorporating water cooling towers and evaporative condensers; piped water supplies and cold, warm and hot water pipework; spa pools, spa baths—I do not have much experience there as I prefer the warm waters of the Whitsundays; I see a few faces lighting up, but we will push on—and hydrotherapy pools; ice machines and that has been pretty well documented by a number of colleagues tonight, as well as chilled water dispensers; air-houses; humidifiers and nebulisers; and decorative fountains. While it is important that the cost burden is minimised, good public health outcomes come at a cost.

I want to acknowledge the people and organisations who provided submissions to the Transport and Utilities Committee. In particular, I acknowledge the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service. Proposed new section 61A proposes the definition of '*Legionella*' to mean 'bacteria belonging to the genus *Legionella*'. The health service stated that there are over 50 species. The big problem child is—and I will do my best with the pronunciation, although I am not sure that some of my colleagues got it right—*Legionella pneumophila* serogroup 1.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I hear the interjection from the member for Southern Downs, the former health minister.

Dr Rowan interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I can tell the member for Moggill that we have had a bit of practice getting the pronunciations right. This is a serious issue. It is important that we get it right. We know that that is the baddie in the system. The department acknowledged that certain species of *Legionella* present a greater health risk than others. The committee report No. 15 quotes the department as follows—

... the conditions that allow low risk Legionella species to proliferate are the same conditions that allow for the more dangerous species to proliferate. Therefore, for the purposes of identifying hazards in a water risk management plan, and in relation to the notification and reporting requirements, the Bill doesn't differentiate between different types of Legionella bacteria.

I thank the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service for raising concerns about a number of issues, particularly in relation to the so-called 'prescribed facility'. They were not alone, as we have already heard. At the public hearing, the department stated—

It is the intention that the requirements of the bill will not apply to these units as they are not hospitals as defined by the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011.

Of course, that is in relation to the mental health community care units, about which the Metro South Hospital and Health Service raised some queries in its submission to the Transport and Utilities Committee.

In particular, I acknowledge the men and women who work in the field, some of whom I caught up with recently in my part of the world. Of course, I refer to the plumbers themselves. Kelvin Slade would be known to a number of people in this chamber as one of the great captains of industry in the plumbing game. I thank the Master Plumbers' Association of Queensland for its submission in relation to these matters. I also thank them for the show-and-tell. For me, sitting on the committee and learning about thermostatic mixing valves was an eye opener and I am sure that I was not the only one who learnt about the process.

Mr Whiting: You said you'd put one in your spa.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from my colleague on the Transport and Utilities Committee. I do not have experience in spas.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: Not all of us in Airlie Beach get around in a three-piece suit. I prefer not to impersonate Borat and certainly I prefer the warm waters of Pioneer Bay over a spa any day.

Mr Seeney: There are dangers in there, too.

Mr COSTIGAN: There are, but we manage those risks, member for Callide, I can assure you.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from the member for Kawana. I can assure him that there is no such concern for the people of Whitsunday.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! We might just start addressing your comments through the chair, member for Whitsunday.

Mr COSTIGAN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. The amendments to the Public Health Act 2005 are very sensible. As has been alluded to by a number of colleagues, we need to be on the front foot in relation to these matters. Queenslanders need and deserve as much confidence as possible that our aged-care facilities and hospitals guard against the potential threat of legionella. We should always aspire to world's best practice.

I mentioned the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service. I thank them for their submission. The establishment of the hospital and health boards was a great legacy of the former government. Certainly members on this side of the House would back me up on that.

Mr Seeney: Absolutely.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from the member for Callide. We have people with local knowledge and passion for their communities on the boards. That was before the red army stacked the side with the likes of Tony Mooney and Tim Mulherin.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Brisbane Central.

Mr COSTIGAN: The input of people like Kelvin Slade from the Master Plumbers' Association and the Plumbers Union in relation to these matters was very much appreciated. It certainly was an eye-opener for us. We have to be on the front foot and make sure we stay ahead of the game in relation to these matters because of what has happened in the past at the Wesley and the John Howard situation previously.

A lot has happened since that discovery in Philadelphia. This was touched on by the member for Surfers Paradise and shadow minister for health. I would also like to thank Dr Jeannette Young, the Chief Health Officer, for fronting the committee. She is a very experienced and knowledgeable lady.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: You must have been out of the chamber, member for Lockyer. That is right, it was in Philadelphia.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Whitsunday, address the chair not the member for Lockyer.


Mr COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: Richard Fidler is not here, member for Cleveland. The committee in its deliberations came to the conclusion that this is making Queensland a better place and a safer place. What has been noted already is that someone has to be responsible. Someone is going to have to check the system in accordance with the water risk management plans. At the end of the day, if that person is not doing their job it defeats the purpose of trying to make the system better.

Mr Krause: Lives are at risk.

Mr COSTIGAN: Lives will be at risk if we do not get it right. In conclusion, I would like to thank my colleagues on the Transportation and Utilities Committee. I also thank the secretariat—our research director, Kate McGuckin, and her crew—for their professionalism and assistance in relation to these matters. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (5.54 pm): I too rise to speak in support of this bill. I congratulate the Minister for Health for its introduction. I thank the committee for its careful consideration of the legislation.

As we have heard other speakers indicate, by the nature of the bacteria legionella targets the most vulnerable in our community—children, the sick and the elderly. The measures contained in this bill will mitigate the risks of legionella. As we have heard from many speakers this evening, it will save lives.

As the Minister for Housing and Public Works, I am responsible for the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002 and for ensuring that plumbing work does not pose a risk to the health and safety of the community and to the environment. I regularly discuss the relationship that plumbing has with the health of the community when I meet with representatives in the plumbing industry, including the Master Plumbers' Association of Queensland, which has been referred to this evening, the Plumbers Union, business owners, subcontractors and tradesmen and women.

When I get an opportunity to meet with plumbers and their representatives across the state I am consistently impressed by their dedication to protecting the health and safety of our community. As a result of the efforts and vigilance of licensed plumbers and those who represent and work with them, Queensland has a strong industry that protects the community from several dangers that are posed by plumbing and drainage work—most of which the community is largely, and thankfully, blissfully unaware of. As I talk with representatives and members of the plumbing industry they regularly raise the issue of legionella and hot-water systems with me.

The recent outbreaks of legionella in Queensland were linked to the operation of hot-water systems. These systems, which we all take for granted, can suppose significant public health risks if not installed and maintained correctly. When talking about the risk posed by legionella, it is important to remember that legionella is everywhere in our environment. As a result it is not feasible to completely eradicate it from our environment nor is it feasible to completely eradicate it from our water supply. Happily this is not necessary because for most people exposure to legionella bacteria does not pose a significant health risk. People with normal immune systems are more than capable of fighting off legionella related infections.

My department is responsible for the standards that ensure the safe delivery of hot water to our community. These standards do two things. Firstly, they ensure that when hot water is stored it is done so in a way that does not allow the bacteria to grow. This generally involves heating the water above 60 degrees Celsius. Secondly, the standards require water to be tempered back down to below 50 degrees Celsius to protect against the risk of scolding injuries. As many of us would appreciate, the risk of scolding injuries amongst young children and the elderly is particularly problematic.

What we have learnt from the recent outbreaks is that meeting these two competing priorities can prove to be a significant challenge and require a sophisticated management strategy to ensure that both objectives are being met. That is why the bill requiring hospitals and residential care buildings to adopt management plans is the right way forward. It will ensure that most at-risk members of the

community, the elderly and the ill, whose immune systems are more likely to be compromised, are provided with a safe environment.

It would be remiss of me not to talk about the risk posed by plumbing and drainage work without mentioning the important inspection and enforcement roles undertaken by the Queensland Building and Construction Commission and local governments to help maintain high levels of safety. The QBCC is responsible for ensuring that all work is undertaken by licensed plumbers.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, there is too much discussion in the chamber. The minister is almost finished. We will commence the debate on the private member's motion soon.


Mr de BRENNI: Local governments assess applications and inspect new hot-water installations to ensure they meet required standards. The bill will strengthen the existing regulatory framework that protects our community. The amendments to this legislation complement the excellent work undertaken by the QBCC and local governments to ensure that hot-water systems that serve the most vulnerable members of our community—as we mentioned, the sick and the aged—are installed and maintained in a way that protects them from the risk of legionella.

I will confirm for the benefit of the House that the current attention being played to plumbing licensing takes into account water and air systems that are legionella risks. I can advise the House that the Service Trades Council will play a key role in providing advice to government in respect of that. Plumbing is a serious business. Its role in preserving the health and welfare of our community often goes unnoticed. The bill, through CEO reporting and other measures, will uphold public confidence through public transparency of reporting. This bill further lifts the already high standards of our plumbing industry. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr de Brenni, adjourned.


SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Rule of Anticipation

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Mansfield to move his motion, I caution members that there are two bills on the *Notice Paper* that deal with youth justice issues. I refer to the Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. Members should avoid breaching standing order 231, the rule of anticipation, by referring to these bills in debate on this motion.

MOTION

Level of Crime

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (6.01 pm): I have been anticipating the debate but I will not be anticipating those bills, you will be glad to know, Mr Speaker. I do want to speak about this issue and I move—

That this house notes the rising level of concern regarding unaddressed levels of crime in our community and condemns the government's failure to act to restore law and order and ensure the safety of all Queenslanders

This issue is often raised in the House and it is often raised at the highest level of crime within our community. I do want to get there, but, before I do, I want to start probably at the most humble of levels. When I first became the member for Mansfield, like other members in the House, I started going around my Neighbourhood Watch groups. It is a fundamental part of the eyes and ears of our community, looking at crime in our community.

Mr Costigan: Grassroots.

Mr WALKER: It is grassroots, as the member for Whitsunday says. It became pretty clear to me when I started going around those groups that in 2012 when we came to government we had inherited a system where Labor had failed to support, even at the basic level, community policing initiatives and crime prevention strategies. Neighbourhood Watch was in freefall, with widespread disillusionment from those involved. It was saved by an injection of an extra \$1 million per annum from the Newman government to set up a parallel online blog for those younger people who wanted to get involved in community policing and in Neighbourhood Watch.

School based policing had stalled since 2006. Individual responsibility as an issue was downplayed and continual excuses made for offenders. Only five per cent of sentenced graffiti

offenders received a custodial sentence. Hooning was a big problem for those in the suburbs. We moved strongly on that—something which many would dismiss as a small issue but one which goes to people's comfort and security in their own homes, a significant issue. Thanks to strong action by the LNP, with more resources for the police and the legislative tools that they needed to do the job, reported crime across Queensland reduced by 12 per cent in 2014—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you were warned and I urge the Minister for Industrial Relations not to provoke the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, please.

Mr WALKER: As I was saying, thanks to strong action by the LNP, with more resources for the police and the legislative tools they needed to do the job, reported crime across Queensland reduced by 12 per cent in 2014 compared to 2011. Robberies were down by 28 per cent, while break and enters were down 27 per cent. Almost 900 fewer cars have been stolen and there were 9,600 fewer break-ins to homes and businesses, meaning that more hardworking Queenslanders could go about their daily lives without the fear of becoming a victim of crime. That was at the basic level—things like hooning, break and enters and so on that affect ordinary people.

It peaks with the main area where Labor wants to go soft—and that is on bikies and organised crime. The fix, as we know, has been in from day one in respect of that. A closed shop review was established with a predetermined outcome of watering down penalties and scrapping the VLAD laws. That is precisely what the terms of reference for that commission required—recommendations as to how to repeal the laws and replace them with something else. There was no proper assessment as to how they were working or how they were protecting Queenslanders. It was a closed shop review with that predetermined outcome.

Last night we saw the first of the actual moves to water down those laws. Queenslanders expected on 1 July that the construction industry would be kept safe from criminal activity. I predict that under this government those measures will never come in. They were postponed for a year last night, but that means they will never come in and Queenslanders will remain unsafe in that area. It was an important area—the role of bkie gangs, outlaw motorcycle gangs, in organised crime in Queensland. I quote from Mr Byrne's final report. He states—


The illicit drugs market is inextricably linked to organised crime ... that illicit drug markets remain the most prominent and visible form of organised crime activity in Queensland.

He goes on to say—

The Commission learned that outlaw motorcycle gangs play a major role in illicit drug markets in Queensland and are also involved in other illicit activity.

What has happened? The commission is in to repeal the laws. Task Force Maxima has continually been wound back, its leadership moved on, its status diminished and its resources dwindled. That is despite the fact that Task Force Maxima has taken more than \$38 million worth of drugs off our streets in the last year alone. Additional funding to assist the CCC fight organised crime was discontinued. The bikies know what is happening. We know they are gathering in New South Wales ready to come back. Lawyers know what is happening. They are postponing their cases until the laws are changed. The fix has been in from day one. Queenslanders know they are less safe than they have been. This government deserves to be censured for not doing something stronger to address that issue.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (6.06 pm): The government opposes the motion put forward by the opposition. This motion is a direct smear on the Queensland Police Service. It proves once again that it is impossible to craft—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. The government members, by and large, listened to the member for Mansfield in silence. I would urge you to allow a similar courtesy to the Minister for Police.

Mr BYRNE: It proves once again that it is impossible to craft a sentence that has the words 'Liberal National Party' and 'good public policy' in the one sentence. The truth is—

Mr WATTS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If we are going to be directly provoked, we can hardly sit here in silence.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, resume your seat!

Mr BYRNE: I was not provoking; I was simply making a statement of fact. The police have been relentless in their pursuit of targeting crime. That is the whole point I make about this motion: it is a direct attack on the Queensland Police Service. That is what this is about. The fact that the Liberal National Party continue to run this agenda is a reflection of the level of intellect they bring to the debate. Police have been frankly relentless in targeting of crime in all its forms—be it outlaw motorcycle gangs; boiler rooms; child sex exploitation, which I did not hear the member opposite refer to; or drug trafficking. The focus and energy have been on all forms of crime and in all places in Queensland.

Police themselves say that they will continue to exploit every opportunity to target criminal activity everywhere—and they are doing just that. For example, since Task Force Maxima began, more than \$15 million in cash and assets have been seized. These recent arrests and charges reinforce the government's resolve, and that of the Queensland Police Service, to target crime in all places and in all locations. Importantly, we are giving police the resources they need to combat organised crime and keep Queenslanders safe.

We recently committed an additional \$20 million over four years for the Queensland Police Service to specifically target organised crime. This funding will deliver a further boost to police resources and will give our law enforcement agencies the tools and technology they need to tackle organised crime in all its insidious forms, whether it is child exploitation, boiler room fraud, drug trafficking, overt criminal groups such as outlaw motorcycle gangs and everybody else.

It is a nonsense for the opposition to bang on about task force numbers. As I tried to point out yesterday, it is naive and reflects a total lack of understanding of contemporary policing practices and the combined might of police resources. I suppose we should not be surprised by that from those opposite. Police remain resolute in their pursuit of organised crime gangs and all other forms of crime in this state, and the Palaszczuk government backs their efforts every step of the way.


Any decisions about the despatch of officers in Queensland should be made by senior police, not by politicians and certainly not by those opposite. What we see time and again is an inept opposition that persists, and has a history of persistence, in mixing policies, policing and politics. It got them into trouble during the Bjelke-Petersen era, the Borbidge era and even the Newman era, and it will get them into trouble again the more they want to interfere with policing and policing strategies. They learnt nothing from the lessons of the past. They never understood the separation of powers or those that did never respected them in the first place. It is not the government's role to be telling police where to put their efforts. That is why we pay professional officers. That is why the Police Service exists.

Let us talk about the Gold Coast. In the past year, 21 additional officers have hit the beat in the Coomera area. In addition to those officers, there are specialist officers in other parts of the Gold Coast that provide a high level of service to the northern Gold Coast including officers from the water police, forensics, the Dog Squad, detectives from the CIB, and child protection and investigation units.

We are delivering 266 additional police this financial year thanks to the Palaszczuk government. Not only are we delivering extra police; we are giving them the resources and equipment they need. We have rolled out 300 additional body-worn cameras and we intend to roll out more. The LNP has embarked on a smear campaign using law and order issues to create unnecessary angst in local communities. As I told the House earlier this morning, when the Liberal National Party was in power they refused to release crime statistics so I find it ironic that they are bringing crime statistics forward today. They hid the crime statistics and refused to do the annual statistical review. One of our policies we took to the election was to get an independent set of crime statistics published in this state because of the legacies left by those opposite.

What are those legacies? Those legacies are a nearly 30 per cent increase in the prison population, a refusal to publish crime statistics, an abuse of the Police Service where we had the President of the Police Union stand up during the campaign and call the then premier a liar—unprecedented—a war with the judiciary and a war with the legal fraternity. That is the legacy that those opposite left in the justice system in Queensland. I hear silence. They should be ashamed of themselves. Everybody knows the record of the Liberal National Party when it comes to law and order.

(Time expired)

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (6.12 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the shadow Attorney-General. Let me say from the start that this side of the House supports police to the utmost. Nobody supports the police more than the LNP. Our attack is not on the police; our attack is on a

government that will not support the police, that will not give them the resources and the policies to make sure that our crime rate stays down.

After my delivery in the parliament yesterday about crime rates in Townsville, I have received some astonishing feedback from the residents of Townsville. In the *Townsville Bulletin* we saw some of the lame responses from ministers of the current government. I want to focus on the feedback from people in Townsville and the responses from government ministers. I received an email last night. I will change his name and some of the details because I want to protect his identity. I would describe Gary as a gentle, polite, older gentleman whose wife is a teacher. He wrote to me to say this—

Just want to commend you on your stance in parliament yesterday on crime in Townsville ... I was a victim of a mugging just over a month ago where I was confronted for keys to a car that wasn't mine.

I was hit in the face with a handgun and the offender took off. I have lived in Heatley for 20 years and have walked these streets at night with no problems at all.

Crime in Townsville is the worst it's ever been. The courts need to be tougher on these young criminals as they are controlling the streets.

I work ... at night and I don't work alone anymore, it's too dangerous. I see kids as young as 12 roaming the streets as I drive to different sites every single night.

I know the solution is a hard one, but a curfew may help and maybe getting someone up here and patrolling with the police for a night may put some perspective into this problem.

On calling Gary today, he said that the police told him it is a joke. The perpetrators end up at Cleveland Detention Centre for a few weeks. Then they come out a few weeks later with even better ideas that they have learnt inside to go out and commit bigger and more serious crimes. This crime wave is having an impact on the cost of living for people in Townsville. Gary tells us that the car insurance on his wife's car has increased from \$100 to \$124 per month, because he believes he lives in the suburb of Heatley and they are being penalised for the crime that is taking place—a 24 per cent increase in car insurance because of the crime that is occurring in Heatley. It is not only the direct cost of crime but also the indirect cost which is affecting the residents of Townsville.

What do we hear from members opposite in response to yesterday's story? The member for Thuringowa boasted proudly on his Facebook page that the government has a three-point action plan that will solve the problem. One unimpressed local resident went to his website and said, 'Sounds more like a 3 step slap on the wrist to me'—a very insightful comment.


A spokesman for the Attorney-General was reported in the *Townsville Bulletin* yesterday saying that she will host a community forum on 6 June. I think I have heard since that there is a bevy of ministers going up there. On the *Townsville Bulletin* website Alan said—

That is their answer for everything, a community forum. The AG will turn up, look you in the eye, tell you she understands, recommends a board be formed before she gets back in her taxpayer funded jet to go back to Brisbane where she will tell the Premier everything will be fine.

The Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland, the member for Mundingburra, said she was 'extremely passionate about re-engaging Townsville's youth to proactively address the issues before young people turn to crime'. John said this—he is very insightful—'That is political mumbo jumbo for "I haven't got a clue. I have no idea what to do."' Peter said on the same website, 'We have 3 state Labor MPs in Townsville who are no better than the 3 wise monkeys. Our town is being overrun by juveniles who are immune to law and order.'

My message to the Premier is this: do not treat the people of Townsville as fools. They are sick of talkfests. They are sick of conferences. They are sick of rhetoric and they are sick of a do-nothing government that does nothing on crime.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the Minister for Disability Services, I welcome the year 10 students from Mercy Catholic College in the electorate of Mackay who are observing our proceedings from the public gallery.

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (6.17 pm): I rise to speak to this motion, but I will make it very clear that the Palaszczuk government is absolutely committed to keeping Queenslanders safe and that is what we are doing. What we are not doing is recklessly creating a campaign that destroys confidence in our state—a campaign that is based on fear and not evidence.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana, you are warned under standing order 253A for your continual interjections. If you proceed, I will take the appropriate action.

Mrs O'ROURKE: This campaign does nothing but talk down Townsville. This is not what this government will do. This government is absolutely committed to finding solutions to reduce crime—no bandaid solutions but real solutions that improve safety and stop people offending in the first place.

Ms Davis interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Aspley, nothing is to be gained by trying to talk over the top of the minister. You are now warned under standing order 253A. If you want to contribute, you have an opportunity to participate in the debate.

Mrs O'ROURKE: A key part of addressing any issue of crime is to stop it before it begins. Sadly, the evidence shows that many young people turning to crime have come from troubled backgrounds or are experiencing forms of domestic violence or drug abuse. At a local level, I have been working very closely with my colleagues the members for Townsville and Thuringowa to host a public forum on youth justice. I am pleased to say that we have organised this forum and the Attorney-General will be coming to Townsville to listen and work together with our local community. I am also meeting with schools, parents, community groups, Queensland Youth Services and the PCYC, particularly in regard to their successful SAS ME program, with the sole purpose of addressing this issue.

I also meet regularly with Townsville police and know they are extremely committed to upholding the safety of our community. Our local police have an important job, and I am pleased to say an additional 15 police have been allocated to the Townsville district this financial year. Townsville police have implemented a range of strategies to reduce the incidence of crime across the region, such as the Townsville Tactical Crime Squad and the Townsville Rapid Action and Patrols. They provide a proactive and operational capability to detect and deter criminal activity through high-visibility patrols. I have also had the opportunity to meet with officers to discuss their work around Project Booyah, which aims to re-engage troubled youth and get them back into school, training or work.

Through increased police numbers and targeted operations like these, local officers are not only working to keep our streets safer but also working to make sure residents feel safe when they go about their daily lives. These increased police and increased operations mean that we are cracking down on crime and more offences are being reported. The results speak for themselves and are already helping to improve safety on our streets. People have the right to feel safe no matter where they live, but let us remember that the LNP laws did not work and the evidence clearly shows that. Boot camps and naming and shaming do not work, and this government is reforming the youth justice system based on evidence that does work. We are not saying for one minute that young people should not be punished for their actions, but we do believe imprisonment should be a sentence of last resort. Early intervention and diversion programs for young people mean we can build a stronger and safer community.

I will continue to work closely with my cabinet and parliamentary colleagues, local police and community organisations to ensure Townsville remains a great place to live and to raise a family. There is no quick fix or bandaid solution to this issue and we cannot solve things with boot camps and tough talk. We need to look at the bigger picture and work together with experts to tackle this problem from the ground up. I am pleased to say that that is exactly what the Palaszczuk government is doing.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (6.23 pm): I am delighted to join the debate here tonight and support my good friend and colleague, the shadow Attorney-General, and also back up another great mate, the shadow minister for police. We have just heard the gobbledegook from the Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland, the member for Mundingburra. We have heard from these three monkeys: hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil—the member for Mundingburra, the member for Townsville and the member for Thuringowa. Members should go and speak to Garry Eddiehausen, who is a former police officer in the great city of Townsville. As a former resident of Heatley itself, I know what Heatley was like 20-odd years ago. It is a bit different on Charles Street today to what it was back in the early 1990s. Gary Eddiehausen, who was in the police force and who served the city and the Queensland Police Service with great dignity, conviction and courage over many years before going into local government, will back me up here because the place has gone to the dogs. I am not going to talk down Townsville, but I am going to talk down—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, government members. I do not think the phrase 'the place has gone to the dogs' is appropriate language in the chamber.

Mr COSTIGAN: I withdraw. Certainly, Townsville has gone downhill, and it pains me to say that—

Mr HARPER: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take the words he used to describe us as monkeys as being personally offensive.

Mr SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Resume your seat.

Mr COSTIGAN: It pains me to say that Townsville is not like it used to be. It is a great city of North Queensland, but it has been seen very clearly by people like Gary, who was just quoted here by the shadow minister for police. Gary is upset because he does not like what he is seeing in his community. People fear for their safety in their community, and there is no doubt about that in the city of Townsville. It is also in other communities right across North Queensland. In fact, I can think of a former Townsville hotelier in Will Cordwell, who is well known to the member for Kawana in his previous role as Attorney-General, and others in North Rockhampton. I see the former police minister across the chamber—in fact, he is still the police minister. I forget sometimes who is in the job.

At the end of the day, it was the LNP government that beefed up the police numbers. We had 800 extra officers on the beat in 34 months with the blue and gold team making Queensland a better place. What have they done over there? It was great to be with the Minister for Police last Friday when we saw the launch and commissioning of the new water police boat, the *Damian Leeding*. I was pleased to be alongside the police minister for what was a very important and very special day for the family and the Queensland Water Police. Our good friend, the now Mayor of Bundaberg, a former police minister—

Mr Cripps: Bring back Jack.

Mr COSTIGAN: I hear the interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook and my fellow North Queenslander to bring back Jack, and so we should, because there was money for the police boat for the Whitsundays in the budgets of 2012, 2013 and 2014. I remember talking to Bob Atkinson, who was the commissioner when community cabinet came to the Whitsundays in August 2012. Bob said, 'Make sure you keep your advocacy up for that police boat.' Guess what—it finally happened. The government members talk about beefing up resources, but they have got no idea.

We have heard from the shadow Attorney-General about school based policing. We have students in the gallery tonight from my sister's old school, Mercy College. I am sure some current and former students from Mercy and South Mackay can relate to the collapse of school based policing. We saw Neighbourhood Watch basically fade into obscurity. I salute people like Ken and Claire Rehbein in the Northern Beaches of Mackay. My predecessor said in her maiden speech, 'We're going to have a 24/7 police station in the Northern Beaches.' Guess what—it never, ever happened. I was pleased to be alongside Superintendent McNab at a Neighbourhood Watch promotion recently. We made sure there was direct funding for Neighbourhood Watch because we are not soft on crime. The members over there are the marshmallows; they are soft on crime. There is Mr Whippy and plenty more of them over there. That is how soft they are on crime.


We beefed up the Police Service. We made sure Hoon Watch was something that engaged communities because we took a very different approach to combatting the scourge of crime. We have heard about the robberies that are down 28 per cent and the break and enters that are down 27 per cent. Janine and Steve Muller, who own Climate Classics clothing in Proserpine in my electorate, are decent, hardworking people in small business and they got done over recently, and the list goes on and on.

People are concerned about the spike in crime. We have heard about Taskforce Maxima and the \$38 million worth of drugs taken off our streets. We know the connection between that and organised crime. Members should not forget that it was in Mackay in 1997 where we had the bikie shootout between the Outlaws and the Odin's Warriors. As a fifth generation Mackayite, I can say that we have not forgotten. I am so pleased to see those two clubhouses shut down in the city that I represent. I support the motion.

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (6.28 pm): Wasn't that a display from the three members on the other side who are beating their chests and so proud of themselves for their personal insults and derogatory comments on what is supposed to be such an important issue for that side.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, I want to hear the contribution from the Attorney-General. Member for Everton, if you persist with your discussion across the chamber, you will be warned.

 **Mrs D'ATH:** Law and order and community safety is an important issue but what we have heard today is just a stunt. It was offensive. We have year 10 students in the gallery listening to the comments from over there and the giggling amongst themselves because they were making cute little remarks, derogatory comments and personal insults to people on this side all about law and order.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Mrs D'ATH: We know when the LNP drags out the whole tough on crime, law and order subject—and it is obvious—that there is always a reason and I have to say it is often because things are not going well for them. It is often because they are desperate for a distraction. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that a few weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition, in trying very hard to win the leadership, went out there and said, 'Asset sales? That is dead. That is gone. Asset sales are dead.' However, only yesterday the Leader of the Opposition was out there in front of the media saying, 'We'll get back to you on asset sales. We'll let you know in the future what our position is.'

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

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order, member for Mansfield?

Mr WALKER: Relevance. The Attorney-General is casting aspersions over here and yet she is whizzing off everywhere off the topic. She should keep to the topic of the motion under consideration.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mrs D'ATH: I am drawing to the House's attention that this motion is a stunt. It is about a distraction. They are not genuine about this issue. Let us have a look at the wording of this motion, that 'this House notes the rising level of concern'. From whom? From the opposition, because they are concerned that their leader keeps digging them a hole and they do not know how to get out of it? Where is the rising level of concern? There is no basis for it.

They come in here with a motion about rising levels of concern, unaddressed levels of crime in the community and a failure to act to restore law and order without any basis to it whatsoever. This is what they do. They go out there and they prey on the community's fears. They prey on people's fears. It is what they do. They do it well. We have seen it before. We saw it in the lead-up to the 2012 election. We saw that when they came into government they said, 'We're going to be tough on crime.' They certainly were, and they went far beyond what any Queenslander thought they would do. Did the Queenslanders thank them for that? No, they did not. They said, 'These are not the laws we want. This is not the government we want.'

As the police minister has said this evening, we have increasing growth in our prison populations thanks to the legacy of those on the other side. There was no strategy to reduce crime.

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Burdekin, you are warned under standing order 253A. I cannot hear the contribution from the Attorney-General. If you want to participate—sorry, not Burdekin, member for Burnett. If you wanted to participate, you had an opportunity to participate.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, I do not need your assistance, member for Whitsunday. I could name a few others, but I will not.

Mrs D'ATH: We heard the member for Mansfield talking about proper consideration in relation to organised crime, and that is the height of hypocrisy. That was the government that rammed through legislation. They put it together in a matter of days, they rammed it through this parliament and they criticised a process that took months and was made up of representatives from the Police Service, the Police Union, the Law Society and the Public Interest Monitor. We had broad representation in terms of the people who worked through that legislation in detail.

They talk about sentencing, yet they came in here last night criticising the establishment of the Sentencing Advisory Council because apparently they know better. They criticised the CCC, but they are the ones who took powers away from the CCC and its independence. They are the ones who sought to hide political donations by increasing the threshold. That is the sort of integrity they have when it comes to crime and accountability and integrity. They quote rubbery figures. That is why we need to establish an independent crime statistical body, because they like to cherry-pick figures to make out as if something is happening when it is not.

They are running down areas like Townsville when right now we should be talking up Townsville. We should be talking about Townsville being a great place to live and work and talking about opportunities, not saying that it is the worst place in Queensland. When it comes to crime, the attacks from that side in relation to Townsville and other parts of this state are irresponsible. They never base any of their arguments on facts. If they wanted to talk about crime, let us talk about alcohol fuelled violence. Did they want to do something about that? Did they actually want to tackle alcohol fuelled violence when the time came? No. They have no credibility on this issue.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Southport, the issue of asset sales has nothing to do with this debate. You are warned under standing order 253A for your interjections.

(Time expired)

Mr MOLHOEK: I rise to a point of order. Nor do the comments from the Attorney-General about political donations.

Mr SPEAKER: I am not going to debate the matter with you. Resume your seat, member for Southport.

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

AYES, 42:

LNP, 40—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 41—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pair: Miller, Nicholls.

Resolved in the negative.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.40 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That notwithstanding any previous order regarding the cognate second reading debate on the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill and the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill, the Leader of the Opposition nominee shall have 60 minutes to speak to the second reading questions after the member for Dalrymple.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.40 pm to 7.40 pm.

NORTH STRADBROKE ISLAND PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

NORTH STRADBROKE ISLAND PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY (RENEWAL OF MINING LEASES) AMENDMENT BILL

North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill resumed from 3 December 2015 (see p. 3211), on motion of Dr Miles, and North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill resumed from 27 October 2015 (see p. 2359), on motion of Mr Knuth—

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (7.40 pm): I move—

That the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends a number of acts to meet the government's election commitment to repeal the amendments made to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 by the previous government in 2013 to re-establish a 2019 end date for sandmining on the island. The bill will provide certainty for the island community and the thousands of visitors that flock to the island each year. The bill is part of a package of measures by the government to prepare North Stradbroke Island for a sustainable future. This bill is supported by the draft economic transition strategy and the workers assistance package, with a combined funding commitment of more than \$28 million.

There are three key features of the bill: firstly, the bill substantially ends mining on North Stradbroke Island by 2019; secondly, the bill reinstates a restricted mine path for the Enterprise mine and the ability to amend it under strict conditions; and thirdly, the bill sets up a new rehabilitation authorisation under the Mineral Resources Act to support rehabilitation to occur. The bill also makes consequential amendments to other acts to deliver the government's policy intent. I thank the Finance and Administration Committee for its consideration of the bill.

Tonight we are considering two bills that address the same subject matter. The North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015 was introduced by the honourable member for Dalrymple on 27 October 2015. As the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, I introduced the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 on 3 December last year. The committee undertook an extended period of consultation and tabled its report on both bills on Tuesday, 3 May 2016.

The committee put forward one recommendation: that the private member's bill tabled by the honourable member for Dalrymple not be passed. The government will not be supporting the private member's bill as it differs substantially from government policy. The key difference is that the private member's bill allows for mining leases to be renewed to 2024 for mining and to 2029 for rehabilitation. As we have made clear, the government has committed to substantially phase out sandmining by 2019 and to remove the amendments made in 2013 which includes the ability to renew leases. Further, while the private member's bill reinstates a restricted mine path it does not restrict the amount of dredge mining, unlike the government's mine path map. Dredge mining is likely to create much more disturbance to the physical and cultural landscapes of North Stradbroke Island than dry mining.

There were no recommendations directed to the government, and therefore there is no need for the government to table a response; however, I would like to express my appreciation to the committee for the comments that were provided in the report. I note that the committee has requested that I advise the House of the resolution of technical and operational issues in relation to the new rehabilitation authority, confirm that the new rehabilitation authority can provide the required access to the mining company and advise of any amendments to the bill.

In response to the committee's report I am moving several amendments during consideration in detail of the bill to give effect to the comments and suggestions raised. My department has also identified additional amendments that will improve the technical operation and implementation of the rehabilitation authority, provide certainty for future access to Yarraman Mine for rehabilitation and clarify the process for amending the restricted mine path.

The amendments to be made are to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011, the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Mineral Resources Act 1989, with minor amendments to the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 and the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999. A total of 19 amendments will be moved which are minor structural amendments to the bill with five more substantial amendments. I now table the amendments during consideration in detail and the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015, amendments to be moved by Hon. Dr Stephen Miles.

Tabled paper: North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Stephen Miles amendments.

These amendments include: ending the mining lease at Yarraman upon commencement of this bill and immediately replacing it with the new rehabilitation authorisation; extending the time for the mining company to apply for an amendment to the restricted mine path from four to six months, which will give QYAC and Sibelco more time to agree on any possible change; ensuring that the mining operator can manage its health and safety obligations under a rehabilitation authorisation; allowing for rehabilitation authorisations to be issued prior to the expiry of a lease which enhances the community's certainty that rehabilitation obligations will be met; and ensuring that the rehabilitation authorisation includes all activities necessary for proper environmental management, including decommissioning of mining equipment.

The introduction of a new rehabilitation authority is central to the bill. The bill amends the Mineral Resources Act in order to allow a rehabilitation authorisation to be granted to a mining company to access land in limited circumstances after the end of a mine's tenure. This will ensure that rehabilitation requirements are still able to be completed once there is no longer a mining lease. The committee's report raises some questions about the operation of the rehabilitation authorisation, particularly in relation to certainty of access, the types of activities that the authorisation allows and queries about compensation.

I want to be clear that the rehabilitation authorisation was designed in order to give mining companies certainty in terms of accessing land to undertake rehabilitation in very particular circumstances such as those on North Stradbroke Island. Mining companies like Sibelco on North Stradbroke Island will be able to get access to land immediately on their lease ending to undertake all activities that are required for rehabilitation. There should be no doubt about this. To provide certainty of access for rehabilitation at Yarraman mining lease ML 1109, I propose to move an amendment during consideration in detail of the bill to ensure the rehabilitation authorisation is deemed to have taken effect upon commencement of the act. The rehabilitation authorisation is for a term of three years and will be replaced with a subsequent authorisation if the mining company still needs more time to rehabilitate.

This amendment is in conjunction with an amendment to clause 6 that will cease mining lease ML 1109 on the date of commencement of the act rather than 12 months later. As I have just mentioned, after that time land access for the purposes of rehabilitation will be provided to the former mine leaseholder using the new rehabilitation authorisation. The rehabilitation authorisation supports companies to carry out their obligations, and this new amendment ensures a seamless transition to the new authorisation.

I intend to move a minor amendment to clause 27 to put it beyond doubt that the power to enter land under the rehabilitation authorisation includes the power to carry out activities that are necessary to complete rehabilitation. To provide further clarity and ease of administration I propose to move an amendment to the bill that will reduce the number of entry notices that the operator is required to provide to the owners and occupiers of the land. This also responds to concerns raised by submitters that providing a notice every six months may be cumbersome.

The department also considered the committee's suggestion that the parties could agree in writing to change the notice frequency. However, it is expected that this option would result in difficulties with monitoring and enforcing any potential written agreements. As a result of these concerns, I propose that entry notice requirements align with the term of the rehabilitation authorisation, which means that an entry notice would only be required once for the term of each authorisation.

I am confident that the amendments I am tabling today have resolved all of the technical and operational issues that were raised in the committee and that these amendments are supported by key stakeholders. I would stress that the government's policy has not changed and that the new rehabilitation authorisation process does not replace, and would not be encouraged to replace, the current system of mining lease renewals for rehabilitation.

Make-good provisions and rehabilitation are an integral part of the mining process under Queensland law. The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has worked extensively with the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation, Sibelco and their legal counsel to ensure that the rehabilitation authorisation will work on Straddie and in other cases where the criteria are met. The changes proposed tonight do not change the intent of the authorisation but instead ensure that the provisions are more robust and workable.

I note that the committee report made encouraging remarks about the ongoing consultation between officers of my department and the mining company, in collaboration with the Aboriginal

corporation. I have been very pleased with the progress of these tripartite discussions, which place all parties in good stead to work together on the implementation of the legislation.

I note that concerns have been raised about the ability of mining companies to limit access to certain locations for health and safety reasons under the new rehabilitation authorisation. My department has been working closely with Sibelco to ensure that the mining company's concerns about access and health and safety are properly dealt with. I thank the committee for their consideration of this issue, and I will move that clauses 18 and 36 be amended to clarify that the operator can restrict access for safety reasons on an operational area of the site in the same way they can for a mining lease. The ability to restrict access for health and safety requirements will be the same as it would be at any mine anywhere in Queensland. Health and safety is everyone's concern, and the amendments are fair and reasonable. They have broad support from all stakeholder groups.

During the committee's consultation on the bill, a number of stakeholders asked questions on why the bill referred to compensation and who would be entitled to that compensation. On this issue I would like to address what I believe is a misunderstanding. The topic of compensation usually generates a lot of interest, but the fact of the matter is that the bill does not give any party additional compensation than what is provided for in current state and Commonwealth legislation. There is nothing new here. The compensation arrangements in the bill make sure that, when a mining company is issued a rehabilitation authorisation, any landholders affected are treated in the same way as if it was the renewal of a mining lease. Therefore, justifiably, the bill makes the compensation payable for a rehabilitation authorisation consistent with how compensation is payable to native title holders and landowners when mining leases are renewed or granted. In these cases, the state does not pay the compensation; the miner does. In situations where there is a native title holder, such as on North Stradbroke Island, there is no liability to compensate native title holders under the Mineral Resources Act as they are not landholders under that act. Any compensation for native title holders will be payable under the Commonwealth Native Title Act, not the Mineral Resources Act.

The bill reinstates a restricted mine path for Enterprise mine, which is the largest working mine on the island. The proposed restricted mine path for Enterprise mine closely follows that provided under the 2011 act but takes into account the lawful and more recent operations of the mine. The bill currently provides me, as the Minister for Environment, with a discretionary power to grant an amendment to the restricted mine path map within four months of commencement of the legislation. The original 2011 act contained a similar provision.

The proposed restricted mine path is not intended to be unduly restrictive to operations, but it must also ensure that the environmental and Indigenous values around the Enterprise mine are protected. One objective of the 2011 mine path was to provide for mining to continue at broadly the same rate as historical averages. The proposed mine path in this bill is based on the 2011 path, which was approved by the department as a result of an application by the mine operator to amend the restricted mine path attached to the 2011 bill. Five years later, there may be new factors to take into account. The restricted mine path should be based on the best and current information. That is why the bill provides for the path to be amended to reflect current operational needs if it can be demonstrated that impacts to the environment and cultural heritage are not greater than they would have been under the proposed path. As the committee noted, my department has been in discussion with Sibelco and other relevant stakeholders regarding the technical issues and workability of the mine path, while also taking into account biodiversity and cultural heritage issues.

To allow more time for the operator to complete a cultural heritage study and negotiate an Indigenous land use agreement, ILUA, I propose to move amendments to clause 13 of the bill to extend the time frame by an additional two months. This will give Sibelco a total of six months to submit an application to amend the restricted mine path should they wish to do so. In relation to the ILUA, I would also like to move a minor amendment to clarify the parties and subject matters of the ILUA. That is, the ILUA would be between the holder of the Enterprise mine lease and a registered native title body corporate for the land to be added to the mine path. This clarification is important so as not to cause confusion with the ILUAs that already exist over North Stradbroke Island.


I take this opportunity to table an erratum to the explanatory notes which makes a minor amendment to clarify the effect of the original North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 on the operation of Vance mine. This corrects the explanatory notes to make it clear that two of the Vance leases, ML 1124 and ML 7064, were extended by the 2011 legislation to facilitate the 2025 end date for Vance mine. I table the erratum to the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015, erratum to explanatory notes.

The bill delivers certainty for the mining company, native title justice for the traditional owners and a clear path forward for the people of North Stradbroke Island in achieving the island's vision of becoming Australia's most desirable island community, one that has sustainable economic growth and proper protections for the island's unique environment and cultural heritage.

North Stradbroke Island is the second largest sand island in the world. It has the potential to be an international tourism attraction like its big brother to the north, Fraser Island. Sandmining only came to an end on Fraser in the 1970s and was phased out within a matter of months. Now look at Fraser. It is one of Queensland's, if not Australia's, greatest tourism assets, and its popularity is growing every year. Straddie's transition has already begun. The island has all the charms and unique features to be another success story, this time right on Brisbane's doorstep, if we pass this bill. The amendments will ensure that mining lands are rehabilitated to a high standard in a timely way to allow the island to transition towards a sustainable future land use.

Over 2,000 people made a submission on the bill. This demonstrates just how strongly people feel about the future of the island. It is clear to anyone who sets foot in the sand over there just how special the island is, and I look forward to seeing Straddie flourish in the years to come. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (7.57 pm): I move—

That the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

I introduced the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015 into parliament because I believed this issue had been a political football since time began. I wanted to play a part in resolving that political issue.

For many years there have been discussions, decisions and debates about the issue of mining. It has been a political football on North Stradbroke Island. As it stands, the permit for mining activities is proposed to last until 2035. The government bill proposes 2019. The residents, unions, workers and businesses, both large and small, are left with uncertainty about the viability and sustainability of their home, North Stradbroke Island. Many of these employees are paying off mortgages, are paying school fees and have family commitments.

My electorate does not come close to North Stradbroke Island, but it does share concern for the people of North Stradbroke Island and what they have to face, particularly with the closing down of mining operations in 2019.

The KAP is concerned about employment in Queensland and is committed to protecting jobs. Sibelco employs 110 workers on North Stradbroke Island, with about 20 per cent being Indigenous employees. The company also directly employs a further 50 workers in Queensland and generates \$130 million each year into the local economy. The AWU, which represents most of the Sibelco workers, has expressed to me that it is furious that no-one in the government is listening. As I stated in my first reading speech, sandmining is the single largest employing sector on North Stradbroke Island. It directly and indirectly supports between 500 and 750 residents of the total population. Sand has been mined on North Stradbroke Island for the last 60 years, since 1949. Sandmining has been the major tenant on North Stradbroke Island for many decades, supporting other businesses. For example, Sibelco comprises up to 30 per cent of business for the island's vehicle barge and ferry service and 26 per cent of Stradbroke Ferries revenue.

In a small business survey carried out in July 2015 by the Straddie Chamber of Commerce, results showed that approximately 85 per cent of businesses favour sandmining to continue to at least 2025. The North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewable of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill achieves a balanced approach to sustainably ending mining activities within a restricted mining path while supporting the Queensland government's vision for North Stradbroke Island. The bill provides a realistic time frame for the proposed economic transition strategy. The Draft North Stradbroke Island Economic Transition Strategy sounds good, but allocating \$20 million to build on the island's capacity and economy and \$5 million for the workers' assistance scheme to help mineworkers to transition into new employment is all average news for the residents of North Stradbroke Island. However, by the government's own figures, the mine employs 18 per cent of the population and the draft plan has no clear plan of how this 18 per cent can find employment on the island, citing construction jobs on the mainland as a main source of income for the soon-to-be-out-of-work miners.

Using the government's own best case figures, the loss of mining will result in 144 job losses—95 residential Stradbroke islanders—and the loss of between \$55 million to \$86 million annually to the North Stradbroke Island economy. In short, that is a loss of GVA as a contribution to the GRP of between \$563 million to over \$1 billion over the currently permitted 16 years.

The former LNP government passed legislation to permit mining activities in the North Stradbroke Island region until 2035. That permission went way beyond the reach of what it was supposed to and I opposed that legislation when it was introduced into the last parliament. The current Labor government planned to phase out mining activities in 2019. Basically, this bill provides a sensible compromise in that it is not 2035, it is not 2019 but proposes 2024. I truly believe that there will be no winners in this bill, but there are going to be no losers given that it is a compromise. The bill is a win for industry and workers as well as being a win for the community on North Stradbroke Island. It is a sensible compromise. For many years there has been public discussion and debate about the interconnected issues of mining, Aboriginal land rights and the environment on North Stradbroke Island. The bill is designed to respect the diverse points of view that exist for all parties. The bill is designed to provide a realistic time frame for an economic transition strategy to assist with diversifying the local economy by the Queensland government. AWU State Secretary, Ben Swan, has stated that mining workers are getting frustrated with successive Labor governments making decisions around North Stradbroke Island without consulting the mine company's workforce. He said—

In the past five years we have gone from 'we're going to shut it down' to an extension of the lease out to 2035 and now we're back to 'we're finishing in 2019'.

In addition to employment, Sibelco provides other economic benefits including royalties and taxes and the company has confirmed that it is committed to making substantial financial contributions to the economic transition strategy, assisting the Queensland government with diversifying the local economy to a future that is not reliant on sandmining. The KAP is committed to a sensible compromise by working with community, industry and the Queensland government. The KAP is also committed to securing jobs and diversifying the North Stradbroke Island economy to a future that is not reliant on sandmining. According to the Straddie Chamber of Commerce, North Stradbroke Island has a working population of fewer than 768 jobs—most are part-time roles—and limited developmental prospect due to ever-increasing national park, so the future of employment in this small region is under a cloud.

The Straddie Chamber of Commerce wrote to me and was disappointed that the only agreed recommendation from the committee was to reject this bill. It was advocating that all sides of parliament take a sensible approach to the resolution of these bills. It is supportive of KAP's attempts to find a more sensible date for the end of mining in its submission to the Finance and Administration Committee and it acknowledges our efforts and welcomes the common-sense approach shown by the KAP on this issue. The workers on Stradbroke Island need some assurance for their futures. The transitional plan does not offer that security. The loss of the mine with no other contingency plan will leave 18 per cent of the community out of work.

Smaller businesses in their submissions stated the same. The Stradbroke Ferries submission—submission No. 209—detailed that one-quarter of the revenue of Stradbroke Ferries on Straddie is directly invoiced to Sibelco. Up to 40 per cent of the revenue is associated with businesses, including those in sandmining. This was calculated not through a simple measure of foot traffic but cars and other related vehicles. This is a business that has 120 permanent and casual employees that will be gone. We can also talk about the direct benefit to the community from the presence of the mine. Sibelco advised the committee that it had spent an average of \$67.56 million per year over the last three years on goods and services from local South-East Queensland based businesses. This expenditure includes \$7.5 million to North Stradbroke Island based businesses and \$60 million per year to 641 South-East Queensland based businesses.

There is no doubt the immediate closure of any major industry or company in a region will have direct and indirect personal, economic and social impacts. Therefore, an early end of sandmining related revenue without substitute markets being established can result in the redeployment of fleet assets to other markets, the reduction in direct costs such as diesel and labour by the removal of services and subsequent reduced frequency of services, the direct reduction in office and associated staff, the reduction in marketing spend and contractor services on the economic transition package, the loss of higher earners on the island, the loss of families, the loss of jobs, the loss of homes and the devaluation of homes. This is what will happen if this operation is closed down in 2019. We introduced this bill because we wanted to resolve an issue that had been going on for quite some time and that has been, as I said, a political football. The LNP came in with 2035, but we hated the way it rammed

that through and the approach it took. However, at the same time Labor has gone too far with 2019. There are winners with this bill, but they are not big winners. There are basically no winners, no losers and no big winners, but at least this is a balance even though everyone will not get their way. I ask the House to support this bill and I commend it to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Before I call the member for Hinchinbrook, I am informed that North Stradbroke Island Indigenous elder Uncle Bob Anderson is present in the public gallery observing the proceedings and we welcome Uncle Bob.

Mr CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (8.09 pm): I rise to respond on behalf of the LNP opposition to the Palaszczuk government's North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 and the Katter party's North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015, which are being debated in cognate. The LNP opposition does not support either of these bills and will oppose them.

Except perhaps for the Palaszczuk government's current bill that is proposing changes to Queensland's vegetation management framework, this bill is the best example of how Labor's policy agenda is completely corrupted and captured by its ruling left faction and its symbiotic relationship with the Greens. This bill is bereft of logic and is bound together only by a political and ideological imperative. This bill will put workers out of work. It will undermine the economic stability of the local community. It will mortally wound the bottom line of small businesses on North Stradbroke Island. It will impact on property values for people who have made their homes on North Stradbroke Island. It risks isolating residents on the island by reducing the viability of transport services to and from the island. I am certain that there are other implications that other members may touch on during their contributions.

The report by the Finance and Administration Committee, which considered both the Palaszczuk government's bill and the Katter party bill, is very extensive and provides for some very interesting reading. Members of the committee will no doubt deal with the detail of the report at length during their contributions to the debate, but I want to reflect now on a particularly outrageous comment by the member for Sunnybank in the chair's foreword. The member for Sunnybank said—

Throughout the inquiry it was clear that a large amount of confusion for the residents of North Stradbroke Island arose in consequence of the previous government's changes to the former Labor government's legislation. This not only altered the agreed timetable for the cessation of sand mining on the island, but also interrupted forward planning and the progression of key activities to support the island's economic transition.

This was a totally false and misleading statement that speaks to the bias and partisanship of the member for Sunnybank. The member for Sunnybank simply made this observation up. There is no confusion whatsoever for the residents of North Stradbroke Island about the former LNP government's 2013 amendments to the Bligh Labor government's original 2011 legislation. The residents of North Stradbroke Island understand perfectly that the Bligh government did a deal with the Greens in the lead-up to the 2012 state election to suddenly and ruthlessly pull the economic rug out from underneath their jobs and their community by moving to shut down sandmining on North Stradbroke Island by 2019. They were not consulted. They were not asked their opinion. They had this policy imposed upon them.

No, the residents of North Stradbroke Island were not confused. They voted with their feet for the LNP and the member for Cleveland at the 2012 state election at the Amity Point and Dunwich booths. In fact, they did so in record numbers to demonstrate their disapproval of Labor's policy and their support of the LNP's proposal to provide for a more orderly transition of the North Stradbroke Island economy away from sandmining to other industries in a more realistic time frame. Nor were the residents of North Stradbroke Island confused when they supported the LNP and the member for Cleveland again at the 2015 state election after the former LNP government had changed the legislation to extend sandmining on the island to 2035, saving their jobs and the viability of their community.

It was insulting for the member for Sunnybank to suggest that the residents of North Stradbroke Island were confused and the member for Sunnybank should be ashamed of himself. What the member for Sunnybank asserts was confusion among residents of North Stradbroke Island was, in fact, anger and frustration. They are certainly angry that the Palaszczuk Labor government has once again used their livelihoods and their community as part of a sordid preference deal with the Greens to benefit their electoral prospects in inner-city seats in Brisbane and they are certainly frustrated that their future is once again racked with uncertainty because of Labor's appalling political opportunism.

The untruthfulness of the statement by the member for Sunnybank continued, when he suggested that the former LNP government's 2013 amendments had interrupted an agreed timetable for the cessation of sandmining on the island and forward planning for the transition of the island's

economy. This statement is a load of nonsense and, given its obvious inaccuracy, creates real questions about the fitness of the member for Sunnybank to be a committee chair.

How can the member for Sunnybank possibly justify his statement that the 2019 cessation date for sandmining on the island was an agreed timetable? Agreed between whom? Labor and the Greens perhaps, but certainly not between the workers in sandmining jobs on the island and the company that employs them, or the community in which they live. Very clearly, they have not agreed to Labor's timetable and still do not and they turned up at committee hearings and made submissions to the committee and turned up in great numbers at public meetings on the island to make sure that that was perfectly understood. In respect of the forward planning for the transition of the economy on North Stradbroke Island being interrupted—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Can I ask members on both sides of the House not to have conversations with each other across the floor, please. All comments come from the speaker and are directed towards the person in the chair.

Mr CRIPPS: As I was saying, in respect of forward planning for the transition of the economy on North Stradbroke Island being interrupted, this is perhaps the issue that took up most of the time of the committee. Labor's plans to put in place a satisfactory transition plan has been hotly contested by many locals and stakeholders in that community—from local small businesses, the local chamber of commerce, Redland City Council and many others.

I know that the Bligh government's proposals were considered a bit of a joke when they were put up in 2011. Sadly, the Palaszczuk government's proposals are considered not just to be a joke, but a bad one. This aspect of the statement of the member for Sunnybank is also completely ridiculous. You can do nothing else but condemn the member for Sunnybank for including such a subjective statement in his foreword to the committee report. The chair of a committee is expected to facilitate the committee's consideration of the matters it is investigating. In this case, the comments of the member for Sunnybank in his chair's foreword are without foundation and amount to nothing else but speculation.

Another observation that I want to make about the situation that we face in the House today is the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines once again abandoning his post. We have a bill before the House that will have a profound impact on a resource company that employs hundreds of people on North Stradbroke Island. Who has the Palaszczuk government sent to execute this particular arrangement at the expense of the community on North Stradbroke Island? The Minister for Environment. At some stage, the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines is going to have to formally surrender to salvage some dignity. When will he have the decency to pull down his colours and raise the white flag and admit that he has been rendered impotent and irrelevant by the Deputy Premier and Labor's left faction?

Here we are considering a bill that impacts on several mining leases under the Mineral Resources Act. It shuts down a viable mine and severely impinges on the rights and interests of the company holding the leases and the Minister for Mines is nowhere to be seen.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier and the member for Cleveland to cease having a conversation across the chamber.

Mr CRIPPS: There has to be a limit to the shame that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines can put up with after being so obviously sidelined by his colleagues in a portfolio where he is supposed to be the responsible minister. Now, we have a situation where the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines cannot be trusted to handle legislation concerning mining leases in Queensland. The rationale for the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines to even exist in the Palaszczuk government is quickly evaporating. Industry can see it, it is blatantly obvious to the LNP opposition, but we wonder how long the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines' self-respect can hold out.

The main objective of the Palaszczuk government's bill is to repeal the amendments made to the Bligh government's legislation by the former LNP government in 2013 which would phase out sandmining on North Stradbroke Island by 2019. Sand has been mined on North Stradbroke Island since 1949. Currently there is only one mining company operating on the island, Sibelco Australia. Its operations involve several active leases at three sites, the Yarraman Mine, the Vance Mine and the Enterprise Mine. In 2011 the former Bligh government introduced the original North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 which intended to substantially end sandmining on North

Stradbroke Island by 2019. The mining at Yarraman Mine was to end in 2015, although this aligned with the mining operator's intentions. The Enterprise Mine was to cease operations in 2019. The mining leases for Vance Mine were not amended by the Bligh government's legislation as the mine had a relatively small footprint. However, the legislation prevented these leases from being renewed to extend mining past 2015. The original North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 also included a restricted mine path for Enterprise Mine which limited mineral extraction to a smaller area.

In 2013 the former LNP government passed the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. These amendments changed the phase-out of mining on North Stradbroke Island by affecting the leases for the Enterprise and Yarraman mines such that the mining operator could renew the three leases at Enterprise Mine to enable mining on these leases until 2035. In 2035 the leases could be renewed again for up to five years with a non-winning condition to allow for mine site rehabilitation. The restrictions on the mine path at the Enterprise Mine were removed and the non-winning condition was deleted with the environmental authority amended to reflect these changes and annexed to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 and the mining operator could renew its lease when operations ceased at Yarraman Mine in 2015 but only with a non-winning condition to enable rehabilitation of the mine site. Neither the original Bligh government legislation nor the LNP amendments in 2013 made changes to the operation of mining leases at Vance Mine due again to its relatively small footprint.

As has become the modus operandi of the Palaszczuk government, the 2015 Labor bill currently before the House basically seeks to overturn the 2013 LNP amendments. The practical effect of Labor's 2015 amendments will be that sandmining on North Stradbroke Island substantially ends by 2019. One of the more curious aspects of the proposals in Labor's 2015 bill is how the land on North Stradbroke Island will be rehabilitated after the mining leases have ended. This is a reflection of the political rather than the practical imperative behind this legislation. The Palaszczuk government has had to invent a new instrument to be inserted into the Mineral Resources Act which will allow for a permit to be granted authorising access to land to undertake rehabilitation activities required under the Environmental Protection Act. I want to make it quite clear to all members that rehabilitation work is usually undertaken on a former mine site while the site is still subject to a mining lease. This has ensured that the types of activities required to be undertaken are lawful. This new authorisation is a totally new, untested, untried mechanism and potentially exposes parties undertaking rehabilitation works on former mine sites to an unknown level of uncertainty and risk. We would not have to face this level of uncertainty and risk if the Palaszczuk government was not so dogmatic about enforcing the non-renewal of mining leases on North Stradbroke Island even for the benign and uncontroversial purpose of rehabilitation.

I draw to the attention of the House that this new, untested, untried mechanism has also necessitated amendments in this bill that extend the jurisdiction of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act and the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act onto land not covered by a mining lease under the Mineral Resources Act. This situation is very unusual and I note the discomfort expressed by the mining company, Sibelco Australia, and the Queensland Resources Council about the practical issues associated with the invention of this new, untested and untried mechanism in terms of the range of activities that need to be undertaken on the site to successfully rehabilitate former mine sites, the continuity of access to the site and the native title implications on land no longer subject to a mining lease. This is important to the company involved and to the broader resource sector given the proposal is to continue to make them responsible for meeting conditions on environmental authorities associated with mine sites without allowing a mining lease to continue in place. Once again I express my concerns that the Palaszczuk government is taking such a trial-and-error, wish-and-a-prayer approach to the important process of rehabilitation on former sandmining sites on North Stradbroke Island. It appears to me that it is putting politics and ideology before its better judgement.

I want to deal briefly with the technical aspects of the Katter party bill. The objective of the bill is to end sandmining activities on North Stradbroke Island by the end of 2024 and allow for rehabilitation until the end of 2029. As I understand it, the Katter party sought to offer up a compromise arrangement between the alternative proposals of the Palaszczuk government's position of a 2019 date for sandmining to end and the status quo supported by the LNP opposition of sandmining to continue until 2035. I note the only recommendation on which the Finance and Administration Committee could agree was that the Katter party bill not be passed, although, as pointed out in the committee report, the government and non-government members of the committee reached that conclusion for different reasons.

During his appearance before the committee I understand that the member for Dalrymple was rather candid in terms of disclosing that he undertook little consultation and that there was no real rationale behind the 2014 end date contained in the bill that he introduced into the House. With all due respect to the member for Dalrymple, there is really no basis for the 2014 end date proposed by the Katter bill from the perspective of the LNP. While it does offer five additional years of sandmining activity on North Stradbroke Island compared to Labor's alternative of 2019, the member for Dalrymple has admitted that the Katter party undertook no assessment of whether or not the time frame would provide a satisfactory period to successfully transition the local economy away from sandmining to alternative industries.

I would now like to spend some time providing a more accurate description of the work that the former LNP government undertook in 2013 from that provided by the Minister for Environment when it amended this legislation to provide a framework for the more orderly conclusion of sandmining on North Stradbroke Island. While the LNP supported the general intention of the original act in 2011 to transition the economy of North Stradbroke Island away from sandmining and towards other industries, such as nature based recreation, tourism and education, it had become very clear that the Bligh government had made several fundamental errors which had rendered the act ineffective and the LNP's 2013 amendments sought to correct those errors. The first significant error made by the Bligh government was the assumption it made about the island's economy. Under Labor's original legislation the most significant driver on North Stradbroke Island was due to cease in just six years. That time frame is now only three years away. This is far too short a time frame given that there is currently no alternative economic activity of any significance that would be capable of generating jobs and incomes to replace those currently provided by sandmining. Nature based conservation and recreation opportunities, tourism and education could not fill that void with comparable jobs in six years and it certainly cannot do it in just three years.

The strict time frames imposed by Labor's original legislation simply did not allow sufficient time for the local community and businesses on North Stradbroke Island to transition its economy away from a dependence on sandmining. The reality was that the economy of North Stradbroke Island was, and still is, largely dependent on sandmining operations. The population on the island was, and still is, highly dependent on sandmining for employment and income.

Compounding the risk of this assumption about the ability of the island's economy to transition was the Bligh government's failure to do enough to facilitate the establishment of alternative businesses, economic activity and infrastructure on the island. The former LNP government did not do that. It sought to create more opportunities for alternative industries to replace sandmining, such as the changes that it made to the Nature Conservation Act to provide better opportunities for ecotourism. Those amendments would have gone a long way to assisting in the transition of North Stradbroke Island's economy by providing a legislative basis to facilitate the development of tourism and ecotourism on the island. Of course, it would still have taken some time to encourage investment in and facilitate the development of tourism and ecotourism on North Stradbroke Island to help compensate for the end of sandmining. Unfortunately, the Palaszczuk government has subsequently overturned those LNP amendments to the Nature Conservation Act, which is another step backwards for North Stradbroke Island and another reason why sandmining should not be drawn to a close prematurely in 2019.

The Bligh government's original legislation in 2011 materially cut short Sibelco's proposed mining activities and the resource life potential. This represented a significant economic loss to Sibelco and damaged the state of Queensland's reputation in terms of sovereign risk. The regulatory restrictions placed on Sibelco, such as denial of access to a resource, imposed closure dates and reduced mining lease area, ignored all of the normal market-based signals that drive investment decisions in resource projects. Unfortunately, yesterday during a debate in the House on the Mineral and Other Legislation Amendment Bill I had to canvass numerous examples of the reputation of the resources sector in Queensland being negatively impacted on by the actions of this government. As I said to the House yesterday, changes in that bill will impact on Queensland's reputation as a place in which to invest in the resources sector and that will certainly cost jobs. In the past 16 months, the Palaszczuk government has done nothing but undermine confidence in the resources sector in Queensland, which has resulted in growing uncertainty, reduced investment and lost jobs, particularly in regional areas of the state.

Just as I did yesterday, I am happy to run through a list of the decisions that the Palaszczuk government has made since it came to office in 2015 that have contributed to that scenario. It has banned uranium mining in Queensland again; it has unnecessarily delayed the expansion of the port at Abbot Point; it has unnecessarily interfered with the approval of Glencore as the preferred proponent

of the Aurukun bauxite deposit; it has unnecessarily delayed the New Hope Acland Stage 3 coal project; and, of course, as a result of the passage of legislation through this House last year, it has opened up the objections process to abuse by green activity groups based not only in Queensland but also in other states and territories across Australia and, indeed, around the world. That is the track record of the Palaszczuk government when it comes to the resources sector.

As I mentioned in the House yesterday, Labor's policies have been reflected in the results of recent surveys that reported confidence amongst resource sector companies at a near five-year low. It is a fact that if those companies do not have confidence in the regulatory stability of a certain jurisdiction, they will make decisions not to invest in that jurisdiction. That is called sovereign risk. That problem is becoming a real issue in Queensland under the Palaszczuk government, as evidenced by the examples that I just gave to the House. Yesterday's legislation increased the risk and uncertainty that companies investing in the state of Queensland face. Yesterday's legislation was like putting a thick layer of sovereign risk icing on top of a sovereign risk cake and asking the companies that invest in Queensland and create jobs in the resources sector to eat a big slice of it, despite the fact that it was laced with poison.

This Palaszczuk government bill is a terrible example of a jurisdiction creating almost unbearable levels of sovereign risk for investors and potential investors. In particular, the precedent of amending legislation to change mining lease conditions is quite significant and one that has direct implications for investor confidence in exploration and resource sector development in Queensland. However, we should not really be surprised, because in this term of the parliament the Palaszczuk government has already done this with retrospective legislation impacting on Glenore's mineral development licence pertaining to the Aurukun bauxite deposit.

I hasten to add that the extension of sandmining activities on North Stradbroke Island provided for by the former LNP government did not impact on any national parks or environmentally sensitive areas on the island. Indeed, the majority of the Enterprise Mine area is of low ecological significance, with over 50 per cent of its footprint having been previously disturbed or used for key infrastructure such as roads, water pipelines, power lines or electrical substations. It is important for people to be aware that the area within the Enterprise Mine footprint is not a pristine environment and has a history of disturbance from logging, mining and infrastructure construction dating back to the 1950s. Not for one moment does the LNP opposition deny that the natural beauty or environmental value of North Stradbroke Island as a whole is very significant, but we need to be clear that the continued operation of the sand mine, particularly on the mining lease associated with the Enterprise Mine, does not pose a serious environmental risk to the island or its ecosystems.

The last issue that I want to canvass is the issue of native title and the rights and interests of the traditional owners of North Stradbroke Island, the Quandamooka people. I reassure all members that the LNP's 2013 amendments to the Bligh government's original legislation were made in accordance with the requirements of the Commonwealth Native Title Act 1993. The LNP's 2013 bill did not breach or necessitate any amendment to the Indigenous land use agreement between the state of Queensland and the Quandamooka people. The former LNP government was committed to meeting all the obligations and responsibilities under the ILUA that were required for the state of Queensland. I make the following observations in support of my statement in relation to this issue: in the first instance, as the former minister for natural resources and mines in the previous LNP government, I was responsible for the administration of the Native Title Act within the state of Queensland and the machinery of government arrangements. As the responsible minister, it was my responsibility to ensure that the provisions in the Native Title Act were complied with. I took those responsibilities very seriously and I worked diligently to ensure that the legislation that I presented to the House for its consideration was compliant in that regard. I make that statement very deliberately and very earnestly to this House.

It is a matter of fact that on 4 July 2011 the federal court made two native title consent determinations recognising the Quandamooka people's native title rights and interests over certain areas of land and waters on and surrounding North Stradbroke Island. The determinations bestow exclusive and nonexclusive native title rights and cover areas including national parks, reserves, unallocated state land and other leases that were the result of negotiations between the Quandamooka people and the various parties to the applications. When I introduced the amendments to the legislation in 2013, all of the advice that I had from my department and other agencies of the Queensland government reassured me that the provisions of the bill that I was proposing did not breach the native title rights and interests of the Quandamooka people or the ILUA between them and the state of Queensland.


Notwithstanding that, on 6 June 2014, the Queensland South Native Title Services lodged a challenge to the 2013 amendments in the High Court of Australia on behalf of QYAK, the prescribed body corporate representing the Quandamooka people, the traditional owners of North Stradbroke Island. The challenge asserted that the 2013 amendments conflicted with the Commonwealth law, namely, the Native Title Act 1993, and therefore are invalid under section 109 of the Australian Constitution. The state of Queensland is defending the matter. I point out that, since coming to office in February 2015, the Palaszczuk government has not withdrawn from defending that matter, notwithstanding that it has had every opportunity to do so if it believed that the 2013 amendments did conflict with the Commonwealth Native Title Act or breach the ILUA.

Indeed, I would also point out for the benefit of all members that the attorneys-general for the Commonwealth of Australia, New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia have intervened in the case in support of the state of Queensland. As I have pointed out to the House on many occasions, I am not a lawyer by trade. That comes as a great relief to me. In view of the above facts and observations, I consider that my actions as the former minister for natural resources and mines to be on fairly solid legal ground.

I understand all members of the House received correspondence and certainly the Finance and Administration Committee have received a submission from QYAC asserting the contrary—that the LNP's amendments did in some way contravene the ILUA and were therefore invalid and were therefore invalid on the basis that they were inconsistent with the Commonwealth Native Title Act. I have never been presented with any evidence in my previous or current roles in this place to demonstrate that this assertion is factual. I acknowledge the 2011 determination of native title rights and interests, but, with all due respect to the Quandamooka people who feel that QYAC represents them, I do not think the assertion that they have made is correct or valid.

For all of those reasons, I do not think that the Palaszczuk government has successfully made any case for the changes that they have proposed to bring sandmining to an end on North Stradbroke Island by 2019 be supported. That scenario would undoubtedly have a very severe impact on the community of North Stradbroke Island and it is not in their best interests. For that reason, I oppose the government's bill and the private member's bill from the Katter party.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Order! Before I call the next speaker, I acknowledge and welcome in the gallery Anne Warner, a former member for South Brisbane and minister for family services and Aboriginal and islanders affairs, and Aunty Joan.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algera—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (8.41 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. As I have previously advised the House, I am a Quandamooka woman and recognised traditional owner of the Quandamooka lands and seas and a member of the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation.

Whilst I have no direct pecuniary interest to declare in accordance with standing order 260, I do wish to record my interest as a Quandamooka woman so as to avoid any perceived conflict of interest about decisions made by the House which may affect members of my family. I have previously sought advice on this issue from the Integrity Commissioner. I table a copy of the commissioner's letter of reply.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 4 January 2016, from Mr Richard Bingham, Queensland Integrity Commissioner, to the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy, Hon. Leeanne Enoch, regarding potential conflicts of interest.

I confirm that I have also sought advice through the office of the Clerk of the Parliament about my position as a member of this House when matters relating to North Stradbroke Island are debated. I seek leave to speak in the language of Quandamooka people.

Leave granted.

Minister Enoch then addressed the House in the traditional language of the Quandamooka people.

Ms ENOCH: To translate, 'Hello. I am a saltwater goori from North Stradbroke Island and Moreton Island. I acknowledge our ancestors present and past and also the Yuggera and Turrbal people and their country. Quandamooka is my home and also my ancestors' from long ago. Gooris from Quandamooka are strong people. Our country is also strong. So let us all welcome the good spirits here where we talk, think and understand.'

This is the first time that I am speaking publicly on this matter. I can declare to the House that I have removed myself from cabinet whenever this matter has been brought forward. I have remained

neutral with my own family whom I recognise are in the gallery tonight. I have remained neutral because I am a Quandamooka woman. I stand as a Quandamooka woman with more than 3,000 generations before me. I love my family very much. I recognise that they have varying views on this, but, at the same time, we are one family. We are the Quandamooka people. We stand here with more than 3,000 generations that have gone before us.

On 4 July this year the Quandamooka people will mark the fifth anniversary of our native title determination. I remember that day in 2011. It was an historic day. There were tears. There was great excitement. Many of my family, some of whom are here—Aunty Joan and Uncle Bob—never dreamed that they would see the day when the rights of the Quandamooka people would be returned to them. I was so grateful that my father got to see that day before he passed away. It took 16 years to reach that historic moment. Many of my family gave everything they had—their health, their wealth—to keep that fight alive.

There is a reason the Quandamooka people fought so hard for our determination—why Aboriginal people fight for determinations. That is because we are here with 3,000 generations deep of our family. I am 3,000 generations deep in Quandamooka land. That is where my family have been for all that time. That is why we fight for this. That is why we fought for our native title determination. There are responsibilities that we hold and have carried through thousands of generations to ensure that our country, the place where our ancestors have been connected and we are connected, we connect to and we take care of.

In 2013 the LNP government, led by the Newman-Nicholls team, legislated against the native title rights of the Quandamooka people. They stripped that from us. They prevented traditional owners from having a say. In fact the LNP government had met more times with the mining company than the actual traditional owners.

As I understand it, the committee report at the time admitted that the government had not consulted with the Quandamooka people on the legislation that breached the Queensland Legislative Standards Act 1992. Without consent, the LNP changed a range of measures that had previously been agreed on by the Quandamooka people who were standing there 2,000 generations deep.

What we have seen since is the LNP actively working to turn families against families. It has been absolutely heartbreaking to hear elders in tears because they have not spoken to their own sister or brother over this matter. We have had the member for Cleveland around kitchen tables with elders turning them against their own families.

Dr ROBINSON: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I find those comments offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.


Ms ENOCH: I withdraw. It is not the place of politicians or corporations to get in the middle of families and to turn kinship structures inside out to benefit their own political agenda. That is not the place of politicians.

My father worked in that sand mine as a young man. He would say that it was the right kind of economy for that time. Many of my family members have benefitted from the economy that it generated. My father always knew that it was a temporary industry because of the impact on the island. In the final years of his life he reflected on the question of what next for his beloved island home.

Much of the mining lease, for instance, covers traditional places of great cultural significance, places that traditional owners, my family, representing thousands of generations, do not have access to, cannot teach children about, cannot pass on to the next generation. That is why it is important to understand that it is time for a new economy for North Stradbroke Island. That is why the transition plan in particular is one of the most generous that we have ever seen from the Queensland government, one that will make a difference in terms of what kind of economy will go forward but at the same time allow traditional owners the right to fulfil their own responsibilities that they have carried for thousands of generations. It provides that opportunity so that Quandamooka people, who five years ago celebrated that historic win in our native title determination, with the passing of the government's bill, will once again have ownership, that we will once again be treated respectfully and have our say over our own country.

I pay tribute to all of my family, elders, cousins, brothers and sisters who have fought so hard for this and who have continued the fight to remain respected and to ensure that future generations will be able to partake in the culture that we have been holding so close for thousands of generations. I am very proud to be part of a government that puts the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

in the place that it should be—in a respectful place, respecting the fact that we have lived here for more than 3,000 generations. I commend the government's bill to the House.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (8.50 pm): Before I progress to my contribution on the bills, I would like to acknowledge all of those people in the Finance and Administration Committee secretariat who worked to put this report into the House. It was a huge job, a very demanding job and one that they continued to do right through to the last day with enthusiasm.

Also, at the outset, on behalf of the non-government members of the Finance and Administration Committee, I would like to acknowledge and thank all of those individuals who so willingly gave their time to assist the committee in the evidence-gathering role. Many of you spoke up in the face of threats of intimidation and retribution. Having witnessed some of the overt intimidatory and openly bullying behaviour firsthand, we non-government members of the Finance and Administration Committee understand your genuine concerns for your families and for your own wellbeing. We fully understand why you asked for confidentiality in regard to your testimony and we are confident that the steps the Finance and Administration Committee has taken to maintain that confidentiality will reduce the likelihood of you being targeted. On that, I would like to table for the record a copy of a statement of concern, a report, if you like, that outlines some of the details about issues confronting the transition of North Stradbroke Island.

Tabled paper: Non-Government Members Statement of Concern in relation to the Inquiry into North Stradbroke Island Bills and proposed economic transition strategy and workers assistance scheme.

I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 and the North Stradbroke Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015. At the outset may I say that the titles of these two bills are so far off the mark, so inaccurate in their description of what would actually happen to North Stradbroke Island, that they may as well be referring to mining on the moon because mining on the moon would have no direct effect on anyone. These bills will have a direct effect on many people.

Those titles infer that these bills are intended to protect and sustain the island. Well, protecting and sustaining North Stradbroke Island is about protecting and sustaining every aspect of North Stradbroke Island, having no direct negative effect on a society, having no direct negative effect on the livelihoods of or of the lifestyles of something like 2,500 residents, having no direct negative effect on the enjoyment that those residents experience because of the life they live on one of the most unique and amazing islands on this planet.

That is a point that has been completely missed by those opposite, completely missed by two ministers, completely missed by others who are relying on a premise that a 'promise' was made to one group by the then opposition leader, now Premier of this state—and that is just not true. It is, as we say here so as not to offend standing orders, an untruth. We all know that out there we would describe it very differently, as we would describe some of the evidence provided to the committee.

You may be able to say to those who are uninformed that certain things are facts, but when you come before a parliamentary committee—in this case, the Finance and Administration Committee—the things you say have to be backed up with evidence. When you do not produce that evidence, you have in fact proven your untruth. We saw that occur right from the outset numerous times. Let us look at some of what was said.

What is being said is that a promise was made by the official spokesperson for Labor, in opposition, to wind back sandmining on North Stradbroke Island to 2019. That is just not true. A letter was written by retiring deputy opposition leader Tim Mulherin, a letter that purported to speak on behalf of the Labor opposition three days before the election—three days before the election, with no consultation with any of the stakeholders other than QYAC. That letter was so wrong in some aspects of what it said that a second letter from Tim Mulherin had to be written to the Redlands City Council correcting the inaccuracy.

The first letter said, and I paraphrase here, that the Redlands City Council was responsible for providing essential infrastructure to the community of One Mile on North Stradbroke Island at a cost that some estimate to be in the order of \$20 million—and that is not true. A second letter a day later—just two days before the election—had to be written to correct that statement. It was not the Redlands City Council's responsibility; it was the state government's responsibility to provide that infrastructure. We have a retiring member in the then opposition overstepping his authority three days before the election, having consulted with no-one other than QYAC, having to hurriedly correct a \$20 million error.

This was the start of a sorry saga, a saga that has put the people of North Stradbroke Island into limbo ever since that mistake was made on 28 January 2015.

How did it come about? As best as we can establish, the secretive QYAC—that is, the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation—wrote to the retiring member at an earlier date proposing that the opposition should make \$20 million available to wind back sandmining to 2019. The \$20 million was for a transition strategy, not One Mile. We are not talking about One Mile. Let us not confuse the two. There is no money offered for essential services. This is for a so-called transition strategy.

Here is another untruth from those opposite. The Labor government said it came up with the \$20 million sum after consultation with stakeholders. We now know—our committee now knows—that there was no consultation with those people who were directly impacted. We know that, for example, the Australian Workers' Union had no contact whatsoever, and they represent those miners on that island. No, the government did not come up with that figure. QYAC have given us evidence that it was them who came up with that \$20 million suggestion, that it was them who put that recommendation and suggestion to the opposition at the time. That \$20 million was not the government's idea after consultation with anyone. That \$20 million was all about what QYAC wanted to sell out the rest of the island.

Depending on who you talk to, the amount needed is somewhere between \$56 million and \$200 million. That is not the \$20 million that they are talking about and another \$8.5 million in bits and pieces. It is somewhere between \$56 million and \$200 million. In fact, it could be as much as \$285 million. That last suggestion came from the Australian Workers' Union. They suggested that a zero needs to be put on the amount being offered—and that amount was about \$28.5 million, including workers' entitlements as well.

This \$200 million figure is supported by Deloitte Access Economics in a report that they gave to this government, a report that we had to fight for, a report that we got just some weeks before we had to table the report in the House. In a report prepared on behalf of the government in September 2015, they reported that the impact of ceasing sandmining was as follows. They calculated that there would be an annual loss of direct economic activity on North Stradbroke Island, represented as gross value add, of between \$55 million and \$86 million if sandmining ceased. That is each year, every year for 16 years.

They went on to say that this amounted to direct economic impact or loss of between \$563 million and \$880 million over the 16-year time frame from the closure in 2019 on Straddie to 2035 in net present value terms using a 10 per cent nominal discount rate. That is how we come up with that number. However, if you use—and they used as a sensitivity analysis—a lower discount rate of seven per cent, if it was adopted, the impact or loss increases to between \$673 million and \$1,052 million over 16 years.

I table a *Courier-Mail* story on that specific issue because, interestingly, they focused on that—a very important part of our report.

Tabled paper. Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 5 May 2016, titled 'Stradbroke Island sand-off costs \$1b'.

Those opposite are offering a \$20 million transition strategy through, it would seem, the secretive QYAC. Why do I refer to QYAC as secretive? It seems strange to me that the few people we have had an opportunity to speak to who represent QYAC keep telling us that the ILUA is confidential. Let us accept that. The committee asked, 'What are they going to do during the proposed economic transition?' 'That is commercial-in-confidence.' Let us accept that. What about employment? They told us that since 2011 they have created 40 jobs in the steps they have taken to transition North Stradbroke Island. These 40 jobs are, according to QYAC, across three entities. Forty jobs in five years. Can you give us some detail around those figures? At first it was, 'Yes, absolutely.' Then it was, 'We can give you some of the detail but not all of it.' Why is that? It seems that businesses they are partners with may not want to provide the data. They are partners in the business but they might not want to provide the data. There is something secretive about this. 'Can you try,' we ask? Yes, they will try.

What did we get? We got some of the information marked 'confidential'. They cannot release it. They cannot bring it into the marketplace, with a suggestion the rest would be delivered before we were due to report. We are still waiting for the rest of the information. We have an organisation, QYAC, that purports to represent, if not all, most of the Indigenous people on North Stradbroke Island—an organisation that tells the committee it has created 40 new jobs but is unwilling to provide the evidence to back it up and the information that is provided is in confidence. This is salary and wages information, for goodness sake.

They have learnt well from the Labor Party. The Labor Party did some work on the island to gauge support for the so-called economic transition strategy and wages assistance strategy. Guess what? It disappeared into the cabinet-in-confidence realm. I see the people from the department looking very embarrassed sitting over there listening to this, because we asked many times for the information but, sadly, they had no choice but to—

Government members interjected.

Mr CRANDON:—this is my turn; you will have a turn later—say those words yet again and again, ‘I’m sorry, it’s cabinet in confidence.’ You guessed it, we have been denied access to it. We have not seen it to this day. On the one hand, we have a secretive government that withholds information gathered between early December 2015 and early February 2016, withholds information that would prove, I suggest, that QYAC is not the representative of all Indigenous residents, withholds information that would confirm the residents of North Straddie are against the early closure of sandmining on North Straddie and withholds information that would inform the committee on a wide range of matters important to that report. On the other hand, we receive scant information from QYAC—information that could prove the truth of what they were saying if they were prepared to give it to us.

Contrast that with the information provided by so many other stakeholders. Before we go on to those stakeholders, let us discuss very briefly the contribution of the Green groups. Their position for the most part was, ‘We support QYAC.’ That is all very well, but what is your position? What are you arguing about? We know what QYAC’s position is. Their other position was they wanted to close the mine not in 2019 but now in 2016. They do not care about the people on the island. They do not care about 2½ thousand residents on the island or the Indigenous population on the island who are earning an income from that island. Shut it down now because we do not care about any of them.

The position for the most part was that we support QYAC and close it down in 2016. Sadly, when they provided material to us, it was based on very old data and/or it was their opinion. Unfortunately, it was not backed up by science or other evidence. The accusations made by them were sent to the department for assessment. The department reported back to the committee dismissing all of those unproved accusations. The department advised that recent audits confirm the accusations made have no substance to them whatsoever. Remember, this is the department charged with the responsibility of ensuring our precious environment is protected. This, in turn, proves that the mining company is doing the right thing.

Who are the other stakeholders? Of course they are Sibelco, a sandminer that is employing well over 100 people on the island and another 50 or 60 people on the mainland at Pinkenba and other areas. The Straddie Chamber of Commerce represents around about 100 businesses, from memory. There is the Redland City Council; the two ferry services, Stradbroke Ferries and Stradbroke Flyer, which are the umbilical cord for the island community; and individual business owners. The most important stakeholders are the community of North Stradbroke Island made up of so many different people—sandminers, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous; community groups from the footy club, the volunteer marine rescue and all of the clubs in between those two; the families who love their island; all of those who work in very diverse areas like child minding, education; the nursing home Moopi Moopi Pa; the small businesses that provide goods and services; and the already established tourism industry that includes accommodation providers.

Interestingly, we were told that during peak season accommodation providers are completely booked out. Evidence was provided that the island could not cope with any more tourists at these times. Speaking of these individuals, their stories were from the heart. They talked about their lives, their families and the generations of their families who called North Stradbroke Island home. In so many cases it was because of sandmining they could live on North Stradbroke Island, and we have just heard that from the minister earlier today. Without sandmining and an alternative that is shovel ready, they fear for their future. These people, these families, like all of us in our communities, have ties to their local communities and they are fearful they will have to move away from that community because of this ill-timed closure of the mine that is being proposed. They have financial responsibilities. They have a history and with sandmining until 2035 they also have a future. Listen up: they also have a future if we can push that through to 2035.

They have an opportunity to plan for themselves and for their children. They have a real chance of transitioning from the current economy to a new sustainable economy that only time can deliver. They need enough time to do it properly for everyone on the island, and that includes QYAC. If QYAC

want to lead that transition they can, but they need to bring the whole community with them, not just 20 per cent of the community.

Ms Farmer interjected.


Mr CRANDON: You will have your turn later. Once again, time will guarantee that transitions will succeed without the pain early closure would bring.

I want to turn to the contrast I spoke about earlier—the difference between the information and evidence provided to the committee by this Labor government. Let us be clear: I am not talking about departmental staff here—those given responsibility for implementing these changes. They are just doing what they have been told to do based on the false premise of an election promise—a promise that has been proved to not really exist; a promise made by a retiring opposition member; a promise in a letter with a \$20 million error of fact in it.

I am talking about these Labor ministers and the withholding of information by them using cabinet in confidence. I am talking about QYAC with their stories that are not backed up with evidence. I am talking about those Green groups that have opinions and views but once again no provable scientific facts. Whatever we asked for from the business community as it related to evidence and hard numbers, we got it—plausible and provable facts and figures. These were facts and figures that we were freely able to use and include in our discussion with others. This allowed what the business community was saying to us to be tested. Importantly, we included it in the report for everyone to see and appreciate the benefit of keeping sandmining going until 2035.

Just on that, it is worth noting—and members will find it in our report—the reality is that sandmining will in fact all but cease around 2027 under the existing arrangements, giving the miner the abundance of time needed to properly do their job of repatriation and revegetation between then and the absolute end of their tenure in 2040. Over that time, more and more of the island will transition from sandmining to other sustainable activities.

Members should say no to both of these bills. Protect what we have now. Vote for the transition strategy that has time on its side and that will protect and sustain North Stradbroke Island for the future generations of North Stradbroke Islanders and all Queenslanders.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Sunnybank—ALP) (9.11 pm): I rise to support the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. The continuation of sandmining on North Stradbroke Island has been an issue for at least two elections. The extension to the time frame for mining by the previous government was undertaken without consultation and ignored the 15 years of native title negotiations that had been taking place. The previous government proceeded against the wishes of the traditional owners. I support this bill as it returns the North Stradbroke Island act to its original intent.

As chair of the committee, I would like to take this time to note the outcomes of the Finance and Administration Committee's recent examination of the bill. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the Finance and Administration Committee for their assistance during this process. The committee consultation process was one of the most extensive undertaken by the Finance and Administration Committee and included calling for written submissions on the bills, the Economic Transition Strategy and the Sand Mining Workers Assistance Scheme. An impressive total of 301 submissions and 1,600 form submissions were made, and 114 witnesses appeared in public and private hearings—demonstrating that the future of Straddie is important to so many people.

The one recommendation the committee had was that the private member's bill not be passed. While it did not make any recommendations on the government's bill, it may be useful to discuss some comments in the report. Those opposite want to retain the current legislation as amended when their government was in power—they want mining to continue to 2035—suggesting that the bill 'prematurely ceases' sandmining and that the Economic Transition Strategy is not viable. The bill does not prematurely cease mining; it restores the act to its original intent, reflective of the then Bligh and current Palaszczuk government policy to substantially phase-out mining by 2019.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Member for Cleveland, you are constantly interjecting. I see that you are on the speaking list. If you continue to interject, you will get your first warning and you will miss your opportunity to speak.

Mr RUSSO: The bill does not prematurely cease mining; it restores the act to its original intent, reflective of the then Bligh and current Palaszczuk government policy to substantially phase-out mining


by 2019. It also respects the rights and interests of the Quandamooka people to enjoy access to their native cultural lands. The committee report states that those opposite do not believe there was adequate consultation, but the only end date for mining that has been properly consulted on is the 2019 end date.

Let me point out that the explanatory notes to the 2013 amendment bill—the bill that changed the end date—record that there was no consultation on those amendments. Those opposite also suggest that the government did not understand the impacts of their policy or that Labor's policy was not clear before the 2015 election. How can this be so when the Bligh Labor government had spent years negotiating with key stakeholders to develop the original policy and the legislation for North Stradbroke Island, which ended sandmining in 2019. The Labor members of parliament strenuously opposed the 2014 amendments—as did the member for Dalrymple, Mr Shane Knuth.

The committee highlighted the need for certainty. The only uncertainty has been caused by the 2013 amendments that were supported by those opposite. The lack of a regulatory impact assessment was also a concern to the committee. I note that there was no regulatory impact statement prepared for the 2013 bill that assessed the cost of that decision in continuing to deny the Quandamooka people new opportunities and access to their land. In relation to the current bill, it would be really hard to argue that undertaking a regulatory impact statement would have provided any different information than what was considered in preparing the 2011 act. The 2015 bill will affect the same key stakeholders in the same way—by facilitating the phase-out of mining by the same date, 2019.

I understand that executives from the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection and the Department of State Development provided an exceptional level of assistance to the committee: attending multiple departmental briefings, public hearings and meetings with the secretariat as well as providing background briefings, responses to questions on notice and answers to letters from the committee, often within very short time frames. I thank them for their professionalism and commitment.

Lastly, I would like to state that this bill sets a clear direction forward for Straddie. The associated \$28 million package will support the continued transition of the island to a sustainable, broad-based economic future, based on the island's unique cultural and natural values. I am pleased to support the bill. This bill should be supported by parliament to give the North Stradbroke Island community the certainty they deserve. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (9.18 pm): I rise tonight as a member of the Finance and Administration Committee to make my contribution to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. This government bill was introduced into the parliament by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, the Hon. Dr Stephen Miles, after a private member's bill was introduced by the member for Dalrymple, Shane Knuth, the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015. Both of these bills seek to overturn the sensible and considered changes made by the LNP to facilitate the transition of the economy of North Stradbroke Island from a reliance on sandmining to a sustainable future. The current LNP legislation provides for an opportunity for a renewable mining lease to be extended until 2035 with a non-winning condition until 2040.

This time frame is essential to avoid what would otherwise be a disastrous impact on the economy of North Stradbroke Island, as is evidenced in the report tabled by the Finance and Administration Committee. It became obvious in the early stages of the inquiry how contentious and controversial the impact sandmining is having on the island, with those both for and against the industry. With this in mind, the committee held a number of public and private meetings on North Stradbroke Island, Cleveland and here at Parliament House. One factor immediately became apparent at these forums, which was the lack of consultation across the community by both the government and the member for Dalrymple in the formation of the respective bills.

In the initial stages of the inquiry the committee was only to investigate which of the proposed dates for an end to sandmining was the most acceptable with no consideration to be given to the economic impact on the island or any scrutiny of the proposed transition strategy. The non-government members soon became aware that the draft economic strategy was an integral part of any deliberation of the future of the economy of North Stradbroke Island and was of vital importance to the affected mineworkers. On 17 March 2016 the House extended the scope of the committee's inquiry to include consideration of the draft economic transition strategy and the North Stradbroke Island Sand Mining Workers Assistance Scheme.

While sandmining is not the only industry on North Stradbroke Island, it was evident to the non-government members that many sections of the island's business community are reliant on the economic benefits that flow from Sibelco's activity on the island. Sibelco advised that sandmining on the island directly employed 114 full-time equivalent positions on North Stradbroke Island and 41 full-time equivalent positions at the Pinkenba loading facility. A recent survey conducted by the Straddie Chamber of Commerce estimated that the total number of jobs lost as a result of the closure of the sandmine by 2019 would be 300, both directly and indirectly. Deloitte Access Economics was commissioned by the Department of State Development in April 2015 to report on the likely economic and employment impacts of closing sandmining in 2019 as opposed to 2035. The findings of that report predicted a direct annual loss of economic activity on North Stradbroke Island of between \$55 million and \$86 million. In addition to this, over the 16-year difference between closing down in 2019 versus 2035 there would be losses of between \$563 million and \$880 million.

These figures were reinforced by the Straddie Chamber of Commerce survey of their business membership, which showed 82 per cent of their members indicated at least 30 per cent of their business is directly or indirectly derived from the sandmining industry on North Stradbroke Island. A further survey conducted in February 2016 reported that more than 50 per cent of businesses attributed one to five of the staff members they employed directly or indirectly to mining activity on the island. Stradbroke Ferries submitted that at least a quarter of their revenue is directly invoiced to Sibelco and they have estimated that approximately 40 per cent of their income is associated with mining related business. They raised concern that a loss of revenue of up to 40 per cent may directly impact on their ability to maintain current employment levels of 120 full-time and part-time staff, noting that 40 per cent of that number would mean a loss of up to 48 jobs. David Thomson, the General Manager of Stradbroke Ferries, stated that the ferry service is the umbilical cord between the mainland and Stradbroke Island. All transport to and from the island must travel on the ferry. He stated—

Take a quarter of our revenue out of our business and we cannot provide the same service we do today.

The fact that the economy of North Stradbroke Island will be severely affected was not shared by all submitters to the committee. Cameron Costello, the CEO of the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation, known as QYAC, believes that sandmining should end immediately. In QYAC's submissions on the economic future of the island they spoke of some projects that were already happening with room to expand, for instance, Straddie Camping and rangers working in partnership with Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service, some of the proposed projects such as the knowledge and cultural centre to share the history of the island's first inhabitants, whale watching, aquatic farming and tourism.

The Quandamooka hold native title rights over 54,408 hectares of land and water on and surrounding North Stradbroke Island and believe that the existence of the mining lease impinges on their rights to access some of the land covered by that mining lease. These ideas were largely supported by organisations such as Friends of Stradbroke Island, Stradbroke Island Management Organisation and the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland. These groups also expressed concern about the impact mining has upon the vegetation and wildlife of the island.

Sibelco disputes the long-term impact that mining is having on the island. They have a team that is solely assigned to the task of rehabilitation of the landscape and vegetation. The committee was taken on a tour to inspect the rehabilitation sites that were completed some 20 years ago and some sites where revegetation has only just begun close to the mine site. This work is being undertaken by highly qualified experts in the field of mine rehabilitation and revegetation. The people we spoke to were very proud of the work they were doing and the progress they were making. There is a large nursery on site, which propagates the local native plants and trees to be planted to bring the area back as close as possible to its native state. Some of the submitters we spoke to stated that this successful rehabilitation was not always the case, with some past mine owners having a poor record of management practices, which has created a negative reputation for the mine. This is not a situation that is unique to North Stradbroke Island as there have been many examples of poor rehabilitation practices across many Queensland mines prior to best management practices being introduced to the resource and gas industries.

It must be noted that, whilst the directors of QYAC were openly against the continuation of mining on the island, this was not universal amongst the Quandamooka people. The committee heard from many Quandamooka who submitted and spoke to the committee under the condition that their identities were kept confidential. Many of the Quandamooka people work for Sibelco in various roles, for example,

in management, mineworkers and in the area of rehabilitation. The committee noted that many of the supporters and workers of the mine were very cautious when speaking publicly.

The groups that are opposed to the continuation of sandmining on the island were passionate in their arguments. However, they could not provide a solid economic case for the immediate future of North Stradbroke Island. The non-government members of the committee were amazed at the lack of diligence around the proposed economic transition strategy and the fact that there had been no risk impact analysis done to investigate how the island's economy would survive the end of sandmining.

The committee became aware that the department had conducted a survey on the island between December 2015 and February 2016 and requested to see the findings of this research. The committee was told that the findings were cabinet in confidence and could not be released. On several occasions the committee tried to access the findings but to no avail. The committee then invited Minister Miles and Minister Lynham to attend a hearing with the committee, but this invitation was declined. The only conclusion that the non-government members could derive from this is that the findings of the survey are so damning that there is no intention by the government for that report to ever see the light of day.

The workers assistance scheme left a lot of unanswered questions as to how many employees would be eligible, particularly any worker who had received a redundancy payment from Sibelco. Submitters argued that all employees, regardless of whether they receive a redundancy payment, should be entitled to, and be able to, access support under the scheme. The more submitters the committee spoke to, the more apparent it became that there was no workable strategy in place to transition the economy and the workforce with an imminent end to sandmining. Almost all submitters expressed their disappointment and frustration at the lack of consultation by the government in the formulation of this bill, and none more so than Ben Swan, the Secretary of the Australian Workers' Union. In submissions to the committee Ben Swan stated—

It would seem that the group most affected by the cessation date—the workers—were not given an opportunity to be consulted on the Government's actual legislation.

This should not be particularly surprising to the AWU, given that there was no consultation with the union and the workforce in 2011 when the Bligh government announced its intention to cease sandmining. Mr Swan further stated—

I just find that an appalling lack of process, and this is an era where we have been promised much about accountability and transparency. ... Consultation does not mean being told what the end result is after the decision has been made ...

He then went on to say—

It has been repeated *ad nauseum* that this government had an election mandate to introduce this legislation. This is nonsense. There was not one public statement made during the course of the 2015 election campaign about the cessation of sand mining on NSI.


The non-government members do not support either the government bill or the private member's bill. While there are many submitters critical of the lack of consultation with the government bill, it was almost impossible to find anyone who had been consulted on the private member's bill. This bill makes no mention of any transition plan or economic strategy for affected workers or businesses. This bill is so lacking in detail as to be unworkable and can only be seen as a cheap grab for a headline.

The motives for the government bill appear to be much clearer: Green votes. The lack of consultation and the withholding of information can only be seen for what it is. The decision to end sandmining was already made, and nothing and nobody would stand in the way of securing Green preferences. The Labor Party is dancing with two partners: the unions and the Greens. It is never easy, and on this occasion they can only dance with one. They have chosen the Green partner, and the blue collar workers who are employed at the sand mine will be sacrificed at the Green altar for those Green preferences. The only jobs that those opposite are interested in saving are the jobs of the member for Mt Coot-tha and the member South Brisbane.

The path to harvest Green preferences by the Labor Party has been plain for all to see and even more so over recent times. The sneaking through parliament of a major change to our voting system with no consultation to once again introduce compulsory preferential voting was a blatant one. While we were on North Stradbroke Island we heard from many workers from Sibelco who are fearful for their future and that of their families. There are limited employment opportunities on the island for these plant operators and tradespersons unless they go and work in a coffee shop or go to one of the resorts and make beds. Most are very concerned about the impact that a rushed end date for sandmining will have on the value of their homes.

No-one that the committee spoke to or received submissions from disputed that sandmining will and should end—all agree on that point—but it must be done in an orderly and well-managed way, otherwise the impact on the economic and social fabric of North Stradbroke Island has the potential to be devastating. The non-government members of the committee hold very real fears for the future of North Stradbroke Island should the 2019 end date be passed. We will be opposing both bills, and all members in this House should do the same.

In conclusion, Madam Deputy Speaker, there have been a number of changes to the Finance and Administration Committee of recent times, of which you were a member. You spent some time on this bill, and thank you for your contribution. Our deputy chair, Michael Crandon, has also moved on—thank you very much for all your time, Michael—and a new chair has come in amongst it. The member for Bulimba, Di Farmer, started this report, so thank you very much; the member for Sunnybank, Peter Russo, has taken over from there. How could we forget the member for Barron River? I would like to finish by acknowledging all the hard work of the research director, Amanda Honeyman. Thank you very much for all the work you have done; it is very much appreciated.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (9.33 pm): I rise to support the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 and to oppose the private member's bill introduced by the member for Dalrymple, though I do so with the greatest respect for the good intentions that he has shown towards those who live on or who care about North Stradbroke Island.

In supporting this bill I wish to acknowledge the many hundreds of people whose views I personally heard on North Stradbroke Island and on the mainland or read in my role as chair of the Finance and Administration Committee before I stepped down from that role and for all those who submitted to the committee over the life of its inquiry. In the short time that I was involved in that inquiry it was absolutely clear just how deeply people care about what happens on that island. The people who spoke to us—whether they were someone who owns a store, whether they were a worker or a teacher or a child-care worker, the wife or husband of someone who makes a living out of the mines or whether you are an Indigenous person—no matter who you were you deeply cared about that place and have a genuine love for that place. That is why I have slightly changed what I was going to say in this speech tonight, because what has really concerned me about some of the contributions so far is the deep disrespect which has been shown for many of the people who appeared before this committee. The parliamentary committee process is a process where every person in Queensland or every group in Queensland who has an interest, regardless of whether that is an interest that is different to our own, may appear before this committee or any other committee without fear that their view will be pilloried or criticised in this chamber. They must feel that they can go to that committee and express their view.

Tonight we have heard the member for Hinchinbrook say that he represents the views of everybody on the island when he says how much they all disagree with Labor's bill. From the member for Coomera we heard outrageous accusations and imputations against people's character and the way they appeared before the committee and gave evidence. There have been imputations against the incredibly hardworking public servants from the Department of State Development and the Department of Environment and Heritage. It is fair enough to appear in this House and have a go at each other with the argy-bargy that happens between parties, but to criticise people or groups like QYAC or the greens who did not happen to be supportive of their position is an outrageous travesty and a terrible reflection on the committee system. If some of those people never, ever wish to appear before a parliamentary committee again then I would not be surprised, because whatever decision is made by this House tonight—and we do not know what that decision is going to be—there are going to be many people who will be disappointed. The views of those people should be respected by this House and we should acknowledge that, whoever does not get the outcome they want, they will be deeply affected. They have engaged in such a strong way with this committee.


This bill fulfils an election commitment of the Palaszczuk Labor government to cease sandmining by 2019. In doing so it reinstates the legislation which was in place prior to the LNP taking government in 2012. We know that when the LNP passed their legislation in 2013 which extended sandmining to 2035 it was against the expressed wishes of traditional owners. If anybody who heard the speech from the member for Algeester tonight did not have a tear in their eye regarding the position of Indigenous people on that island, then I think they must have hearts of stone.

This legislation will not please everyone, but without any doubt whatsoever it will put an end to the uncertainty as swiftly as possible. Everyone on the island who spoke to the committee knew that mining was going to cease. When I was on the committee many of them said, 'If the LNP gets back into

government after you guys, can we please just have no more changes?' Even the people who still support 2035 do not want any more changes.

There is much I would like to say about this bill—about the certainty it provides, about a sustainable future for that beautiful island, about respecting native title and about respecting the environment. I acknowledge the good work the member for Condamine talked about—the environmental rehabilitation work by Sibelco that is already going on on the island. I completely acknowledge that.

I was going to talk about the economic transition strategy, which will be a significant support in these coming years for the people of the island and will give them a real alternative to mining and what it currently provides to the economy. What I want to acknowledge most is the deep respect of the people of this House for the people of North Stradbroke Island and all of those who care about it. I am supporting this bill because I believe that it provides a sustainable future for that island. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (9.39 pm): I rise to oppose Labor's job-destroying North Stradbroke Island bill, because Labor's bill does not allow sufficient time or resources for a proper transition from mining without causing mass job losses and community pain. Due to the short time allotted to me today I will restrict my comments to specific aspects of Labor's bill, though I commend the member for Dalrymple for seeking a compromise in this regard.

The issue is not whether mining should or should not be phased out but how quickly and smoothly that transition takes place. If 2019 is passed, what are the impacts of the sudden loss of a major employer on the 2,000-plus people in the townships and on the businesses and jobs currently dependent on that employer? My fear as the local member for the last seven years is that if Labor's 2019 bill is passed tonight, and without an adequate economic transition strategy, SBS will have another potential site for *Struggle Street*. Yes, SBS could consider running *Struggle Street: Straddie* in 2020.

The sudden loss of a projected 300 direct and indirect jobs would bring unnecessary hardship on the island's residents and potentially create a Struggle Street environment that the island may never recover from. Australian Workers' Union State Secretary Ben Swan summed up the situation with respect to Labor's 2019 decision to shut down the mine prematurely when he said that it would be a kick in the guts for workers. This is a Labor man saying that it would be a kick in the guts for workers!

Why 2019? Where did that come from? It is important to understand that 2019 is a premature date and that the community has expected for a long time that leases would be renewed on a rolling basis into the late 2020s and even 2030s and then mining would end. Historically, all Cleveland and Redlands MPs and state governments, until the Bligh government, have supported mining continuing well into the 2020s and 2030s, including long-term Cleveland member Darryl Briskey, a well-respected Labor member; Phil Weightman, another respected Labor member; and the Goss and Beattie Labor governments. It was not until the Bligh government that Labor even considered an early closure.

Where did 2019 come from? I will highlight three aspects. The first is a Greens preference deal. 2019 is the Greens' date. The Greens chose the date of the expected lease renewal for Enterprise mine as their wish list date for shutting mining down. The Bligh Labor government needed Greens preferences desperately to survive the 2012 election, so then premier Bligh acquiesced to the Greens date. Ben Swan, in his role as secretary of the AWU, described it perfectly when he said—

This decision speaks more to the soy milk latte sipping politics of Paddington and West End in inner city Brisbane than it does to the Government's stated objective of supporting jobs and sustainable resource development throughout Queensland.

It was a Greens preference deal with Labor's Far Left. The second aspect is the supposed election promise. Outgoing Labor MP Tim Mulherin wrote a letter to an island stakeholder group—albeit an important stakeholder group—about 2019. That was announced just a few days before the 2015 election. The island residents did not see this as an election promise to them as it was not by the normal means. It was irregular. It was not by the Labor leader, not via a media event and not to the whole community. In fact, the island residents consider that the election promise from this Labor government is to protect jobs on the island. 'Jobs, jobs, jobs' was the mantra in the 2015 election. That is what they expected those opposite to do—to keep their jobs, not the cuts, cuts, cuts of the Deputy Premier.

Ms Trad interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order!

Mr Crandon interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Crandon interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Coomera, order! I will start warning members. Both the member for Cleveland and the Deputy Premier need to direct their comments through the chair, not across the chamber.

Dr ROBINSON: They expected their jobs on the island to be protected as an election promise. They expected their jobs to be safeguarded, not destroyed by a Labor government. The people of Straddie will hold this Labor government accountable once again, as they have in the last two elections on the island, if Labor seeks to sack workers in breach of its election promise.

The third aspect is Indigenous injustice. A more recent argument that has been put forward is that if mining continues beyond 2019 the government will be in breach of the Quandamooka native title claim and the ILUA with the Queensland government. Legal advice contradicts this position, including crown legal advice of the Palaszczuk government, crown legal advice of the Newman government, legal advice from the federal government and the Quandamooka traditional owners. Some of those who have sought legal advice have come to a conclusion different from what a couple of the QYAC elders have come to. Legal advice rules out the issue of Aboriginal injustice through continuation of mining past 2019. Quandamooka traditional owners have written to the High Court foreshadowing a potential challenge to Labor's 2019 bill if it gets up tonight. That is traditional owners—Quandamooka people—challenging this Labor government because it has not listened to them. They claim that ending mining prematurely—

Ms Trad interjected.

Dr ROBINSON: You have had your say and I listened to it respectfully.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Cleveland, I have asked you to direct your comments through the chair. I appreciate that this is a matter about which you are very passionate.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of Opposition Business—

Mr SEENEY: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Since when have members in this House not been entitled to respond to interjections? There was a clear interjection from the government, to which the member for Cleveland—

Mr Power interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for Logan, the Leader of Opposition Business is entitled to raise a point of order without being interrupted by you.

Mr SEENEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I pose the question to you: since when have members in this House not been allowed to respond—

Ms TRAD: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, allow the Leader of Opposition Business to put his point of order. Then—

Ms TRAD: I think he is reflecting on the chair, not making a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, please resume your seat. Leader of Opposition Business, that is not what I was saying. I was asking the member for Cleveland to direct his comments through the chair, as is appropriate under the standing orders of this House. He is entitled to respond to interjections. I did not say that he was not. I simply asked that he direct his comments through the chair, as is appropriate under the standing orders.

Ms Grace interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Employment, I do not need your assistance either, thank you very much. Member for Cleveland, you have the call.

Dr ROBINSON: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for your protection from a very overexcited government.

Some of the traditional owners claim that ending mining prematurely in 2019 may remove their native title rights as it would reduce the royalties from mining to the Aboriginal people, amongst other rights. In summary, the real reason for Labor adopting the Greens' 2019 end date is the election promise

of Labor not to the people of North Stradbroke Island but to the Greens political party and a few other supporters of the Labor left.

I note that the Finance and Administration Committee's report did not recommend that Labor's bill be passed. The bipartisan parliamentary committee made no favourable recommendation of Labor's 2019 bill. It did not recommend that the bill be passed. It made no positive recommendation about that bill.

I thank the committee for its good work and for attending open public meetings on the island and for listening to the community. The report captures the great anger from island residents about this premature closing. Unfortunately the Premier could not find the time to listen to the residents as she committed to do so in the parliament. Instead, she went to Straddie on a holiday. The Deputy Premier held secret and closed meetings with the ETU only. Minister Miles visited the island to go scuba diving and riding in boats.

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. That is untrue. I find it offensive.

Dr ROBINSON: You went to the ETU meetings.


Ms TRAD: I ask him to withdraw.

Dr ROBINSON: I withdraw. There were meetings on the island with the Electrical Trades Union that the Deputy Premier attended.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, they are untrue. I find them personally offensive. I ask him to withdraw. He should get his facts right.

Dr ROBINSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I withdraw and I will be writing to the Speaker soon in terms of the member's misleading of the House. No senior member from the government had the time to meet the people in an open public meeting. With regard to the economic transition strategy and in terms of no regulatory impact statement ever being done by the government—deliberately I suspect—the government is flying blind when it comes to the extent of the impacts of its job-destroying bill. Queensland Resources Council boss Michael Roche raised industry concerns that a 2019 end to sandmining on the island was unachievable. He said that there was simply no way that the government could come up with a plan that replaces by 2019 the hundreds of jobs and the annual economic injection from sandmining.

Based on all available evidence from the CCIQ, Straddie Chamber of Commerce, Redlands Chamber of Commerce, Sibelco and other sources, Labor's bill will likely have a hugely detrimental impact on the local residents in terms of mass job losses—up to 300 is estimated—as well as economic, social, Indigenous and environmental impacts. The time until 2019 is simply not enough from a starting date of now for the economic transition from sandmining. The time frame for the transition that is brought about by Labor's bill—only three years—is too short. There are many other things that I could say. Tourism in the short term will not make up the gap. Toondah Harbour in the short term, as good as that project is—started under an LNP government—will not make up the gap until in the 2020s. There was no community consultation about the decision itself—a matter that key stakeholders have complained about. The community was not involved in the conversation. The community at around about 80 per cent to 90 per cent is opposed to Labor's 2019 bill—something it worked very hard to keep secret from the rest of Queensland. The Indigenous people and the many groups that make up the Quandamooka people have spoken to us and they are largely against the government's closure in 2019. I oppose Labor's bill.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.52 pm): I rise in support of the government's North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill and in opposition to the private member's bill. Before starting I want to acknowledge in the House Quandamooka elders. I acknowledge Uncle Bob Anderson and Aunty Joan Hendriks. I acknowledge the CEO of QYAC, Mr Cameron Costello. I also acknowledge the member for Algester, who is also a traditional owner of Minjerribah and the Quandamooka clan. I also want to acknowledge in the House Dr Jan Aldenhoven who has been an incredibly strong evidence based, scientifically driven advocate for the cessation of sandmining on Stradbroke Island. I also want to acknowledge one of my predecessors who may or may not still be in the gallery, Anne Warner, who is an incredible woman.

I want to address a couple of issues that have been presented to this House by those opposite, but in doing so I also want to talk from the perspective of being the shadow environment spokesperson in the last term of this parliament—the 54th Parliament—when the Newman-Nicholls LNP with its

massive majority steamrolled over the interests of Queenslanders wherever they were but particularly the traditional owners and community members of North Stradbroke Island. I start with the assertion put forward by those opposite that they are merely interested in the jobs and the economy of the island. For those opposite to go to the wall for 200 jobs at a time when they were sacking 14,000 people is pure hypocrisy. For them to steamroll over the interests of native title holders and tear up an agreement between a former Queensland government and the traditional owners based on a Federal Court determination for less than 200 jobs while they were sacking thousands of Queenslanders is pure hypocrisy. They are not to be believed—they cannot be believed—because of their actions. They say that they are concerned about the mining industry. We have heard those opposite talk about sovereign risk and threats to the resources industry. Who increased royalties at a time when commodity prices were taking a dive in the last term? Those opposite! What did we see? We saw the loss of 8,000 jobs in the resources sector—8,000 jobs. That is the legacy of the member for Clayfield—the former Newman government treasurer and now the Leader of the Opposition. They speak with forked tongues. They care about the resources industry but they were directly responsible for hiking up royalties after promising not to and then driving job losses in the resources sector. They are not to be believed.

In relation to the deal, we have heard the member for Cleveland go on about deals with the Greens. I challenge him to table evidence of a deal with the Greens that propelled the original Bligh Labor government agreement in relation to the end of sandmining. He should table it because in the last term I did table Rowland's strategic advice given to the former government—given to the people of Queensland—around the success of its campaign. Let me writ large for those people in the chamber about a dirty deal: a dirty deal where Rowland on behalf of Sibelco ran a campaign—a mischievous, deceiving campaign—where it knew it could not advance the interests of a mining company and had to couch its campaign as Straddie Stories and Straddie Mothers because it knew it could not get up an argument on behalf of Sibelco in favour of Campbell Newman, the candidate for Ashgrove. Some \$92,000 on behalf of Sibelco was used to make sure that Campbell Newman got elected in Ashgrove. In return, what did it get? It got the privilege of writing the legislation—writing the riding orders, of handing over to the government in secret meetings with ministerial officers but no departmental officers present the riding orders. It got to include the maps. It got to determine the mine path. It got to provide the economic analysis. What did it get in return for its \$92,000? It got an additional 22 years. Even Sibelco was not asking for an additional 22 years. You gave it to them because—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Deputy Premier, I have clearly already in the debate tonight asked people to direct their comments through the chair. I would ask that you not say 'you' across the chamber and direct your comments through the chair per the standing orders.

Ms TRAD: Let us be clear: the Liberal National Party of Australia after a donation of \$92,000 to the Campbell Newman Ashgrove campaign in 2012 returned the favour by giving Sibelco absolutely everything it wanted and more in terms of changes to the legislation at the expense of the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee people, and that is a disgrace and that is a shame. Every single member of the Liberal National Party will live with that shame for the rest of their time in this chamber.


I want to address the absolute disrespect by those opposite and particularly the member for Hinchinbrook in terms of leading this issue in the former government. This is a complete disgrace. Not once did he sit down with the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee people and have a discussion about what they wanted. Let us be very clear about what initiated the changes to the cessation of mining on North Stradbroke Island. It was the Federal Court determination in 2011. What did Labor do at that time? Labor sat down with the traditional owners, with the community, with the mining company. Not everyone was happy, but an agreement was reached that those opposite, when they sat on this side of the House, tore up. They tore it up, because they got paid \$92,000 by Sibelco in Ashgrove to win the campaign.

I am proud to be part of a political party that is the only political party that can manage the transition to more sustainable industries. We have done it through the regional forestry agreement. We have done it by increasing renewable energy. We have done it in terms of North Stradbroke Island and we will continue to do it as a Labor government for North Stradbroke Island.

You can only trust Labor to transition to a more sustainable economy. Those opposite have not met a tree, a piece of dirt, or a piece of water that they have not wanted to tear up, pollute or pillage. I am proud to be part of a government that is righting a wrong. You can trust only the Australian Labor Party to understand what it takes to move an economy on to a more sustainable footing. You can trust only Labor to do that, because those opposite have a proven track record of not doing that.

When we are talking about transition, this Labor government has put millions of dollars on the table. We have a clearly articulated strategy to get us to a more sustainable future for Minjerrabah, for North Stradbroke Island. I say this to the House and I said this in the second reading speech in the last term of the government: the father of the former premier of Queensland, Campbell Newman, stopped sandmining on Fraser Island. It took him eight weeks to transition and close down that industry. Those opposite and the former premier could not do what his father did in eight weeks in eight years. In eight years, he could not do what his father, when he was a federal minister, did in eight weeks. The only reason for that is they did not have the political will, they did not have the integrity of leadership. What is more, the only reason they were motivated to change the legislation to give Sibelco an extra 22 years and \$1.5 billion in profit was a \$92,000 donation. That is their shame. Can I say, when you think about it in those terms, they are pretty cheap.

(Time expired)

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (10.02 pm): I rise to speak to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill. As a former member of the Finance and Administration Committee, it was made patently clear at public hearings and in submissions the serious impact that this bill will have on the economic viability of the community on North Stradbroke Island and in the adjacent communities. This legislation is a base appeal for green preferences. It certainly is not about improving employment in Queensland. It certainly is not about making Queensland businesses strong. As the Queensland branch secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, Ben Swan said—

Nothing has materially changed on the island. I am unaware of any particular initiatives that have been undertaken by the government to gear up the island economy to contemplate a transition to tourism or any other activities that might support a transition away from sandmining.

There are a number of reasons I think this bill is flawed. It is flawed in that it makes a seriously significant decision that impacts on a region but makes only a cursory attempt to deal with the people affected. It is flawed because it is based purely on paying back the Greens—a party that seeks to undermine the Queensland industry and cripple our mining and agricultural industries. Whatever there is of a regulatory impact statement will remain subject to cabinet in confidence. There is no economic transition statement. There is a false belief that this government can transition a region's economy in three years. There is no acknowledgement that it will destroy the jobs of local Indigenous workers who have been well employed by Sibelco and replace them with fewer jobs and ones that pay significantly less. There is no consideration for the island's economy and those of adjacent mainland communities.

Sandmining should be extended on North Stradbroke Island to 2035, allowing rehabilitation of the mine site to 2040. That would allow an appropriate period for the local economy to transition from sandmining to other industries. It is appalling how much this government is willing to sacrifice in its blind support of the pursuit of green fanatics.

The committee hearings were a surprise. It was a revelation to hear the state secretary of the AWU, Ben Swan, slam this government. It was a revelation to know that the people spoke up in the face of threats of intimidation and retribution. It was a revelation to learn about some of the overt intimidating and openly bullying behaviour firsthand. All members of this parliament should read the report and they will discover the true extent that this government will go to secure those green preferences while undermining a viable industry and pushing people out of work. The workers have become collateral damage.

Mineral sands are used everywhere, including in the daily lives of all Labor Party members. They are used in silicon chips for computing, glassware, cells for solar power generation, pigments in paint, plastics, paper and latex rubber, cosmetics and pharmaceuticals, sporting and surgical equipment, watches, aerospace components, welding rods, glazes on pottery and in toothpaste, rechargeable batteries, engine parts and electrical fuses. Let me be very clear: sandmining will continue to go on elsewhere. It will continue in Third World countries where workers are paid paltry wages. It will continue in countries such as Mozambique, Sierra Leone, the Ukraine, Namibia, South Africa, Canada, Russia, China and India.

Let me go to a number of other points. Firstly, there is the farce that this bill is an election commitment. This is not an election commitment; this is a set-up. This is about the government members in inner-city seats being propped up with an appeal to green idealists. The basis on which this bill is claimed to be an election commitment is manufactured and flimsy at best. Let us be very clear: this government pays lip-service and cherrypicks what is a commitment. The so-called election promise was no more than a letter from a retiring Labor member of parliament written to one stakeholder

three days before the election. It was not backed up by any correspondence or approval from the then opposition leader. It made significantly factually incorrect claims, especially claiming that the Redland City Council was responsible for providing certain services. Yet despite correcting those claims two days later in a letter to the Redland mayor, and admitted state government responsibility, the government manipulates and manufactures this bill as an election commitment.

Let us go to the so-called consultation process. There are serious concerns and reservations about the manner in which the government conducted its investigations and consultation and with the information provided to the affected residents and workers regarding the economic transition strategy and the workers' assistance scheme. Let me be very clear: on no grounds of reasonableness could anyone say that there was adequate consultation. The seriousness of this issue is backed up by numerous submissions and the evidence of witnesses. The attempt to consult with all stakeholders on North Stradbroke Island was miserable, inadequate and unacceptable. Listening to one group under the false claim that an election commitment was made and then proceeding to tell other stakeholders what was going to occur is not consultation. Abrogating responsibility for conducting consultation to the committee process, but refusing to provide the committee with all the available information, is not consultation. Undertaking eight weeks of fact finding using external consultants and then hiding the results from the committee under cabinet in confidence rules is not consultation. In fact, it is further evidence of a lack of genuine effort to ensure that the North Stradbroke economy and the whole community were properly considered in the decision-making process.

According to the explanatory notes attached to the bill, the government undertook consultation between April and December 2015. Based on the submissions and witness testimony, it would seem that the consultation on the intent of the bill was undertaken with only the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation. The current mining operation, Sibelco Australia, and the Straddie Chamber of Commerce likened their decisions to being told what was going to occur. The Australian Workers' Union, the Queensland Resources Council, Straddie Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland described the consultation to be tokenistic, disingenuous and designed to inform, not consult.

The manipulation of this process is deplorable. The QRC submission pointed out that—

Page 10 of the Explanatory Notes states, 'In September 2015, Sibelco Australia Limited was consulted on a draft restricted mine path map. In October 2015, Sibelco Australia Limited was consulted on a version of the Bill.' It would perhaps be more accurate to say that the company was informed of the proposal to end mining within the timeframe nominated in the Bill, as opposed to being 'consulted'.

The AWU was very clear that they had not been consulted at all. Members should read the AWU submission, which makes very interesting reading in regard to their frank views of the government's so-called consultation. AWU secretary Ben Swan said—

I think the process has been abysmal. I have described it as shambolic and superficial. I am yet to be convinced that the process that has been undertaken to date represents best practice of any government, let alone a Labor government that should have the interests of workers at heart. We have had to kick and scream publicly to get the ear of the government and to even get the cursory sort of attendance of the Premier in front of members just to hear directly from them the sorts of impacts that the government's proposed legislation will have on their employment prospects, and I think that is highly unsatisfactory to be brutally honest.

...

I have been a member of this party for 27 years and I have been supporting Labor governments all my life, but I find it somewhat disconcerting that the very people who should be front and centre of consideration for very important pieces of legislation around this and the effects that this will have on their livelihoods are not actually going to be given active consideration.

....

I just find that an appalling lack of process, and this is an era where we have been promised much about accountability and transparency. This is an era where we have been promised consultation. Consultation does not mean being told what the end result is after the decision has been made.

He went on further to speculate as to the real motives of this government saying—

This has been a lockout of my union...I do not understand it, but I can take a pretty good educated guess at some of the motivations that some people may have around that.

...

I do not appreciate the fact that when we did get around to meeting the Minister for Environment we were told directly that the reason that the union and its members were not consulted was because we were likely to be less vocal than the mining operator or the traditional owners on the island.

The message is loud and clear. When the government's own backers, the powerful AWU, is scathing in its assessment of the consultation process we know that the bill is a political stitch-up for left-wing members and an appeal to the green movement which is marching on Labor seats in Brisbane. The government is obviously willing to throw workers to the wolves as it tries to fend off the green movement.

The poor manner in which the government progressed its so-called planning and consultation includes: lack of consultation with the broader community; lack of consultation with the Indigenous community and native title holders individually rather than with QYAC; and lack of adequate and timely consultation with mine workers and their unions in ceasing sandmining and the related economic transition strategy and workers assistance scheme.

I wish to raise the inadequacies in failing to provide a reasonable and fair transition from a viable industry supporting the economy on the island and adjacent regions. Both the economic transition strategy and the workers assistance scheme lacked any substantial detail. There was no consultation on this, with the Straddie Chamber of Commerce, Redland City Council, Sibelco, representatives of the workforce and Walker Corporation saying that they had no input and were only told about it. The amounts discussed have been described by the AWU and the Redland City Council as woefully inadequate. Ben Swan of the AWU said—

The \$20 million that has been earmarked for assistance is a paltry sum in contrast to other things that this government is currently doing in the face of other crises,

...

That \$20 million needs another zero on the end of it. Some \$5 million for a workers' transition package is paltry. It is insufficient.

The Redland City Council identified more than twice that amount, proposing \$57 million was needed. When I asked the CEO of QYAC about his knowledge about this he acknowledged that the \$20 million for a transition strategy was their proposal and not determined by any analysis by Queensland Treasury. This is policy on the run. There are serious concerns that a regulatory impact statement was never undertaken in the preparation of this bill. This means that the decision to bring forward the end to mining has not undergone a formal cost-benefit analysis or any transparency in decision making. What we now have after the event is subject to cabinet in confidence so is unavailable for inspection by the parliament and especially those people affected.

Ben Swan said—

It concerns me because it is precisely the issue about the effects that these bills will have on workers both on and off the island, workers both within and outside of the mine, businesses whose trade is reliant on this activity persisting at least for the next several years. It worries me that those sorts of things will not form part of the consideration of this committee or indeed of this parliament, notwithstanding the fact that the minister when he introduced the legislation identified the fact that these things are part of a three-pronged sort of strategy that the government has implemented. They heralded this on the record in *Hansard* notwithstanding the fact that these are explicitly referenced in the explanatory memoranda attending to the bills, and I actually find that quite disgraceful to be honest. This is an attempt at silencing—deliberately silencing—scrutiny and oversight of factors and considerations that should be at the absolute forefront of what members of this government should be doing.

Based on the government's own guidelines, and if applied to the issues uncovered by the committee, 90 per cent of the issues raised would apply to a RIS. Significant impacts include the economic impacts, competition impacts, social and environmental impacts and government impacts. All of the evidence provided indicates that this will have a severe and detrimental effect to the community. There are the losses in employment, local company expenditure, workers spending in the local economy and corporate donations and sponsorships, directly and indirectly supporting between 500 to 750 residents, for instance workers, contractors, business owners and their families.

Mr Crandon: Over a billion dollars!

Mr PERRETT: That is correct. I will take that interjection from the member for Coomera. This includes the loss of an average of \$67.56 million a year that Sibelco spent on average from local South-East Queensland businesses, including \$7.55 million per year with 44 North Stradbroke Island based businesses and \$60.01 million per year with 641 businesses based in South-East Queensland. There is a loss of an annual wage and employment spend on the island of approximately \$13 million based on average annual remuneration of \$114,000 per employee, as well as \$3.5 million annual employment that is spent in Brisbane. In a Straddie Chamber of Commerce survey 82 per cent indicated at least 30 per cent of their business is directly or indirectly from sandmining. A further survey conducted in February this year reported that more than 50 per cent of businesses attributed between one to five staff members to direct and indirect mining activity and expenditure. At least a quarter of the revenue of Stradbroke Ferries is directly invoiced to Sibelco. They estimated that up to 40 per cent of their

revenue is associated with mining related businesses and transport. In the absence of replacement industries or economic activity to compensate for that 40 per cent they advise that it will directly impact their ability to retain and maintain current employment levels of 120 full-time and part-time jobs. They also advise that it seriously impacts their ability to provide transport services to the island, saying, 'Take a quarter of our revenue out of our business and we cannot provide the same service we do today.' One submission stated—

...the island will not cope with the premature loss of funding and price rises i.e. ferry prices will rise making commuting even more expensive. Eventually choking the island of a required lifeblood from the mainland. A lifeblood that is nowhere near as critical whilst mining operations continue.

There are impacts such as trying to transition the majority of mining workers who are aged 40 to 59 years. We all know that older workers face more difficulty obtaining new employment and the jobs that are available are unsuited to their skill sets or are casual, temporary or part time at best. There is no guarantee that the skills of the current sandminers will translate into the hospitality and tourism sector. What is being proposed is grossly inadequate. Suggestions that the island will rely on a replacement tourist industry that competes with every other tourist attraction on the Gold and Sunshine coasts is fanciful. Of this bill AWU State Secretary Ben Swan said—

Government members interjected.

Mr PERRETT: He has it pretty right. I take the interjection. When he makes comments like this, he is on track. You might deny it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Gympie, you cannot say the word 'you'. You have to direct your comments through the Chair.

Mr PERRETT: I notice the member for Stretton is not on the speaking list this evening. I am quite intrigued by that. If the member for Stretton does speak on the bill, I will be interested to hear his points.

Of this bill AWU State Secretary Ben Swan said—

... it is a brave parliament and a brave government that steps in actively to demolish and steamroll their way across an industry only to replace it with jobs that can best be categorised as intermittent, casual in nature and low paid. If that is the strategy for the future prospects of North Stradbroke Island, then I have grave doubts as to whether that vision will ever be realised.


In closing, I remind the House that the CCIQ has urgently written to all members, raising serious concerns and urging that the bill be rejected. It states—

Despite the state government's commitment to "jobs" the Bill will unquestionably remove 116 jobs on the Island with the potential to impact an additional 184 indirect jobs.

(This) loss ... comes at a time when the trend unemployment rate for Queensland is again on the rise increasing to 6.2 per cent in April 2016 and compares to a national unemployment rate of 5.7 per cent.

... the lack of consultation particularly with businesses on the Island, coupled with a withheld draft consultation report produced in reference to the Government's North Stradbroke Island Economic Transition Strategy, does not support a balanced and fair process assessing the likely economic impacts of the Bill.

I do not support the premature end to sandmining on North Stradbroke Island and, therefore, I do not support these bills.

 **Mr CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (10.22 pm): Tonight I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the North Stradbroke Island bills. Madam Deputy Speaker, like yourself I was a member of the Finance and Administration Committee that travelled to North Stradbroke Island on two occasions. I recognise that this is a very polarising and divisive topic. We spent about five days on North Stradbroke, on two different occasions. We met with a large range of people. We held a number of community functions that attracted a couple of hundred people. We met with a number of different organisations. On North Stradbroke Island, the palpable feeling was that this is a very divisive topic about which people are very passionate. I respect that because I know that for the people of North Stradbroke Island this is certainly about their future and it is certainly about their past.

I am not from North Stradbroke Island. I am from Cairns. My family has lived in Cairns for one generation. At best I can trace three generations who lived in Victoria. Beyond that, I can track my ancestors back to Scotland and England for, at best, 10 generations. What I cannot do is what the member for Algeester can do; she can track her ancestors back some 3,000 generations. I acknowledge the Quandamooka people in the gallery tonight, particularly the elders and the CEO of QYAC, Cameron Costello. They too can track their ancestors back through that many generations. That is a very special thing and I am quite envious of it.

I have transferred committees since the North Stradbroke Island report was handed down. I thank the members of the Finance and Administration Committee with whom I have worked over the past 14 or 15 months, yourself included, Madam Deputy Speaker. In particular, I thank the member for Bulimba, who was the original chair of the committee. She travelled to North Stradbroke Island with us the first time. The member for Sunnybank escorted us on our second visit to the island. I thank all the members of the committee.

The committee heard a lot of information from the many sides of the debate. However, I do not think we heard a lot of fact. We received a lot of information and a lot of—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr CRAWFORD: I said we did not hear a lot of fact; we heard a lot of opinion. I will summarise some of what I picked up. As I said before, I am not from North Stradbroke Island; I am from Cairns. Prior to visiting North Stradbroke Island with the committee, I had never been there. I had no preconceived opinions about North Stradbroke Island, mining or anything else to do with that part of the world. I went pretty much as a clean slate. I thought, 'We'll see what we have to deal with'. I was not instructed to follow any particular line.

When on North Stradbroke Island, I spoke with people about the issues around the miners who work for Sibelco. I can see their pain. I can see the issues that they have as workers and what they are facing. I recognise the uncertainty that they have for their future and the future of North Stradbroke Island, and what that means for their families. It is very important that after tonight, irrespective of the outcome of the debate, the government takes into consideration the need to ensure that things are in place and are done properly.

The economic transition plan for North Stradbroke Island needs to be very robust. I do not think it is necessarily an issue about the dollar figure. I have heard a lot of zeroes being talked about, but I do not think it is about the zeroes. I think it is about what it actually means for the people on the ground, on North Stradbroke Island. If you are a 35-year-old bulldozer operator who is working for the mine at the moment, what does it mean for you and your family? At the end of all this, when mining finishes, what will it mean for you and your family? How will you continue to survive and prosper on the island? The government and all of its departments need to ensure that this conversation continues well past this evening.


It is my observation that workers on the island work quite hard. They have good trades. I spoke to a number of heavy machinery operators and environmentalists who work with a number of different tools in a number of different trades. I learnt that for some of the workers on North Stradbroke the transition to tourism will be challenging. That has to be taken into consideration by our departments as we move forward.

I did pick up on the concept of rehabilitation, which I will talk about briefly. A few other members have also touched on rehabilitation tonight. When we talk about rehabilitating the land after a sand mine is finished, we are not talking about restoring it perfectly to the hill, the slope, the creek—whatever it was prior to the sand mine. To me, that really creates a GPS coordinate that you can stand on and say, 'This is the GPS coordinate of a very important site for myself'. I felt that we were doing a bit of an injustice over there, because an Indigenous person from North Stradbroke Island cannot stand on a spot on that island that has been rehabilitated and say, 'This is the location of a significant event for my family'. I feel a bit of sorrow for them, in that respect.

Throughout this whole inquiry, the thing that got me the most—and it is a thing that I cannot move past—is the subject of native land title. Without the native land title declaration in 2011, we might be having a whole different argument. For me the conversation around native title and Justice Dowsett's decision on 4 July 2011 is one that stuck with me. Everywhere I looked in relation to this topic I could not move past that particular issue. The Quandamooka people were given native title rights and interests within the Australian legal system in 2011. I feel that binds us as a parliament.

I heard what the member for Cleveland said about the legal option on native title. That is his advice. That is fine. At the end of my time as a parliamentarian in Queensland I want to know that I have done what is morally right for people. What I cannot do is sit in this House and be a part of anything that advocates the taking away of the legal rights of people—people who have been here for 3,000 generations—and replaces it with something which is totally unjust.

I support the government bill. I do not support the bill introduced by the crossbench. I thank the Quandamooka people for their contribution to our inquiry.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (10.30 pm): I rise to address the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. This bill was introduced by the Hon. Steven Miles MP on 3 December 2015. The purpose of Labor's bill is to effectively repeal existing, sensible and realistic legislation implemented by the former LNP government and, in doing so, phase out sandmining on North Stradbroke Island by 2019.

North Stradbroke Island, or Minjerribah, as it is known to the Quandamooka traditional owners, is one of nature's jewels. It is the second largest sand island in the world. In close proximity to Brisbane, the island has lakes and wetlands, a rich biodiversity and Aboriginal cultural heritage that spans 20,000 years. Certainly nothing should be done to damage this valuable asset of Queensland.

While tourism plays an important part in the island's economy, sandmining is, and has been for over 60 years, the main source of income to keep the island and its community viable. This should be acknowledged by the native title holders. Unfortunately, Labor's planned economic transition strategy is not adequate to replace the hundreds of jobs that will be lost as a result of the Palaszczuk government's rushed plan to end sandmining. Labor's so-called plan has been widely questioned because its details are scarce and the level of funding that will be made available is inadequate.

Understandably, local residents have little confidence that it will deliver a smooth transition and have warned that they will most likely have to join the long list of Queensland communities suffering as a consequences of a mining and resources sector economic slowdown.

The LNP is opposed to the Palaszczuk Labor government's plan to end sandmining on Stradbroke Island before 2035 because of the impact it will have on the local community, including the traditional owners of North Stradbroke Island. Full, genuine and open consultation with the local Stradbroke Island community and all affected residents on this issue should have been completed before this legislation was debated in the Queensland parliament.

The Finance and Administration Committee, which held public hearings on this important public matter during March, uncovered the fact that the loss of sandmining jobs on North Stradbroke Island will not be replaced by jobs in other industries. At the present time, sandmining generates between \$60 million and \$80 million per year for the local economy and employs around 100 island residents. What Labor's job plan for Queensland could really be called is jobs now and no jobs for the future.

The Finance and Administration Committee report stated that mine workers could retrain with government assistance and find jobs on the \$1.3 billion Toondah Harbour development planned for Brisbane's bayside. However, for many residents moving from North Stradbroke Island is not an option.

A Deloitte Access Economics analysis, commissioned by the state government, found the transition strategy to end mining on the island could create up to 151 jobs across the construction, conservation, tourism and aged-care sectors. The Deloitte report also noted that these industries will not replace all mining jobs in the short to medium term.

Mr Colin Battersby from the North Stradbroke Island chamber of commerce is stated to have agreed that the said 151 transitional jobs would not be enough to sustain the losses to the local community. Mr Battersby said that many of the chamber of commerce's member businesses relied heavily, directly or indirectly, on the mining business and its associated employees. He said that they are very worried about the speed in which the mines will close down. He questioned who is going to be visiting the island, staying in local accommodation, eating in their restaurants and shopping in their shops.

As clearly outlined by the LNP shadow minister for mines, the honourable Andrew Cripps MP, the LNP remains satisfied that the 2035 closure date is the most sensible time frame for the end of sandmining on North Stradbroke Island because it provides certainty for local residents and businesses and provides for a realistic time frame to transition from sandmining to other alternative economic endeavours to maintain the local economy. The North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Another Act Amendment Act 2013 put in place by the former LNP government allowed for a reasonable time frame for the local economy to transition to other industries and so far no persuasive argument has been put forward to change the LNP's position. The LNP is very concerned about the Palaszczuk Labor government's plan to end mining by the year 2019. This is many years earlier than was envisaged by the former LNP government and is of great concern.

I also take the opportunity to refer to the private member's bill introduced by the honourable member for Dalrymple which seeks to end sandmining by the end of 2024. That would allow another five years for rehabilitation of the mine sites by the operator, Sibelco, on the island up until 2029. The

honourable member's bill also calls for the imposition of a mine path. It should be noted that this private member's bill was rejected in the parliamentary report.

As I have said, the LNP recognises the importance of sandmining to North Stradbroke Island's economy. It provides hundreds of direct and indirect jobs, which are the livelihoods of many families both on the island and on the mainland. There are sound arguments to keep the current 2035 closure date in place and not to accede to political pressure from groups that do not represent the views of the overwhelming majority of local people on North Stradbroke Island. Whilst the Katter bill is an extension from 2019 to 2024, it is still very fair from an adequate time frame.


There needs to be a fine balance between sustainable economic growth and the environment and the continuation of mining should not detract from that. As the recently appointed shadow minister for the environment and heritage protection, I will work to ensure our natural environment is retained and preserved whilst also achieving balance when the competing interests of conservation and commerce exist.

One local residents and business operator voiced her concerns that one result of the mine closure would be the transition of a vibrant locality into a ghost town. Consider the current situation in Emerald where rents once commanding \$1,000 a week are now only worth \$100 a week, and that is if they are rented at all. Many houses are now sitting empty in Emerald. The local business community and residents on North Stradbroke Island do not want to see that happen there.

The impending loss of jobs as a result of the legislation before us comes at a time when the trend in Queensland's unemployment is on the rise. The latest unemployment figures show increases in both trend and seasonally adjusted terms as Queensland falls further behind the rest of Australia.

The current mine operator on North Stradbroke Island and the chamber of commerce and industry in Queensland have determined that ending sandmining in 2019 will cause the loss of \$70 million to \$100 million in net economic and social benefits to the local community and broader state economy, as well as a loss of millions of dollars to the state of Queensland by reduced annual royalties and associated taxes and levies. What the Palaszczuk Labor government should be delivering is a responsible, measured and balanced outcome with respect to environmental policy and community and economic needs of the residents on North Stradbroke Island. Unfortunately, the Labor government is not doing so.

For the Deputy Premier to make some outrageous allegations about former LNP premier Campbell Newman, also including a reference to his late father, the honourable Kevin Newman, was highly inappropriate and poor indeed. All I would say to those Labor backbench members opposite is that when the time comes for the Premier to be rolled as leader of the Labor Party, make sure that the new leader is someone with an ethical framework as opposed to the member for the South Brisbane. I oppose this bill.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (10.38 pm): I rise with pride tonight to speak in support of the government's bill, the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. I firstly acknowledge Aunty Joan Hendriks, who is unfortunately not in the gallery at the moment, Uncle Bob Anderson and Cameron Costello. They have been fighting this battle for a long time. I commend them for that. Uncle Bob Anderson made a great contribution in a public meeting today. It should be on the record in this debate. I table Uncle Bob's speech that he made today.

Tabled paper: Document by Dr Robert Anderson OAM, dated 25 May 2016, regarding North Stradbroke Island legislation.

There are three competing proposals to end sandmining on North Stradbroke Island. One is the Newman proposal to end sandmining in 2035, one is the Katter bill to end sandmining in 2024 and obviously one is the government bill to end sandmining in 2019. I grew up on the bay living just a few streets back from it. The creeks, the waterways, the forested areas and the islands of Moreton Bay were my backyard. Those who know me know that I am blue collar first and green collar well and truly second. I am, after all, a Labor MP elected on a Labor platform, not a Green. However, you do not have to be a radical environmentalist to understand that some of these things that we are doing around the world simply are not sustainable.

I have met with people from Sibelco, traditional owners, residents of the island and environmental campaigners, and I have spoken with miners, businesspeople and unions on the island—I have heard every side and every argument in this debate, but none of it shakes me from the simple fact that sandmining on the island is not a sustainable economic future for my community. The previous Labor government legislated a substantial end to sandmining by 2019. This was largely for environmental and native title reasons. The main way this legislation achieved its policy objective was by removing the

capacity for Sibelco to extend their mining leases. To be clear, this meant that the first mining lease would end in 2015, the second in 2019 and the third, and at the time the smallest mine, would not extend past 2025.

I have nothing against Sibelco and, in our democratic system, I am comfortable with anybody having their say as long as they declare it. Reasonably enough, Sibelco decided to campaign politically in Ashgrove against the environment minister and in favour of the LNP candidate, Campbell Newman. History was made and the government changed. However, in October 2012 we have a disclosure belatedly lodged for the March election for expenditure of \$91,840. During that election, the LNP candidate for Ashgrove, Campbell Newman, promised to restore Sibelco's previous rights to extend their mining operations before the Labor government legislation. After the election, then premier Campbell Newman must have found a new-found reserve of charity, however, and legislated to extend Sibelco's sandmining rights until 2025.

Ms Simpson: You haven't read the history, have you?

Mr BROWN: I have been polite in this debate.

Ms Simpson: The policy was announced before Newman was even drafted into the LNP membership.

Mr BROWN: I have made an effort to be polite and listen to the opposition members in this debate, particularly—

Ms Simpson interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! It is my call and I call the member for Capalaba.

Mr BROWN: An ABC report from 18 August 2013 even contains a quote from the member for Hinchinbrook. He said, 'Well, we asked them to go away and come up with a package that would provide for a much smoother transition process.' I think the only thing they were talking about in regard to the word 'smoother' was smoothing out the sandhills on Stradbroke Island. I can find no evidence that any work was done under the previous government on any sort of transition process at all. I would even be so bold as to suggest that Sibelco, in stalling the end of sandmining, were acting as though it would never end. In any case, an extra 22 years is certainly a far smoother transition and why not put off to the next decade what you really should be doing today?

To recap, Sibelco, for the bargain basement price of \$90,000, got over two decades of extra time and effectively wrote the legislation it was bound by. Sibelco in its community awareness raising has made much about the effect on the island's economy, particularly employment.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Hinchinbrook wishes to interject, he will need to do so from his own seat.


Mr BROWN: This is a point I am having a hard time pinning them down on. In 2011 it was reported that mining employed 145 people on the island, with no clear breakdown of the number of locals represented in that number. In 2013, in a media report it was 280, while in 2013 in the Department of Natural Resources and Mines' documents it was 107 FTEs. In 2015, a report prepared by Sibelco in response to the economic transition strategy estimated 300 jobs were provided by the mine. In 2016, in a Stradbroke chamber of commerce document it listed 109 people employed by the mine, 45 being local residents. Muddying the waters in this regard is a smart campaigning tactic by Sibelco to protect their economic interests. I am not convinced that it does a lot for the North Stradbroke Island community in terms of their future planning.

The final point made by Sibelco is the amount they inject into the local community in terms of funding and support. On North Stradbroke Island the unemployment rate is higher than the mainland, household income is lower, workforce participation is almost 10 per cent lower than the mainland and the labour force is dominated by part-time employment at a much higher rate than the mainland as well. I just want go back to a point the member for Cleveland made in referring to it as 'struggle street'. I find those comments highly offensive. They go along the line of his federal counterpart the member for Bowman, Andrew Laming, in saying that North Stradbroke Island would be comparable to Palm Island. Not only are they both environmental vandals; they are also economic vandals in regard to what those comments do to the tourism industry on North Stradbroke Island. They want to tear down tourism on

Minjerribah and they do it through those comments. They do not realise the effect that making those comments in this House has on tourism.

No doubt Sibelco has done some good on the island. They would do a hell of a lot more good if they paid some income tax, but I do not want to cast them as the villain in this tale. We do need a little reality check. North Stradbroke Island under Sibelco is not a Garden of Eden. It is just a community with an economy that is not diversified, with a barrier to transition to a more sustainable future as long as sandmining is there.

I read a number of the submissions on this legislation and a lot of them implored the government to introduce policy certainty with regard to the island. The year 2024 is several election cycles away, but we need to have certainty now. Sibelco has the right to campaign politically and governments come and go. Minjerribah needs certainty, the economy needs to transition, the environment needs to be protected and, most importantly, Indigenous rights need to be recognised in this process. The only way to achieve those competing policy objectives is to restore the 2019 time frame. We have to do this. We cannot stall on these hard decisions. I commend the government's bill to the House.

 **Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (10.47 pm): I rise to speak on the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill and the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill. I note that we are considering these bills in cognate. I acknowledge the Quandamooka people and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. I do respect that there are differing opinions within the Quandamooka people, as there are across the North Stradbroke Island community. I also want to acknowledge the work of my colleague and Redlands neighbour Dr Mark Robinson. The member for Cleveland has been a tireless advocate for locals, for jobs and for opportunities on North Stradbroke Island, and I commend him for continuing to do so in response to this proposed bill by those opposite.

The legislation put in place by the former LNP government was sensible, it was reasonable, it recognised the importance of sandmining to North Stradbroke Island's economy and it had a nominated end date. Mining creates hundreds of direct and indirect local jobs both on the island and in the mainland Redland City. The 2019 end date and economic transition strategy proposed by those opposite provides no certainty for locals, with hundreds of jobs to be lost. A date of 2024 is an improvement, but I am satisfied that the 2035 closure date remains the most sensible time frame for the end of sandmining on North Stradbroke Island. Sandmining has operated on North Stradbroke Island since 1949. Currently operated by Sibelco Australia Ltd, it is an example of world's best practice in sandmining operation.

The real cost of a premature end to sandmining can be seen in the following recent survey of Straddie Chamber of Commerce members. The survey found that 82 per cent of businesses reported at least 30 per cent of their sales were either directly or indirectly derived from sandmining on the island. That is putting aside the economic stimulus of the 104 Straddie locals including 35 indigenous employees plus up to 23 more in my electorate of Redlands currently employed in the mining operation—local jobs for local people who, in turn, reinvest in their community; local businesses such as the corner store, newsagent and many more mum-and-dad operations.

Decisions like these are never as simple as the Deputy Premier would seem to have us believe. There are flow-on effects to local businesses and industry. It is no surprise that the Deputy Premier is unaware of these issues, particularly given her refusal to meet with Straddie locals who opposed the early closure. What we see here is political pressure from groups who do not represent the views of the wider North Stradbroke Island and Redland City population. Those people who have contacted both the member for Cleveland and me about their concerns over the early closure feel as though they are being ignored by this Deputy Premier and the Palaszczuk Labor government.

The LNP position on sandmining and rehabilitation of the mine site is widely supported in our local communities. Legislation put in place by the former LNP government provided a reasonable time frame for the North Stradbroke Island economy to transition to other industries and provide for local jobs. Thus far the Palaszczuk Labor government has been unable to put forward a logical argument for early closure. No-one disputes that sandmining will come to an end on North Stradbroke Island.

What is in question, certainly from my perspective, is the disrespectful manner in which this matter has been handled by the Deputy Premier and the Palaszczuk Labor government. The Deputy Premier has continued to demonstrate her lack of respect for Queenslanders. Her actions—her callous disregard for local jobs and local people—are evidence of that. This is not the first time the Deputy Premier has acted in this manner. Her display during the vegetation management legislation debate

demonstrated her blatant disregard for the effects of those insidious laws on landholders, not just those trying to run a business in primary industries but every Queensland landholder.


I was made aware of a meeting held by the Deputy Premier with union representatives on North Stradbroke Island. In a practice run for lockout laws, Straddie locals were locked out of the meeting. Locals reported that ETU members manned the doors and prevented them from entering the meeting at Little Ship Club in Dunwich. I have photographic evidence of that which I would like to table.

Tabled paper: Photographs of Electrical Trades Union staff.

It was even reported that some were being forcibly removed from the venue and press were prevented from attending. This is further evidence that government has no understanding of the real effect of the legislation. The Deputy Premier continues to demonstrate that she is more interested in ensuring green votes in her seat of South Brisbane than she is in governing in the best interests of Queenslanders. It seems to me that the Deputy Premier is doing a lot more than just deputising. It begs the question who is the real Premier of Queensland.

These bills are unnecessary. The LNP continues to support its 2013 position to extend sandmining on North Stradbroke Island to 2035. It gives a reasonable time frame for a proper economic transition. I say to the members opposite that I have spent time in Central Australia. I have spent time with Gurindji people. I have been to Wave Hill Station where Vincent Lingiari sat down and took on Lord Vestey. I have worked with the Wik people from Far North Queensland, and I know that there are Indigenous communities around the country that are crying out for an economic path out of the position that they are in. We are in an extraordinary position where we have a diverse economy on North Stradbroke Island, and we are taking that away without a proper transition.

I urge those members opposite to consider what this will do to all the people on North Stradbroke Island. I urge the crossbenches to consider it as well, because it is my belief that in a few short years if this is successful tonight we will see horrific effects of an economy that has been trashed, and that will be the government's legacy. I cannot support this bill.

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (10.55 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 and oppose the bill from the crossbenches. When I think of this legislation, I think of it in the same way I think about a lot of what we are doing in this place in this term of parliament. We are going about the work of restoring Queensland to the way it was before the abnormality of the Newman years.

As an outsider, I understand from a distance a little of the history of North Stradbroke Island. I understand the key role that sandmining has played in the island's economy for many years; that it represents 14 per cent of the jobs on the island; that the company gives considerably to the community and, as such, has been observed by many in their submissions.

Taking a balanced view is important for legislators. In taking a balanced view, I am happy to concede all of these points because I think they are, as far as I can tell, probably truthful. Importantly, they do not undermine my central reason for supporting the legislation to bring a close to sandmining on the island in 2019. The original legislation, which we are going about restoring here now, was introduced in 2011. The original North Stradbroke Island legislation of 2011 was finalised in the context of the Federal Court's native title determination on 4 July 2011 over the island and its surrounds.

The indigenous land use agreement between the state of Queensland and the Quandamooka people was finalised in conjunction with that native title determination. This legal agreement recognised the traditional owners who have lived on and around the island for more than 20,000 years. There are of course environmental concerns with any mining operation. Nobody can convince me that mining anywhere and anything is an environmentally neutral process. Of course there can be mitigation, but damage is a by-product of mining.


It is the native title argument that I find the most compelling. For as long as mining is occurring, it prevents the Quandamooka people from accessing a sustainable future for their land. The government changed in 2012 and so did the legislation. This legislative seesaw can only have been disruptive to the island's future. I am aware of the alternative proposals to extend the deadline to 2024 or even longer to the 2030s, but if 2019 seems sudden it is only sudden to those who would prefer to ignore the island and the state's history since 2011 and focus instead on the history since 2015. Many in Queensland try to pretend that the period from 2012 to 2015 did not happen, but unfortunately it did and we need to operate in the world as it is, not as we might like it to be. The end date of 2019 is already a compromise for many of the island's traditional owners. The Quandamooka people spent 16 years

negotiating their native title claim over the island, and it was through this considered process that the mining end date of 2019 was finally negotiated.

In the committee forum held on the island we learnt of one young Quandamooka woman who had grown up on the island but had never set foot on some of the areas of traditional country, unable to conduct traditional ceremonies, use traditional natural resources, conduct burial rights, learn from or teach others about the physical and spiritual attributes of the area, and maintain places of importance and areas of significance. These are areas that have existed as sacred ceremonial and culturally significant places spanning centuries but in her lifetime these sites had been restricted to the Quandamooka people to make way for sandmining. At least two generations of people have not been able to visit, appreciate or look after these culturally significant lands. It is high time that access to these lands was restored.

We acknowledge that the Quandamooka people have a deep connection to their land and sea country that spans 20,000 years. Understandably, they want to protect their land and their cultural heritage from the damaging effects of mining. Currently, the Quandamooka people hold native title rights over about 54,000 hectares of land and waters on and surrounding North Stradbroke Island. However, the sprawling mining leases by Sibelco have made spectacular and pristine parts of the island inaccessible. These areas are not only beautiful but they also have significant cultural value. The Quandamooka people know these places; most of us do not. Sadly, given the long history of mining in these areas, there are young people who have never had access to these special places. It is incumbent upon us in this place to ensure that the rich cultural heritage of the Quandamooka people is shared with many others in generations to come. This will deliver a better, sustainable future.

Taking a balanced view, this legislation to draw down sandmining in line with its original intent, with a transition package for the workforce and the population, working with traditional owners for a sustainable environment and economic future, is the responsible way to approach this complicated matter. As such, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (11.00 pm): I rise to support the minister's North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. The transition from one industry to another is difficult—difficult for workers, just as the start of mining would have been difficult for traditional owners. The act of mining inevitably damages the land, and the land on Straddie is indeed special and something that all Queenslanders would seek to protect. No-one should pretend that this issue is easy or that the transition will not be difficult for some.

Sandmining started on Straddie in 1949, but for thousands of years Aboriginal people practised traditional ways of life, generation after generation. They called the island Minjerribah, and having survived almost 200 years of dispossession they still call the island by that name. With my brothers on a camping trip on the island, I stared at wonder at the thousand year deposit of shells from a midden that a recent storm had exposed on the island. There was also a heavy, sharpened stone amongst the shells, no doubt taken to the island by a locally made boat and used perhaps before any Aboriginal person ever dreamed that aliens from a cold island on the other side of the world would dump prisoners on their island changing their way of life forever.

European colonists often used the island and interacted with the people who had called this island home in an unthinking and often violent fashion. The Brisbane colonists attempted to build a military post at Dunwich, displacing the local residents using convict labour. Later the colonial society dumped others on the island, creating the Dunwich Benevolent Asylum. Some 500 people at the asylum died on the island and are buried mostly in unmarked graves, including my great-great-grandfather, Michael Ryan, who died on the island in 1911. The ultimate damage for the island was that in 1896 after a ship struck the island looters attracted to the wreck blew up the ship's supply of dynamite, creating craters that when a storm came through further tore apart the island creating the north and south island we know today. Our presence literally tore the island in two.

We have further torn at the island since 1949 through sandmining. The mines have had both positives and negatives for the island. It has provided a source of local employment not least for some Aboriginal people. However, it is also something that all in this House recognise has a limited future and at some stage must end. As we mine more of the island, the balance between economic activity and preserving this incredible island begins to tip. Further, I hope all in this House recognise that Aboriginal people continue to have a special relationship, a right to this land.


In 2011 the then Labor government recognised a path to the end of mining in recognition of the wishes of the Quandamooka people. The bill allowed for an 8½ year transition and locked in a Labor

policy to end sandmining on the main lease in 2019. We know that Straddie must find a path to sustainability beyond sandmining. It has incredible beauty and is a special place. We must find a way to sustain the economy of the island.

The new government under Mr Newman for political reasons extended leases to an extraordinary date of 2035—far beyond the expectation of any party involved. They did this maliciously to ensure that Straddie workers and landowners would continue to be uncertain, as they knew that the majority of Queenslanders would never accept the LNP's indefinite extension. They made political playthings of workers and landowners. The LNP knew it and they did not care. They steamrolled over the views of native title holders. A more reasonable transition—and I recognise the member for Dalrymple's attempt at this—may have met with broader community acceptance over time. However, I think the LNP knew that their indeterminate extension would never give certainty. They wanted to play their political games with people's lives. Here again they have a cynical strategy about the inevitable transition from mining.

This is not to pretend that the transition will be simple, nor that the differences in views between parties can be reconciled. I respect the AWU for standing up for workers facing this difficult transition. Their job is to stand up for their members. Our job in this place is to attempt to balance all of the views and values, which as I said sometimes cannot be reconciled.

I saw submission No. 208 from a group of Indigenous sandminers which asked for the sandmining to be continued. I also saw submission No. 244 from QYAC that asked that the sandmining be ended in 2019. It is not easy to reconcile even these views between two conflicting Indigenous groups. The Queensland government is committed to an economic transition—a transition to a sustainable economy that inevitably does not include the sandmining that all in this place accept must cease. To deliver the commitment, the Queensland government has developed a Draft North Stradbroke Island Economic Transition Strategy, supported by 16 actions which aim to drive sustainable tourism, expand education and training opportunities, and foster business development and growth. The government will be allocating \$20 million to build on the island's current capacity and economy over the next five years and \$5 million for a workers assistance scheme to help mine workers transition into new employment. This is part of the process of 16 years of native title negotiations and a process also begun in 1991 to begin ideas about a transition to national park for the island. As I said in the beginning of this speech, this transition will be difficult for some but we also know that this transition was inevitable and that this government offers support for the transition. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (11.06 pm): I rise to oppose both the government's bill and also the private member's bill with respect to sandmining on North Stradbroke Island. At the outset, I would like to thank the people of North Stradbroke Island for their great hospitality when I was a serving member of the Finance and Administration Committee. It was the people of North Stradbroke Island who should have the opportunity to have a say, and it was the people of North Stradbroke Island who I believe made it very clear to the committee that 2019 is simply too early to end sandmining.

Every single day, members of this government claim that all they care about is jobs, but what we have seen is that the only jobs they care about are the jobs of the members for Mount Coot-tha, Ashgrove and South Brisbane and the other members who rely on Greens preferences in order to be in this House. What we see very clearly is that this government does not care about the workers in the sand mine. It does not care about the people who rely on employment as a result of small business. It does not care about the people who work for any of the transportation companies that rely heavily on the business that Sibelco provides them. We have seen very, very clearly today and over many days the hypocrisy of this government when it comes into this House and says—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Member, please do not use unparliamentary language.

Miss BARTON: We have seen very, very clearly that this government is disingenuous when it comes into this House and says that all it does is care about jobs and wanting to create jobs for Queenslanders. If it did, then it would not be tearing out the heart and the guts of the North Stradbroke Island economy. We have seen very clearly that this is what they are doing with this bill.

The best way we can describe this bill is that it is a job-destroying bill because that is exactly what it does. The government are acquiescing to the left, the far left and the Greens so that they can protect the nine seats they won at the 2015 election solely and wholly on the basis of Greens preferences. We know that the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, the member for Mount Coot-tha, is one of those members. We know as well that the member for South Brisbane, the Deputy

Premier, needed to rely on Greens preferences in order to retain her seat at the 2015 election. Those are the only jobs that this government clearly care about.

One of the things that I was particularly struck by, Madam Deputy Speaker—and I am sure you, yourself, were too, because we served on the Finance and Administration Committee at the same time—was the bravery of people in the Indigenous community who were prepared to stand up for their community. They were prepared to stand up for their people who want a job that is going to allow them to live and work in their own community. They were prepared to stand up and fight for what they want and for their beliefs in the face of intimidation from other members of the North Stradbroke Island community. What we are hearing from the government today is that they do not care about the hundreds of workers at Sibelco. They do not care about the hundreds of families that are impacted by this decision. They do not care about the impact on small business. They do not care about the impact on tourism. What they do care about, as I said, are the jobs of the members for Mount Coot-tha and South Brisbane.

We had an extraordinary scene when the Australian Workers' Union, who alongside the Labor Party are supposed to be the bastion of workers in this state, stood up very publicly and criticised this government because they are not representative of the people that the Labor Party claims to represent. Over a number of years the Australian Workers' Union have made significant contributions to the Australian Labor Party. In the lead-up to the last state election they made contributions to the member for Stretton's campaign, who served on the Finance and Administration Committee during its consideration of the bill. They made contributions to the member for Lytton's campaign. They made contributions to the member for Mackay's campaign. They also made contributions to the campaigns against the member for Coomera, who was at the time serving as the deputy chair of this committee. They made contributions against both the members for Gaven and Whitsunday. If honourable members take a look at the register of members' interests they will see that the member for Woodridge has an affiliation with the AWU, the member for Sandgate does, the member for Gladstone does, the member for Redcliffe does, the Premier does, the member for Stretton does and the member for Logan does. But where are those people standing up for the workers? They are abandoning the people who got them into this place. They are abandoning the people whom they say they represent, all in the face of seeking to protect the member for South Brisbane and Deputy Premier because that is their only focus. They do not care about the families who are going to be destroyed. They do not care about the Indigenous workers in the mine. This is according to families to whom I spoke. This is an opportunity for them—

Mr RYAN: I rise to a point of order. It is a practice of this House that members should not make a comment about whether members speak or not speak on a particular bill. I have just listened to the member for Broadwater list a whole number of members who may or may not be speaking on the bill.

An opposition member: You can—

Mr RYAN: No, that is disorderly and I ask for her to withdraw those comments.

Miss BARTON: On the point of order, perhaps the member is hard of hearing, but that is not what I said. I simply said that they are affiliated with the AWU. Those members may choose to make a contribution. I made no reference to whether or not they would—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! There is no point of order.

Miss BARTON: Clearly, the members of the government are feeling just a little bit sensitive about this tonight, because they do not want to be reminded that they are ignoring the people whom they seek to represent and whom they say they are very proud to represent. Clearly they are a little bit touchy tonight.


As I said, we had the opportunity when we were on the Finance and Administration Committee to hear from Indigenous workers at the mine. I remember people saying to me—looking me in the eye and saying—'This government is ripping opportunity away from my family. This is the only opportunity that I and my family have to have a well-paying job on this island that allows me to be part of the community that I am proud to call home, and for the Indigenous workers it allows them to have a well-paying job on their traditional land.' I appreciate that there are divergent points of view—absolutely—there always will be, and the make-up of this House is a reflection of that. However, it is incredibly naive to assume that QYAC is the only body that can speak for the Indigenous people of this island. Overwhelmingly, what I heard from the Indigenous people is that they want sandmining to continue past 2019 because, one, they want to ensure that they have an opportunity for gainful employment; two, they want to ensure that the economy of North Stradbroke Island is strong; and,

three, they are very, very clear about the fact that—not only the Indigenous people of North Stradbroke Island, but the broader North Stradbroke Island community—the transition time which has been allowed by this government is not long enough. When the Bligh government made changes in 2011 it said at the time that eight years was an appropriate transition period, so why now must we have a transition period of three years? Very clearly the people of North Stradbroke Island are worried about what this is going to mean for their economy, what this will mean for the families who live on the island who want to be a part of the island community, what this will mean for businesses whose entire livelihood is dependent on Sibelco requiring not only machinery to be transported over to the island but also workers transported over to the island.

I am very conscious that I do not have much time remaining. I want to particularly pay tribute to the member for Cleveland. Nobody could doubt that the member for Cleveland has been an incredibly strong advocate for the people of North Stradbroke Island. That is reflected in the fact that the people of North Stradbroke Island supported the member for Cleveland and voted overwhelmingly for the member for Cleveland at the 2015 election. That is proof that the member for Cleveland is a representative voice of the people of North Stradbroke Island because they have overwhelmingly put their trust and faith in the LNP.

When I was on the island we had an opportunity to hear from people who were opposed to sandmining continuing past 2019. They were people who did not live on the island. They were not people who were representative of the island. They were people who sought to be representative of the island. I believe that they were misleading the committee because, as I say, they were not representative of the island. The people who live on the island who are directly affected by this, overwhelmingly, is the voice that we should listen to.

I would just leave the House with one comment that struck me the first time I visited North Stradbroke Island. It was from an Indigenous person who is very concerned about what this decision will mean for their economy and for the Indigenous people. This person said very clearly to me that it is about closing the gap, not closing the mine. We need to make sure that the Indigenous community on North Stradbroke Island and across Queensland have an opportunity for gainful, well-paid employment, have an opportunity to access that in their own community and on their land and have access to a quality education and quality health care. It is about closing the gap, not the mine. I oppose these bills.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (11.17 pm): I rise tonight to support the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill as it is important to the future of conservation and tourism on North Stradbroke Island. I would like to acknowledge the elders of the Quandamooka people and their advocacy for this legislation as Minjerribah's first people.

This government is committed to diversifying the economy of Queensland including on North Stradbroke Island. If the island is to have a prosperous future, we must accept the reality that sandmining cannot continue forever and that only Labor has a plan to transition North Stradbroke into the new economy. This bill is about conservation, and it is also about providing a just transition for workers on the island and justice for the traditional owners and native title holders.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and the Deputy Premier for all their hard work in putting this bill together and their commitment to developing a framework that will enable Straddie not only to transition but to thrive. I note the former government had no economic transition strategy for the thousands of workers that it callously sacked after telling them to simply trust them before an election. There was no worker assistance scheme for the many thousands of workers sacked in Queensland under their reign.

I would like to acknowledge the commitment of the member for Capalaba to a just transition for Straddie. I have known the Deputy Premier, the minister, the member for Capalaba and the Minister for Science and Innovation for a long time now. As we all know, each of them through their actions has demonstrated a lifelong commitment to protecting and progressing the welfare of workers in this state.


I know that they are committed to the dignity of work, I know they value every member of our society and they ensure that everyone is treated with compassion. This dedication is reflected through the transition measures for North Stradbroke Island. The workers assistance scheme, which has been developed after consultation with the union, will support workers and their families in this transition. As part of the scheme real on-the-ground support will be provided to help people pursue new avenues.

We are supporting diversification through a \$28 million combined investment to stimulate economic activity and investment. This is part of a long-term economic plan for the island that recognises the value of the unique environment of the island and the principles of intergenerational equality. This issue has been subject to extensive consultation over the last five years. Dozens of those consultations have been held in the lead-up to this bill, including with the traditional owners, unions, Sibelco, local residents and businesses. Our government's approach is carefully considered, it is transparent and we were clear about our intentions before the election, which is an approach to lawmaking that neither Straddie nor the rest of Queensland experienced under the LNP government.

I have no doubt that there is a bright future ahead for North Stradbroke Island. If you talk to a southerner who has visited the island, they are generally shocked at the existence of such a wonderful and diverse place so close to the CBD of Brisbane and they are often amazed that more people are not aware of it. Straddie is well-placed to grow in terms of tourism and really cement itself as a sought-after national and international attraction, and conservation is a significant part of this. Conservation tourism, as we all know, is big business. As members would know, I am a passionate surfer and I was proud to stand with the Premier, Minister Miles and numerous supporters at the dedication ceremony of the World Surfing Reserve earlier this year, albeit on the Gold Coast. Surfing already brings in \$1.4 billion each year and supports 20,000 jobs. This side of the House understands that these sorts of measures are important tourism attractors. Straddie has some awesome breaks like Cylinder, Main Beach, Frenchman's Beach and Deadman's Beach. There is a stack of potential in tourism aligned to surfing, and Straddie is part of this future.

It is not just the beaches. Although mining only affects a sliver of the island at any one time, the lease covers 40 per cent of the island. This means that much of the southern part of the island is locked up and inaccessible by land. There is great scope to make more of the island accessible in an environmentally responsible way. I have no doubt that Straddie's prominence as a tourism destination will increase as it transitions from mining and that this will provide a solid economic base. I also acknowledge the great contribution that extractive industries have made to this state, and at the same time I acknowledge that the environmental impacts are significant. The conservation tourism opportunities denied by mining on North Stradbroke Island are significant.

I acknowledged the traditional owners earlier, and I think it is worth reminding the House that when the LNP moved to extend mining it was against their wishes. Labor recognises the Quandamooka people's connection with the land, and this bill is providing native title justice for Minjerrabah's first people. I can only repeat that Straddie has a bright future beyond mining, and through this bill and the hard work of the minister and members on this side North Stradbroke Island will not only thrive, but its transition will be a model for other communities facing change across the state and around the world. I commend the government bill to the House.

 **Mr PYNE** (Cairns—Ind) (11.23 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2016. Sandmining was always going to end on North Stradbroke Island. It could not go on forever. This bill has a plan to transition from mining jobs to long-term sustainable jobs. With a \$28 million investment and a focus on supporting new projects, this proposal will create jobs that can last well past the end of mining. I support a strong plan to stimulate the economic transition of Straddie. This plan will create 151 direct and ongoing jobs across tourism, education and training and business development sectors. I support the \$5 million workers assistance scheme, developed after consultation with the AWU, which will support affected workers transitioning to alternative and diverse employment opportunities through real on-the-ground assistance. This will help mine workers with new employment opportunities.

In terms of consultation, I note that this bill and the ETS have been the subject of extensive consultation dating back to 2011. Ministers and departments conducted dozens of consultation meetings in the lead-up to the bill's introduction and the release of the draft ETS in December 2015, including with QYAC, Sibelco, unions, businesses and residents. Consultation on the ETS resulted in 191 completed online surveys, 110 stakeholders providing comments during 22 listening posts or informal discussions on the island and 30 groups provided additional written commissions. During the committee process there were a total of 301 submissions, 1,600 form submissions and 114 witnesses appearing at 12 public hearings, departmental briefings and private hearings over five months of consideration.

In relation to sustainability, Straddie is the only place in Queensland where mining leases sit on top of national park. It is the only place where park rangers and joint managing traditional owners cannot access national park. This must change. Although mining only directly affects part of the island at one


time, leases can cover 40 per cent. This patchwork nature also means that much of the southern part of the island cannot be accessed by land. While many on both sides of this House refuse to transition away from a 'dig it up at all costs' mentality, we need to stop sandmining on North Stradbroke Island and protect our special natural places for future generations. I know that my good friend the member for Hinchinbrook and other champions of the coalmining industry in this place simply choose to ignore the—

Mr Cripps: Madam Deputy Speaker, I cannot tolerate being defamed like that and I ask the member to withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Thank you for introducing some levity into the debate at this time of night.

Mr PYNE: I withdraw any imputation that I am a friend of the member for Hinchinbrook. We must transition to green jobs: jobs of the future. Just as Adani is symbolic of this government getting it wrong, North Stradbroke Island is an example of this government getting it right. We are living in a time of unprecedented environmental crisis and catastrophic climate change. I say to all members that there are no jobs on a dead planet. Capitalism is unquestioned and treated as holy doctrine in this place. It is a doctrine based on infinite expansion through the exploitation of labour and the ransacking of nature. There is another way guided by the knowledge and experience of Indigenous people whose economies are embedded in a classless society and in fundamental unity with nature.

In relation to the traditional owners, let me say that the Quandamooka people are a proud people. They never ceded sovereignty of their land and they never signed a treaty with the colonial government. It was, is, and will always be Aboriginal land: people in this place must understand this. When the Campbell Newman LNP government reneged on the existing undertaking with traditional owners, for the Quandamooka people it was—and I quote one traditional owner—'Just like terra nullius all over again.' For me, tonight is about righting an historical wrong, and I for one embrace this opportunity. The wonderful thing about this bill is that it recognises the Quandamooka people's connection with the island and it is giving native title justice to this region's first people. That has been my overriding consideration in supporting this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (11.29 pm): I rise tonight to speak in support of the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill and to oppose the passage of the North Stradbroke Island Protection Sustainability (Renewable of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015. I wish to add my thanks for the hard work of both chairs of the Finance and Administration Committee, the member for Bulimba and the member for Sunnybank, and I also thank the other committee members.

The committee undertook extensive consultation both on and off North Stradbroke Island in its work. I acknowledge all of the submissions made to the parliamentary inquiry from both key stakeholders and interested constituents. I particularly want to thank the Australian Workers' Union for its submission and acknowledge its ongoing commitment to its workers on the island. The committee made one recommendation, which was to not pass the private member's bill, and our government fully supports this recommendation.

I have followed the debate in the House this evening quite closely. I understand the passionate views that many members of this House, and indeed members of the community, have regarding this issue. I am, however, personally disappointed by some of the comments made by the member for Hinchinbrook and will not be responding at all to his contribution.

North Stradbroke Island, or Minjerribah to the Quandamooka people, is a jewel of South-East Queensland with enormous and untapped potential. Our government envisions a sustainable future for the island, with long-term employment opportunities promoting economic growth and protection of the island's natural environment and its cultural heritage. That is what this bill aims to achieve. However, we know that the bill alone will not be enough. That is why we have committed more than \$20 million to transition this island's economy. We know that the island's transition from sandmining will be a continuous and long-term process. However, the resource is finite and a strategy needs to be in place to support this transition. We have consulted extensively and developed an economic transition strategy that plots a way forward to a sustainable future—


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The level of conversation in the House is rising and there is quite a bit of cross-chamber conversation. I ask people to keep their conversations to a minimum, please.

Dr LYNHAM: My Department of State Development has engaged with over 450 people and reviewed results from the 191 online surveys, 110 stakeholder comments and 30 written submissions we received to further hone what will be our final economic transition strategy. The department also engaged a number of consultancies to provide professional advice on developing an ideal strategy and appropriate actions. We see the future economy of the island driven by sustainable tourism, expanded education and training opportunities, and business development and growth. The economic transition strategy will set the scene for a range of opportunities through private sector investment and organic growth. It will draw in private investors, local entrepreneurs and existing businesses and community organisations.

Our government also understands the needs of workers on the island affected by the transition away from mining. That is why we have also committed \$5 million to a workers assistance scheme, to help affected workers find alternative employment. This includes employment support, training services, a commuting subsidy for workers, income supplementation and dislocation assistance. Passage of this bill will ensure we have more time to devote to the transition of the island's economy. It will also ensure that the former mine sites are rehabilitated adequately.

Tonight we have heard from a very proud Quandamooka woman. Indeed, the Quandamooka people are passionate about the return of parts of the island to their natural state. Amending the Mineral Resources Act 1989 to ensure certainty of access to the sites for rehabilitation and environmental management after the leases have ended will ensure that environmental authority holders can effectively plan and carry out necessary works to comply with their obligations. This needs to be conducted in a manner which recognises the need to meet all health and safety aspects during rehabilitation. Further, this amendment and the rehabilitation will open up more employment and retraining opportunities for people living on the island as it transitions to a more sustainable economy.

The workers of North Stradbroke Island have a proud history and heritage on this island. We want to ensure that this working heritage continues in other enterprises that will strengthen and not weaken with time. There comes a time in any mining community when resources exhaust or it is simply not viable or feasible to continue. It is at this time that a path to transition must be determined and supported. That time is nearing for North Stradbroke Island, but the time for opportunity, enterprise and growth for the workers of North Stradbroke Island is just beginning.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.34 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 and also make reference to the private member's bill, the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015.

The proposal in the private member's bill to move the sandmining closure date to 2024 offers a sensible compromise between the positions of both major parties. The former government had sandmining continuing to 2035, while the current government plans to phase it out by 2019. The middle ground proposed provides some balance. It recognises the intent of many parties to wind down mining but at the same time allows an acceptable transition period. I will come back to that point, but I think the transition period is the most critical point, from the point of view of the KAP and me.

These workers have been pulled from pillar to post. At the moment there is an ongoing dialogue in Queensland about job certainty and industry and employment issues. I think they are paramount with people. I do not think this is the time to compromise that. This bill most certainly does in this case. I appreciate the virtues of some of the arguments being put in favour of the 2019 closure, but they are not reason enough to cut those 100 very precious mining jobs that exist on the island at this time. Of course, I come from a mining community in north-west Queensland, which I see as a microcosm of what we are experiencing in this state—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I know that it is getting very late and that this has been quite a long debate, but there are a lot of people standing around talking and it is actually getting quite hard to hear the member for Mount Isa. Could we please pay him the respect of allowing him to speak.


Mr KATTER: Forgive me for stating the obvious. It may seem like only 100 jobs and that they can be replaced in other areas, but 100 jobs is 100 jobs. Jobs are so precious at this time in Queensland. In the Mount Isa area, if 100 jobs are lost to a town or community it can smash it. It will send shock waves through the community. The same amount of damage is done in an economy down here; it is just not as visible because it is on a bigger scale. You want to think very carefully about cutting 100 mining jobs because the reverberations are felt, even if not acutely. The effects are there and they do hurt the economy. I think that is a very critical point. In the part of the cycle we are in at the moment,

I think jobs and industry issues are paramount to most Queenslanders. That is not to discount the native title issues and environmental issues that have been raised. I think they are very important, but on balance they do not outweigh the imperative to give people the benefit of a livelihood and meaningful work.

Clearly, the committee faced difficulty in its inquiry process. It heard a lot of conflicting views. That was evident in a lot of recordings I read. I refer to the Deloitte Access Economics report. It said that 141 mining jobs were identified in 2011, and this was assumed to be the number of direct sandmining jobs. An amount of \$55 million was established to be the current total contribution of sandmining operations. That is \$55 million from some 140 workers.

The same study said that currently three per cent of the Redlands workforce or 1,256 people are employed in jobs relating to the tourism industry, with visitors currently contributing \$49 million each year to the Redlands gross regional product. Another interesting comment in that report was that sandmining jobs offered the highest average personal income of \$73,000 a year versus the average annual income on North Stradbroke of \$44,000 a year. Clearly mining is a foundation of the economy that not only affects the Redland Bay area but also contributes to the Queensland economy, even though it might be in a small way, and now is not the time to do this. Tourism has its strengths, but often in a lot of rural towns if the cattle industry is down tourism has a great capacity to provide some income but it is not a replacement. It cannot be a replacement of those bigger industries that really drive the economy in those places. If we relied on tourism alone, some of those towns would disappear. It is a great thing to put energy into and nurture and cultivate, but it is not a replacement for these industries and we have to be very careful to treat it that way.

The main thrust for extending the life of that mine is not to disrespect or disregard the considerations by the stakeholders involved, but from KAP's point of view jobs and industry are essential in the current economy. That is an imperative. These might be actions that can be taken at a time when we can afford to do them, but this is not a time in Queensland when we can do that sort of thing. Coming from a mining area, I know what cutting 100 jobs does to the economy. You get a very real sense of that in a smaller community and I am sure that this would have the same effect on the island. I have visited Stradbroke Island three or four times in my life. I would not say that I have a good feel for it at all, but I am not completely naive as to what the drivers are in that economy. It is clear that tourism plays a part, but without mining it will leave a massive hole and my heart will be with those workers who rely critically on that income to keep their families going. Without that meaningful work from mining it will leave a big hole. Many of the social issues that we talk about and address in this parliament come back to that one issue—that is, that there is meaningful work available for someone to support their family. With regard to taking those 100 jobs away, yes, in time you might recreate them in some other industry, but sending a shock through a community like that in an abbreviated time line as suggested is not the right thing to do. It is a poor decision which is why we have introduced the alternative bill to 2024 to at least give these people some longevity and a right to have that income and that meaningful work.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (11.43 pm): I stand proud to speak on this bill. I wish that I did not have to speak on this bill, but I have to speak on this bill because of what we saw the LNP do when it was in government. I start by acknowledging the traditional owners of Stradbroke Island, the Quandamooka people, some of whom are still in the gallery tonight, and my good friend the member for Algester. To be honest I do not think there is anything more to say beyond the words of the member for Algester, who spoke tonight, except to say that the only good that came out of the LNP bill was the fact that tonight we got to see an Aboriginal woman stand in this parliament and speak in her language. That is an historic moment for Queensland and I am very proud of her. This bill is about providing a long-term future for the people of North Stradbroke Island. The genesis of the original legislation that was passed in this House in 2011 was that as much as Sibelco wants to deny it it knows that it was always going to end sandmining on North Stradbroke Island. That was always going to happen and we as the government at the time felt that we had a responsibility to look at how we could transition the island to a long-term sustainable future to provide employment for the people of North Stradbroke Island. In stark contrast to those who sit opposite in the LNP, we did that in consultation with the traditional owners of that land, the Quandamooka people.

I was very honoured and privileged to have many hours with the elders of the Quandamooka people talking about how we could do that in a way that could take their community forward—their land and their community. I take this moment to acknowledge and thank them for their generosity. In actual

fact, seeing Aunty Joan tonight was really moving for me because when we had those meetings I was pregnant with my first son and the first thing she said to me was, 'How is your baby?' What a wonderful woman she is and what a proud woman she is. Unfortunately I am not sure if she is still here tonight because tomorrow is Sorry Day and she has a lot of engagements because she is a true woman who is in every essence trying to build reconciliation in this country. I want to acknowledge that she was here tonight with Uncle Bob and other members of the Quandamooka people.


Tonight I rise as the Minister for Tourism and say that we know that Straddie is a jewel in the crown. It is a very special place, as Leanne has said here tonight. When we end sandmining on that island we will be able to open up vast parts of the island that have been locked up from people to visit and people to see, including the traditional owners of the land. By passing this legislation tonight, we will enable vast tracts of Stradbroke Island that have been locked up from access to be seen for the first time and create new opportunities for the traditional owners of that land to have employment in the tourism industry. We know that tourism is growing and that by investing with the \$20 million package that has been put on the table by this government as part of the transition we can support the Quandamooka people in creating new tourism opportunities on the island. Whenever there is change there is conflict—we know that—but the whole point of our government's legislation and the package that has been put forward is to make that change as smooth as possible. We will not play politics, as the LNP has done, with people's land and people's families. We want to work in consultation—

Mr Springborg: How's your vegetation laws going?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question, because vegetation management laws go to the heart of protecting the Great Barrier Reef—one of the best natural assets in this state. I will never, ever apologise for standing up and protecting the Great Barrier Reef.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: That is right: we are talking about providing certainty to the Quandamooka people about their land and the transition and we have the interjection from the member for Southern Downs talking about vegetation management laws. Once again, he is highly disrespectful. What we know is that renewed investment in tourism has the potential to generate an additional \$16.5 million in new visitor expenditure and attract up to \$20 million in private investment and see an additional more than 100,000 visitors to the island. I make this pledge here tonight that as the Minister for Tourism in this state I will work closely with the Quandamooka people and I will work closely with industry to ensure that tourism thrives on this island. I will not go on for much longer because there is no need because, as I said, the most eloquent speech here tonight, member for Hinchinbrook, was given by the member for Algeester. In actual fact, I think that was the best speech of the night and as I said was a historic moment. I pledge here tonight that our government will work closely with the traditional owners to ensure that we make this transition as smooth as possible, that we create new opportunities for tourism and long-term jobs growth on North Stradbroke Island. I thank you very much for being here tonight. I thank you for your support and I look forward to working with you.

 **Mr GORDON** (Cook—Ind) (11.49 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the bills before the House. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the Quandamooka people, the traditional owners of North Stradbroke Island, and pay my respects, as is our custom, to their elders, both past and present. I acknowledge the Quandamooka people who have come to the gallery tonight to witness these proceedings.

Mining on Indigenous land has always been a double-edged sword. It is a complex coexistence between economic development, protecting a natural environment and respecting the rights and interests of Indigenous people. Mining can bring communities great economic benefits and improve the quality of life of people and families. There is no doubt about that.

I have used the last 12 months to speak with and seek out as many people, organisations and stakeholders as possible to gain a greater appreciation of both sides of this issue. It has not been a process that I have taken lightly. I have been deliberate in my endeavour to maintain an open mind in my consultations and communications with a diverse range of stakeholders. I have heard the views of the member for Cleveland—and his passion is indeed compelling—local businesses, mine representatives, their workers, unions, particularly the AWU, environmental groups, island residents but, more importantly, the Quandamooka people who are both for and against the proposed 2019 shutdown of mining operations.

As an Independent in this parliament, I have committed to examining all sides of this debate. To the best of my ability, I have given consideration to the myriad issues that confront this great community


should this legislation pass into law—what it potentially means for mineworkers and their families, the island's business community and, more broadly, the island's future economically and socially. I have listened to the political debate that has raged about the merits of this bill but, more significantly, I have listened to the voices of the Quandamooka people. I have listened to their hopes and dreams and have felt their passion, their spirit and their strength. I have come to know them to be a proud people, rich in culture, traditions, laws and custom, which is why it greatly pains me to know of the conflict among them in regard to their competing dreams and ideas about the future for their people and their land. It is my sincere hope that, somewhere down the track, the Quandamooka people find a way back to unity.

When it comes to native title and land rights, the great electorate of Cook has a rich and storied history. In the Torres Strait there lies the island of Mer, where the Meriam people have lived for time immemorial, practising their culture, living off the sea and the land. It is the home and final resting place of the great Eddie Koiki Mabo. Despite more than a decade living away from his island home, Eddie Koiki Mabo maintained a powerful connection of stories and traditions passed down to him, and he to his children and grandchildren. Forty-two years ago there was a chance conversation between two men over lunch on the lawns of James Cook University in Townsville. Professor Henry Reynolds asked gardener Eddie Mabo, 'You haven't been to the Torres Strait for 10 years. How do you know your land will still be there for you when you go back?' Eddie replied, 'Everybody knows it's Mabo land. It's been Mabo land for generations. No-one would dream of trying to move in on it.'

Next Friday, 3 June, is the anniversary of the 1992 landmark High Court decision that overturned the concept of terra nullius—land belonging to no-one. That decision was handed down only 24 years ago. Just 24 years ago, Australian history books, Australian legislation and laws supported the British government's claim that Australia was uninhabited when they arrived in 1788. Despite all the evidence proving that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have been here for more than 60,000 years, our history books and laws said that British settlers did not invade the land because it did not belong to Aboriginal people. Britain acted as if it was settling an empty land. I pay my respects to Mr Eddie Koiki Mabo. From a chance conversation over lunch, he took on this great lie and won. The Mabo decision rewrote history. It forced changes to government legislation and, ultimately, in this case it led to the Quandamooka people gaining native title rights over North Stradbroke Island in 2011.

For 16 years, the Quandamooka people fought to have their rights recognised, for their right to live and conduct traditional ceremonies, conduct burial rights and maintain places of importance in areas of significance. The Quandamooka decision was described as an historic breakthrough that stands as a powerful example that positive native title outcomes can be achieved in developed areas other than remote and regional Queensland.

Earlier this year, I was able to spend a lot of time on North Stradbroke Island, walking around, talking to a lot of people—business men and women, as I have said, residents and also traditional owners. This is not an easy decision, but I have great confidence that the island will prosper and grow. In my electorate, mining has delivered many benefits to Indigenous people and I hope that it continues. But it is different in Cape York from what it is on North Stradbroke Island. As I have said, I have listened to many people, and particularly the Quandamooka people. The Quandamooka people have bled long enough. They have cried long enough. Their wait is now over. Today, the Quandamooka people will no longer be beggars at the gates of their own kingdom. Rather, they will be masters of their own dreaming. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (11.57 pm): I rise to speak wholeheartedly in support of the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. In doing so, I acknowledge the Quandamooka people, the traditional owners of Minjerribah—or North Stradbroke Island as it has been more recently known—for thousands of generations. I acknowledge in the gallery tonight all elders and members of the Quandamooka people, including Dr Robert V. Anderson OAM, or Uncle Bob, as he is often known, whose commitment to his traditional land is unwavering and resolute. I also acknowledge my colleague the member for Algeester and Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business, who earlier spoke so eloquently and movingly. I also acknowledge Mr Cameron Costello of the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation in the gallery.

The time to preserve and protect Minjerribah has come. It is unfortunate that this time has had to come twice. It is agreed that sandmining must end on this island, but the issue is whether it should be soon on the basis that enough environmental damage over 67 years has been done to the second

largest sand island in the world or whether it should continue unabated for another 16 years beyond 2019.

When history is written, the passing of this bill to become law will be a great credit to this parliament and to the members who supported it. Since sandmining commenced in 1949, Minjerribah has changed substantially. In that time, our values as a community have also changed substantially. We now understand—most of us—that unique environmental values are important and deserve to be acknowledged and protected. We also have a much greater understanding and respect for Indigenous culture and history and their inseparable relationship to their land.

A memorable example of that tonight was to listen to the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business speak of her traditional lands the subject of this bill in her own Indigenous Quandamooka and, I say advisedly, Australian language, a language that came directly from Minjerribah over thousands of years of local generations. The Queensland parliament in 2011, via the state Labor government of the time, made a clear decision to cease sandmining by 2019. It is unfortunate that the LNP chose not just to reverse those historic reforms but to extend mining on the island. It is hard not to see that the Newman-Nicholls LNP government decision was in some way punitive and vindictive. The Deputy Premier spoke accurately earlier about the substantial political donations by sandmining corporation Sibelco to the LNP, a matter of public record. She is right to say that it was no coincidence that the Newman government changes and the donations were aligned and that Queenslanders were right to question the connection of these two factors and the lack of integrity from the LNP government.

I acknowledge the Deputy Premier's strong leadership on this issue as a first term MP and the shadow minister in the last parliament and also the role of the Minister for Education and member for Ashgrove in the historic 2011 bill's introduction and passing. The Newman government bill was a retrospective jump back to the past which has done no favours to anyone in relation to this issue and history will be harsh upon it. It created false hope for those who supported sandmining and it created unnecessary uncertainty for everyone on all sides of this debate. Labor has a clear and consistent policy on Minjerribah and was never going to change its policy. We were always going to form another government in Queensland and the Newman-Nicholls government law to extend environmental damage would never last to anyone who understood the issue and this state. Labor says 67 years of mining on this unique environmental jewel is enough. Labor says the environmental values of this unique part of the world should not be further destroyed for another 16 years. Labor says it is time to transition Minjerribah to a sustainable future and the challenges that entails.


This reform is consistent with Labor values of environmental protection of unique parts of Queensland. It was Labor who stopped logging on Fraser Island and supported the local workforce to transition in order to protect Fraser. Fraser is now visited by travellers and tourists from all over the world and is revered for its environmental values. It is Labor, through this Palaszczuk Labor government, that acted to protect the Great Barrier Reef and face the leadership challenges that entails in terms of stopping capital dredge spoil being dumped on the reef and working to take real action to minimise climate change and reduce nutrient run-off which affects the reef. Again, the environmental values are a major economic drawcard and job generator for Queensland. History will be kind and favourable to both the Goss and Palaszczuk governments for these reforms. There is no doubt that Minjerribah, on the doorstep of a major city such as Brisbane with a major international airport less than an hour and a half away, has great potential for travellers from all over the world to share its wonderful environmental values and, in harmony with the Quandamooka people, its Indigenous history and values. I have no doubt that history will equally review the reforms tonight in the same light: as a modern and courageous reform of contemporary and inclusive values.

The Palaszczuk government will be supporting local workers whose positions of employment will phase out on the island with a \$28 million investment package to focus on private sector projects and to stimulate the economic transition by creating 151 direct and ongoing jobs across tourism, training and education sectors. Our \$5 million workers assistance scheme, developed in consultation with the Australian Workers' Union, will support affected workers to alternate and diverse job opportunities. We do that because we support both the workers and the environment. We talk to and listen to the representatives of the workers, including and especially when we do not fully agree with their position. Leadership is identifying when reform and change is necessary and working with all parties to achieve optimal outcomes. It is not about short-term thinkers with 20th century values or picking fights, it is about envisioning a new future for a special place, which Minjerribah is.

Let me address a few points raised in debate by the opposition in a remarkably uniform way by many of their speakers. The LNP opposition laces their speeches in parliament ad nauseam alleging the Palaszczuk government is somehow a union dominated government. This bill clearly shows that the Palaszczuk Labor government will make policy decisions based on their intrinsic merits. It is natural for the Australian Workers' Union as the representative of many workers at the mine to seek to extend the life of sandmining. It is the government's view, however, that it is time the island's unique and environmental values were fully protected after 67 years of mining. The embittered opposition, still smarting from losing the unlosable election, remains obsessed by green party preferences. The Greens will make their own decisions. The facts are that Labor is the great reformist party in Queensland when it comes to protecting our environment and implementing the difficult reforms. That is not extreme, that is common sense. That is science. That is modern values. That is political courage. That is living in the real world. Whether it is Fraser Island, the Great Barrier Reef, the integrity of our national parks, the promotion of renewable energy and action on climate change or whether it is protecting Minjerribah, it is Labor that has led this state on environmental policy over the last 25 years. Sadly, the opposition remains in the Bjelke-Petersen era when it comes to our environment in Queensland.

The government bill deserves support. I cannot support the private member's bill as any further delay in my view is unacceptable given the unfortunate and regrettable history under the Newman and Nicholls government. What a tremendous opportunity it was tonight for the opposition leader and member for Clayfield to chart a new course for the LNP by drawing a line under their appalling record on Minjerribah, yet all we got is more of the same: environmental and Indigenous disregard and an absence of leadership. We said before the last election that we would stop sandmining in 2019. Tonight we do exactly that. We have kept our word and our policy, a policy we have had for five years consistently and clearly. It is a policy we stuck with when we had seven members of parliament in this House. It is a policy we stick with now that we are in government. It is an election commitment. While we respectfully listened to those submitting for extensions of time for a variety of reasons we do say it is an election commitment and we will stick with it.


(Time expired).

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (12.07 am), in reply: Tonight we have heard different arguments from both sides of the House and different points of view. There is no doubt that we support robust debate in this House. There have been many arguments. The Deputy Premier was right about the relationship between the Newman government and Sibelco being very shaky. I was on the committee when the legislation to extend sandmining to 2035 was smashed through with disrespect towards the Quandamooka people. The way that the legislation was smashed through was probably one of the lowest acts that I have ever seen in this parliament.

At the same time I believe that we are going a bit too far in legislating to cease sandmining on North Stradbroke Island in 2019. That is why I introduced our bill. We have many reasons for that, in particular jobs for the community on North Stradbroke Island. Using the government's own best case figures, the loss of mining will result in the loss of 144 jobs, 95 of those being residents of Stradbroke Island, and the loss of between \$55 to \$86 million annually to the Stradbroke Island economy and a loss of over \$1.52 billion over the next 10 years.

The bill that I have introduced states that the mining lease will end in December 2024. It also allows for rehabilitation until 30 December 2029. Representatives from the chamber of commerce, the AWU and mining workers were much more content with 2024 than they were with 2019, which is why I have put this bill before the House. It is a compromise. It is a fact that none of us will get it all our own way. However, I believe that this is in the best interests of North Stradbroke Island, particularly in terms of jobs. If my bill is passed tonight, everyone gets an outcome and no-one has it completely their own way. Tonight, there will be big winners and there will be massive big losers, which is why we have made this suggestion. This it is not radical. It is a balanced compromise.

I believe that the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill 2015 is sensible. It is sound. It is good policy and it gives an outcome for everyone. I ask members to support this bill.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (12.11 am), in reply: Firstly, I thank all honourable members for their participation in this debate. I also thank the Finance and Administration Committee for their thorough consideration of the bill, which included taking a broad range of community views into account. I especially acknowledge the work of both committee chairs who worked on the

inquiry, the members for Bulimba and Sunnybank. In their contributions tonight, both demonstrated how deeply they had listened to and reflected on the issues.

When I introduced this bill, I said that North Stradbroke Island—Straddie or Minjerribah to the traditional owners—is a special place, and it is. Anyone who has spent time on the beaches or in the ocean, walking on the tracks or climbing the sand dunes knows just how special it is. It is even more special to the Quandamooka people who, as we heard tonight, have 3,000 generations of history there. It is just gone midnight, which means it is now National Sorry Day. To have the voice of Indigenous communities restored on this important day is very significant.

The member for Algeester spoke powerfully, from a perspective unique in this place, as a Quandamooka woman. It is a great honour to serve with someone so passionate and so powerful. It was wonderful to hear her speak that language, with elders and leaders of the Quandamooka people in the gallery. It was almost as good as watching the member for Hinchinbrook squirming in his chair after his disgusting self-justification of his utter disregard for the traditional owners.

The member for Algeester spoke some big important truths. It was a shame she had to, but it was important that someone finally called out the LNP and especially the member for Cleveland for their campaign to divide the Minjerribah community. When I heard that the member for Cleveland was setting elders against each other and against their family members and when I learnt of the grief and sadness that was causing, it reinforced to me just how important certainty is for this community. I plead with the member for Cleveland: whatever the result on this bill, put an end to your cruel campaign of division. It has to end.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, the member for Cleveland has not raised a point of order or asked for a withdrawal.

Dr MILES: I repeat: I plead with the member for Cleveland, whatever the result on the bill tonight, to put an end to his cruel campaign of division. It has to end. If he is any kind of servant to that community, he must accept the outcome and work with us on a transition.

While the member for Algeester called those opposite out for their behaviour on the island, it was the Deputy Premier who called out the LNP for their hypocrisy in protesting the closure of sandmining while they sacked thousands of workers. What is the difference between the Sibelco workers and the thousands of others the LNP sacked? There is one difference.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hinchinbrook, you have had ample opportunity to speak on this bill.

Dr MILES: What is the difference between the Sibelco workers and the thousands that the LNP sacked? One big cheque!

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Minister for Education, I do not need your provocation.

Ms Jones: They spent 90,000—

Mr SPEAKER: No! I call the minister.

Dr MILES: The difference is one big cheque for \$92,000, which helped elect the Newman government. That is all it cost to buy a bill from the member for Hinchinbrook. Let us be clear about the history here: in 2012, the then Nicholls/Newman opposition promised that they would make no changes to the Bligh government's legislation. Then, as with so many of the promises they made, and just like with land clearing, as soon as they were elected they let their environmental vandal in chief, the member for Hinchinbrook, off the leash. It was his job to pay the mining company back for its support for Campbell Newman and for its aggressive campaign to unseat the then and now member for Ashgrove. They delivered an extension to 2035, which is eight years longer than Sibelco asked for, with no regard at all for the rights or interests of the traditional owners.

As with so many of the extreme ideological things the member for Hinchinbrook did, tonight this parliament must right a very bad wrong. Tonight we can start Straddie back on a path to sustainable jobs. Tonight we can protect the precious environment of this special place. Tonight we can give back to the Quandamooka people the right to access and care for their land.

Sandmining was always going to end. It was a finite resource with a finite life. Only Labor has a plan to create sustainable jobs that will be there long after mining ends. Only Labor has a vision for the island other than ripping it up.

I acknowledge the efforts of the member for Dalrymple in proposing what he considers to be a compromise. I want to be clear that the traditional owners consider that 2019 is a compromise. The 2011 native title determination was unequivocal in granting the Quandamooka people native title rights over 54,408 hectares of land and water on and around North Stradbroke Island. As we heard from the member for Algeester, Quandamooka elders have not had access to sites of great cultural significance since they were young children and, without this bill, they will not be able to teach the new generation, perhaps the 3,001st generation of Quandamooka, about those sacred sites.

This bill substantially ends sandmining by 2019, the bill reinstates a restricted mine path over the Enterprise Mine and the bill ensures that rehabilitation occurs in a timely way so that others can begin to enjoy the lands that have been occupied by mining for decades. This is especially true for the traditional owners, who not only desire but also deserve access to their sacred lands. It is time to restore their access and help them to achieve their aim of becoming the world's most sustainable island. Transitioning from mining supports ecotourism, which is a sustainable use of the island.

We have heard that the committee received over 2,000 submissions on the bill, which my department and the committee have gone through in detail. The private member's bill allows access for rehabilitation for a maximum period of only five years. This is a key deficiency and, as has been determined by the committee, is insufficient. Allowing satisfactory rehabilitation to occur following the end of sandmining is essential and the reality is that it is likely to take longer than five years.

My department has taken on board the operational requirements of the mining company and the native title requirements of the prescribed body corporate. I am confident that the new rehabilitation authorisation in the bill resolves stakeholder concerns satisfactorily.

The member for Algeester reminded us of the landmark ILUA signed by the state and the prescribed body corporate in 2011. That ILUA took 16 years to negotiate. From talking to anyone who was there that day, it is clear that it was a much celebrated and extremely emotional event. Today we remember that historic signing and honour the elders past and present who fought so hard to see that agreement in place.

The bill reinstates a restricted mine path for the Enterprise Mine that properly reflects contemporary operational issues, while avoiding impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage and high conservation areas. In combination with the draft economic transition strategy, the bill will secure the rich cultural heritage of North Stradbroke Island.

As we have heard tonight, the bill is just one element of the government's policy for North Stradbroke Island. The government has committed \$20 million over five years to support the island's economy throughout this transition period. On top of this, there is an additional \$3.87 million in in-kind contribution from the Queensland government to support the strategy. A further \$5 million has been allocated to the North Stradbroke Island Sand Mining Workers Assistance Scheme to help affected sand miners transition to other employment.

The strategy focuses on actions which drive sustainable tourism, expand education and training opportunities and foster local business development and growth. The actions that are contained in the strategy are too many to mention, but I am particularly pleased that the strategy includes an expansion of the Indigenous Land and Sea Ranger program. This is a unique and highly successful initiative that delivers real environmental and employment outcomes to some of the most culturally important and environmentally sensitive parts of our state. It is brilliant that the island will benefit from a boost in this program.

I will turn to some of the claims made by the member for Hinchinbrook. He claimed the rehabilitation authorisation was untried and untested. Unlike renewing mining leases, the rehabilitation authorisation will allow for compromises to be reached between QYAC and Sibelco about land access. Yes this is new, but in developing this provision we have extensively consulted with both QYAC and Sibelco to make sure it meets both party's needs.

The member also noted concerns that the bill extends the health and safety legislation to areas that are not under a mining lease. Mining health and safety legislation already applies across multiple types of tenures and even includes where mining is illegal and to abandoned mines. The government's

bill makes sure that health and safety legislation applies to this new type of authorisation. As I said earlier, the health and safety of mine workers and the general public is of prime concern to us.

The member for Hinchinbrook raised concerns in relation to supposed sovereign risk. He argued that introducing rehabilitation authorisations to allow access after mining leases have ended will impact on sovereign risk. He called this the sovereign risk icing on the sovereign risk cake. I think his mind had wandered. I think he was thinking about cake.

This argument is based on fear. It is important to emphasise that the bill does not impact mining activities in other parts of the state. It should also be acknowledged that the bill reinstates an end to mining in 2019 that was originally introduced in 2011 and that investment in mining in Queensland continued after 2011. Rehabilitation requirements are set at the point of authorisation. It is just absurd to argue that including provisions that enable these existing requirements to be met creates sovereign risk when the obligations have been there all along.

The private member's bill also fails to include a provision for the amendment of and compliance with a proposed restricted mine path. In contrast, the government's bill allows for amendment to the restricted mine path. I must emphasise that amendments can only be made where no impacts on threatened ecosystems or cultural and environmental values will result. The bill also limits the time frame for making such an application. It is proposed that amending the bill to increase the time limit to six months is a realistic and reasonable compromise.

During my visits to the island and meetings with stakeholders, I was overwhelmed by the talent, commitment and resilience of the Straddie community. With this passion and drive I have great confidence that the island's transition will be a positive one.

The member for Yeerongpilly drew a notable comparison with the transition of Fraser Island away from sandmining and timber logging towards a thriving, sustainable tourism destination. Given North Stradbroke Island's close proximity to Brisbane, I know Straddie will experience similar successes.

I appreciate that change is not always straightforward. It is not always easy, but changes of this type are inevitable and ultimately unavoidable. The transition has to be made at some point. I believe that communities in other parts of Queensland and Australia will look to North Stradbroke Island as a very encouraging transition model.

I thank members for a vigorous debate. I am optimistic about the future of the island as a cultural and tourism asset, a thriving holiday destination and a much loved place to live. I would encourage those members who have reservations about protecting the natural and cultural values of the island to take a holiday. I think they might need one. In fact, I would recommend that they get down to Cleveland, jump on the Stradbroke Flyer and experience the natural splendour for themselves.

Ms Trad: There's a little baby whale shark there.

Dr MILES: While they are there they can see the baby whale shark and enjoy a gelato at the point.

The bill paves the way towards a diverse and sustainable island economy that protects areas of outstanding natural and cultural heritage value for future generations to enjoy. In the words of the member for Algeester, 'It is time. It is time to draw a line in the sand and let the island get on with a successful transition away from mining.' On this I agree with the member for Dalrymple: it is time to put the uncertainty of the past five years behind us and move towards a more sustainable tomorrow. I commend this bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 42:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.


KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pairs: Miller, Nicholls; Pease, Molhoek.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Speaker's Ruling, Same Question Rule

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the question before the House is that the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill be now read a second time. I draw members' attention to the statement I circulated in the chamber earlier today regarding the application of the same question rule. Standing order 87 provides the general rule of Westminster parliamentary practice that once the House has resolved a matter in the affirmative or negative the same question shall not again be proposed in the same session.


As previous speakers have noted, the matters do not have to be identical but merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form. The North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill introduced on 27 October 2015 seeks to achieve substantially the same objective as that of the government's bill, which the House has just resolved to read a second time. Therefore, under standing orders 87 and 150, the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill cannot proceed and is therefore discharged from the *Notice Paper*.

Consideration in Detail

North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

 **Mr KNUTH** (12.33 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 5 (Amendment of s 2 (Object of Act))

Page 7, line 4—

omit, insert—

2024

This amendment extends the mining lease to 2024. I spelt out our reasons for this in my second reading speech.

Dr MILES: This amendment from the member for Dalrymple goes essentially to the heart of the difference between the two bills that were before the House. Obviously the government's position is that our bill with the 2019 date should stand, so we are opposing this amendment.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I propose that all future divisions will be of one-minute's duration unless members indicate otherwise. I urge all members to remain in the chamber.

AYES, 41:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 42:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: Miller, Nicholls; Pease, Molhoek.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) negated.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—



Dr MILES (12.40 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 6 (Amendment of s 9 (Termination of mining lease 1109 if not renewed))

Page 7, lines 9 to 11—

omit, insert—

(2) Section 9(1), from 'ends'—

omit, insert—

ends on the commencement of the *North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Act 2015*, part 2.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill, explanatory notes for Hon. Dr Steven Miles' amendments.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—



Dr MILES (12.41 am): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 13 (Replacement of s 17 (Replacement of environmental authority MIN100971509))

Page 9, line 22, after 'identified'—

insert—

, by reference to the ecosystem's biodiversity status,

Amendment agreed to.



Mr KNUTH (12.41 am): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 13 (Replacement of s 17 (Replacement of environmental authority MIN100971509))

Page 10, line 20, '2019'—

omit, insert—

2024

This is very similar to clause 5, which extends the mining lease to 2025.

Dr MILES: Similarly, this amendment seeks to pursue the Katter's Australian Party bill's approach of a 2024 end date. It is the government's policy that the date should be 2019 and the bill should stand as it is.

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

AYES, 41:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 42:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: Miller, Nicholls; Pease, Molhoek.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) negatived.



Dr MILES (12.44 am): I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 13 (Replacement of s 17 (Replacement of environmental authority MIN100971509))

Page 11, line 19, '4'—

omit, insert—

6

4 Clause 13 (Replacement of s 17 (Replacement of environmental authority MIN100971509))

Page 13, lines 1 and 2—
omit, insert—

- (e) there is an ILUA in relation to the land between—
 - (i) the holder of the Enterprise Mine lease; and
 - (ii) a registered native title body corporate for the land.

5 Clause 13 (Replacement of s 17 (Replacement of environmental authority MIN100971509))

Page 13, lines 6 and 7—
omit.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Dr MILES (12.45 am): I move the following amendment—

6 After clause 13

Page 14, after line 21—
insert—

13A Insertion of new pt 4 hdg

After section 22—
insert—

Part 4 Transitional provisions for North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Act 2015

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 17—



Dr MILES (12.45 am): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Dr MILES: I move the following amendments—

7 Clause 14 (Omission of ss 23 and 24)

Page 14, lines 22 to 24—
omit, insert—

14 Replacement of ss 23 and 24

Sections 23 and 24—
omit, insert—

23 Operation of Mineral Resources Act, s 312—termination of mining lease 1109

- (1) This section applies in relation to the termination of mining lease 1109 (the **terminated lease**) under section 9.
- (2) To the extent the Mineral Resources Act, section 312(4) divests property on the land in the area of the terminated lease from the owner and vests the property in the State, the section applies on the day that is 3 years after the commencement.
- (3) Subsection (2) applies despite the Mineral Resources Act, section 312(1).
- (4) To remove any doubt, it is declared that this section does not apply to any mineral on the land in the area of the terminated lease.

24 Authority to enter particular land—holder of environmental authority EPML00575913

- (1) The chief executive (MRA) is taken to have given an authorisation, under the Mineral Resources Act, section 344A(3), to the holder of environmental authority EPML00575913 in relation to land that was, immediately before the commencement, subject to mining lease 1109.
- (2) The authorisation is taken to start on the commencement and end on the day that is 3 years after the commencement.
- (3) For the period of the authorisation, the holder is taken to have complied with the Mineral Resources Act, section 344C.
- (4) To remove any doubt, it is declared the Mineral Resources Act, section 348 applies in relation to the authorisation.
- (5) In this section—
chief executive (MRA) means the chief executive of the department in which the Mineral Resources Act is administered.

25 Obligation of holder of particular authority to consult about land comprising mine

- (1) This section applies while the deemed authorisation is in effect.
- (2) Before giving a notice under the MQSH Act, section 47(1) in relation to a relevant mine, the holder of the deemed authorisation must consult with a registered native title body corporate for the land comprising the mine or part of the mine.
- (3) Before giving a notice under the MQSH Act, section 47(5) in relation to a relevant mine, the holder of the deemed authorisation must consult with a registered native title body corporate for the land the holder proposes to be added to or omitted from the mine.
- (4) If the holder gives a notice under the MQSH Act, section 47(1) or (5), the holder must, as soon as practicable after giving the notice, give the chief executive—
 - (a) a copy of the notice; and
 - (b) evidence of the consultation with a registered native title body corporate for the land mentioned in the notice.
- (5) In this section—

deemed authorisation means the authorisation taken to have been given by the chief executive under section 24.

mine see the MQSH Act, section 9.

MQSH Act means the *Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999*.

relevant mine means a mine comprised of all or part of the land that was, immediately before the termination of mining lease 1109, subject to mining lease 1109.

8 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 15, after line 27—

insert—

registered native title body corporate see the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cwlth), section 253.

9 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 16, after line 10—

insert—

- (3) Schedule 3, definition *NSI mining interest*, 'Region.'—

omit, insert—

Region, other than an approval to remove a mineral or property from the land under the Mineral Resources Act, section 313.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 17, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 18—



Dr MILES (12.46 am): I move the following amendment—

10 Clause 18 (Amendment of s 9 (Meaning of coal mine))

Page 16, lines 17 to 25 and page 17, lines 1 to 3—

omit, insert—

Section 9(1)—

insert—

- (f) a place that was a coal mine, or part of a coal mine, while—
 - (i) on-site activities are carried on, continuously or from time to time; and
 - (ii) an authorisation to enter land under the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*, section 344A(3) is in force for the place.



Mr CRIPPS (12.47 am): Clause 18 amends section 9 of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 to ensure that the act continues to apply to a coalmine which does not have current tenure but has an authorisation to enter land under the new section 344A(3) of the Mineral Resources Act 19489. The sandmine on North Stradbroke Island of course is not a [coalmine, but the provision that is clause 18 is identical to clause 36, which is the relevant mining health and safety legislation. The clauses are almost identical except for the resource sector safety act that it applies to.

My question to the minister is that, whilst clause 18 says the relevant resource safety act will apply, not the Workplace Health and Safety Act, on a site which does not have a current tenure, the amendment moved by the minister has already revealed some concerns about the application of this resource sector safety legislation to these sites. The effect of the amendment moved by the minister is

that the holder of the permit which will be issued for the first time under the Mineral Resources Act will nominate an area of the former mining tenure that they will be undertaking activities on.

We have already had amendments to the original provision of the bill to try to clarify that. The explanatory notes say that the amendment will remove uncertainty about the activities of the permit holder, but there is no explanation in the explanatory notes about how it will apply to others conducting other types of activities on that site who do not hold a permit. That is a concern for me and for the resources sector, particularly for Sibelco, which is going to be the first holder of one of these permits.

I can recall when I was the minister for natural resources and mines moving an amendment to specify that contractors operating on mine sites were covered under the resource sector legislation and not under the Workplace Health and Safety Act. There was an inconsistency in the past in relation to that where there was overlapping, duplicated workplace health and safety legislation. We cleaned that up, and now there is only one piece of workplace health and safety legislation—that is, the resource sector legislation which applies to mine sites.

Now we are going to have the resource sector safety legislation applying on specified sites on former mine sites, but the legislation that has been presented to the House today does not specify that others doing other activities which are not resource activities related to rehabilitation will be covered by that resource sector safety legislation on that former mine site. That is a concern to me as someone who is interested in this issue, it is a concern to the resources sector and it is a concern to Sibelco.

Dr MILES: As I noted in my speech, these arrangements apply in a wide range of different types of tenure. All this bill and these amendments will do is ensure that the same health and safety standards apply in cases where these authorisations apply. I would simply note that the final amendments that we are proposing here are the result of concerns raised by Sibelco and are indeed designed to address those concerns.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 35—



Dr MILES (12.51 am): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Dr MILES: I move the following amendments—

11 After clause 20

Page 17, after line 18—

insert—

20A Amendment of s 201 (Term of environmental authority)

Section 201—

insert—

- (2) To remove any doubt, it is declared that an environmental authority continues in force in relation to an ERA carried out on land identified by reference to a resource tenure even if the resource tenure expires or is cancelled.

12 Clause 26 (Amendment of s 344 (Definitions for pt 4))

Page 19, lines 22 to 24—

omit, insert—

- (c) for which no environmental authority is in force for activities mentioned in paragraph (a) that were carried out under a mining lease or mining claim that is no longer in force.

13 Clause 26 (Amendment of s 344 (Definitions for pt 4))

Page 20, lines 4 to 8—

omit, insert—

- (b) for which an environmental authority for the mining activities mentioned in paragraph (a) is in force.

14 Clause 27 (Amendment of s 344A (Authorised person to carry out rehabilitation activities))

Page 20, lines 27 to 31—

omit, insert—

land to enter the land, or part of the land, to carry out activities (also **rehabilitation activities**)—

- (a) for the environmental management of the land required of the holder under an environmental requirement under the Environmental Protection Act; or
- (b) the holder would be required to carry out, if an EPA surrender application had been made for the environmental authority, to satisfy an EPA administering authority for the application of the approval matters for the application.
- (3A) If the holder is not otherwise authorised under this Act to carry out a rehabilitation activity mentioned in subsection (3), an authorisation under the subsection is taken to authorise the holder to carry out the activity for the period mentioned in subsection (4).
- (3B) However, an authorisation under subsection (3) does not authorise, and is not taken to authorise, the holder to carry out an activity that is an act to which the right to negotiate provisions apply.

15 **Clause 27 (Amendment of s 344A (Authorised person to carry out rehabilitation activities)) Page 21, line 7, 'prevented'—**

omit, insert—

prevents

16 **Clause 27 (Amendment of s 344A (Authorised person to carry out rehabilitation activities))**

Page 21, after line 27—

insert—

approval matter, for an EPA surrender application, means a matter about which the EPA administering authority must be satisfied under the Environmental Protection Act, section 269.

EPA administering authority, for an EPA surrender application, means the administering authority for the application under the Environmental Protection Act.

EPA surrender application means a surrender application under the Environmental Protection Act, section 257(1).

17 **Clause 28 (Amendment of s 344B (Entering land to carry out rehabilitation activities))**

Page 22, lines 18 to 20—

omit, insert—

- (2) Section 344B(2)—

insert—

- (aa) if the entry is authorised under section 344A(3) and paragraph (a) does not apply—at any time after the end of the notice period; or

- (3) Section 344B(2) (b), 'within a period of 10 business days starting on'—

omit, insert—

at any time after

- (4) Section 344B(2) (aa) and (b)—

renumber as section 344B(2) (b) and (c).

- (5) Section 344B(4)—

insert—

notice period means a period of 10 business days starting on the earlier of the following—

- (a) the day the owner of the land is given notice of the entry under section 344C;
- (b) the day the occupier of the land is given notice of the entry under section 344C.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 35, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 36—



Dr MILES (12.51 am): I move the following amendment—

18 **Clause 36 (Amendment of s 9 (Meaning of mine))**

Page 27, lines 8 to 19—

omit, insert—

Section 9(1)—

insert—

- (g) a place that was a mine, or part of a mine, while—

- (i) operations are carried on, continuously or from time to time; and
- (ii) an authorisation to enter land under the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*, section 344A(3) is in force for the place.

Mr CRIPPS: It may not come as a surprise to members of the House that I think the answer I was given by the minister to my previous question was wholly unsatisfactory. He has not answered my query. He has made it very clear—and the explanatory notes accompanying the bill make it very clear—that the rationale behind inventing this new mechanism to allow for resource companies that previously held a resource tenure at a particular site to keep undertaking rehabilitation activities after the mining lease has ended is because the continuation of a mining lease on these sites excluded access by other people. In particular, in relation to the bill before the House and North Stradbroke Island, the government has expressed that a continuing mining lease on North Stradbroke Island, even for the non-controversial purpose of rehabilitating the land, was still a concern to some stakeholders—namely, the traditional owners because they could not access that land.

Ms Jones: That's right.

Mr CRIPPS: That is fair enough, that is the explanation, but what the minister has not been able to tell the House is that, when you have people traversing the land at the same time as a resource company that previously held the mining lease and is now responsible for the rehabilitation work on that land under this new permit system, they will be subject to the relevant resource sector safety legislation, but what relevant safety legislation will apply to those other people undertaking other activities on that land who are no longer restricted from accessing that land because there is no resource tenure there?

I put it to the minister that the explanatory notes accompanying the bill do not make it explicitly clear that two sets of workplace health and safety legislation are not enlivened. For the resource company undertaking rehabilitation activities, I accept the explanatory notes accompanying the bill state very clearly that the relevant resource safety legislation applies. I accept that, but the explanatory notes do not make it explicitly clear that people undertaking non-resource related activities, non-rehabilitation activities, who are traversing that land are not subject to exactly the same pieces of legislation.

I put it to him again. I tried to clean this issue up when I was the minister and say that contractors on a mine site were subject to the same piece of workplace health and safety legislation. We will now have other people traversing the same site, and the companies involved in undertaking the rehabilitation work on the land are confused and concerned that they will be held liable for the activities of other people not subject to that legislation. It is a legitimate concern. The minister did not answer last time. I am lucky I have another opportunity because clause 36 is a mirror image of clause 18 in relation to other pieces of legislation.

Dr MILES: The arrangements have been developed in consultation with the mine safety and health division of DNRM, which advised that they will operate exactly as if the mining lease was in effect. The member is missing something here. I am sure he is familiar with the lease arrangements on North Stradbroke Island, where often cases a single lease can be a very large parcel of land and mining operations, and in this case the rehabilitation operations, will be a much smaller area. The mine safety and health regulations will apply to that smaller area where it is deemed that the rehabilitation is occurring and will operate exactly as if the mining lease was there.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Dr MILES (12.57 am): I move the following amendment—

19 After clause 36

Page 27, after line 19—

insert—

36A Amendment of s 21 (Meaning of operator)

Section 21(1) (b), '9(1) (d) or (f)'—

omit, insert—

9(1) (d), (f) or (g)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (12.58 am): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 42:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pairs: Miller, Nicholls; Pease, Molhoek.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time

Long Title

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (1.00 am): I move—


That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mount Cotton Driver Training Centre, Clarification

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (1.00 am): I would like to clarify the answer I gave this afternoon to the question without notice from the member for Redlands. If approved, the market-led proposal at the Mount Cotton Driver Training Centre will see the RACQ invest significant funding in revamping the facility into a Queensland driving excellence centre. Any funds from the outcome of that process will be allocated by government in line with the usual practice at the appropriate time.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams

Due to the late sitting, the Adjournment debate will not appear in the *Record of Proceedings*. The complete *Record of Proceedings* will be available by 5.00 pm on Friday, 27 May 2016.

<http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/sitting-dates/latest-sitting-dates>