Third Reading

Hon. SL DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (6.26 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I am going to speak really slowly as we head towards the dinner break. I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. SL DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (6.26 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Order of Business

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (6.27 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding standing and sessional orders, general business notice of motion No. 1, disallowance of statutory instrument, be postponed to a later day.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.28 pm to 7.30 pm.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Error in Introductory Speech, Mining and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

Hon. AP CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (7.30 pm), by leave: Earlier today, in my introductory speech for the Mining and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012, I stated that the competitive tendering process amendments to the Mineral Resources Act would provide for a direct allocation option for coal resources in specific circumstances. I advise the House that this statement was incorrect and I take this opportunity to amend the record, which should state that a direct allocation for coal in specific circumstances is not permitted.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I would remind all members to have their phones on silent.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BILL

Resumed from 1 November (see p. 2380).

Second Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (7.31 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I want to thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee for its consideration of the Economic Development Bill 2012 and its recommendations. The committee has made a considerable number of recommendations and the government will be supporting the majority of them. For the benefit of the House, I table the government's response to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee's recommendations.

Tabled paper: State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 15—Economic Development Bill 2012, government response [1753].

When I introduced this bill to the House I said that it was primarily a process bill. I will say again tonight that it is primarily a process bill. What it does is combine two existing bills together. However, a lot of the commentary that I have seen reported has failed to understand that there is very little that is new in this bill. It is the combination of two existing bills. Given the government's particular policy positions in regard to the ULDA especially and in regard to our commitment to driving economic development in this state, we saw an opportunity to combine those two bills together to establish an economic development driver that would both achieve the government's policy positions and allow us to transition the considerable amount of powers of the ULDA back to local government in a way that created greater efficiencies and synergies within government.

Unfortunately, I think some of the comments that have been made have bordered on conspiracy theories, especially in regard to a provision that was added to the bill to ensure that the recommendations of the Floods Commission of Inquiry were implemented. The Floods Commission of Inquiry recommendations were supported by both sides of this House before the election. The previous Labor government supported those recommendations, as did we. After the election we certainly maintained our support. The Labor members in this House have used the suggestion that those recommendations now be enacted as an opportunity to run off on a whole lot of wild and scary stories that simply have no basis at all.

Tonight let me go through in some detail what this bill is about in an attempt to put it on the record and make it very clear what this bill is about. The bill integrates and modernises key provisions of the Industrial Development Act 1963—can I pause and say that again: 1963; an act that has been around since 1963—and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007. That act was enacted with some controversy by the previous government. But this bill sets out to combine those two acts together to establish a single economic development act to assist government to drive economic development in Queensland.

At the bill's core, there is a re-emphasis on supporting, facilitating and fast-tracking economic development in the state by refining and improving the existing processes. The bill includes amendments to other legislation that will also contribute to the government's economic and community development objectives. It contains legislative changes to continue the vital rebuilding work of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority and to implement particular recommendations made in the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry report, which I referred to a little while ago.

The bill will enable particular developments to be fast tracked to meet the government's priorities for economic development and development for community purposes. The bill is intended to commence as soon as possible. However, some operational arrangements will need to be established, and consequently provisions will commence by proclamation to ensure the smooth transition to the new arrangements. The cost of the operational arrangements under the economic development act will be met from existing allocations.

The Economic Development Bill, while procedural, offers three key and fundamental differences from the Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 that it repeals. Firstly, it provides for a changed and integrated governance model. The Urban Land Development Authority, or the ULDA, was established as an autonomous, self-funded organisation independent of government. The bill, if enacted, will establish the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, or MEDQ, as a corporation sole. In contrast to the ULDA, the MEDQ will be managed from within government and will have the ability to deal commercially in land, property and infrastructure. The MEDQ will also have responsibility for planning and development activities.

The bill integrates the two current entities—the ULDA and the Minister for Industrial Development, or MIDQ—to enable approved operational efficiencies and increased opportunity for streamlining planning processes. It also supports consistency and cohesion as operations will be under the leadership of a single board that is under the direction and mandate of the responsible minister. That single board will be made up of four of the state's most senior public servants.

Secondly, it offers greater flexibility and provides scope to plan and develop within declared areas including for a wider range of activities than is currently the case. At present, development in declared areas must focus on development of affordable housing. That was the charter of the ULDA. The bill provides flexibility to develop land for a broader range of purposes including economic development.

Thirdly, it provides for increased local government engagement. I repeat: it provides for increased local government engagement. I am not sure many of the submissions made to the committee understand that. This bill deliberately and proactively provides for increased local government engagement. Unlike the two existing acts, the bill enshrines local government involvement. This includes consultation on proposed priority development areas, the power to establish local consultative committees and the opportunity for direct delegation of MEDQ functions to local government.

The bill allows flexibility for the Minister for Economic Development to delegate all or some of the planning powers in the bill to local government. The MEDQ powers that could be delegated include the powers to prepare and make development instruments, land use plans and development schemes, prepare and make amendments to development instruments, assess development applications and make decisions to approve, refuse or partly refuse these.

The bill also provides for a local government to prepare an amendment of its planning scheme to provide for a priority development area that is no longer a priority development area. The bill provides local government with the opportunity for greater input into the management of priority development areas through representation on local representative committees. It is intended that these committees represent the interests of local communities and the relevant local government is identified as a potential member of the LRC.

The part of the bill that perhaps caused the most ill-informed and misdirected comment was the part that deals with temporary emissions licences. As I said, this was in response to the Floods Commission of Inquiry recommendations. The temporary emissions licence is designed to be a quick decision on limited criteria to permit a release, for a limited period of time, of water from such areas as mine sites. I spoke about this issue in the parliament earlier and how the previous government had been so totally unable to respond to the issue. That inability to respond cost the economy of Central Queensland dearly. The previous government could not deal with this issue. What we have done since we have come to government is we have dealt with it on a number of levels.

The temporary emissions licence deals with emergency release situations. As this is to be used as an emergency tool, the decision on whether to approve the licences must be made within 24 hours. This takes account of the fact that it is dealing with an emergency situation. However, to balance the quick decision time frame, the licence is fully flexible. It can be immediately amended, cancelled or suspended without receiving and considering submissions from the operator if, for example, downstream drinking water is adversely affected by the release. This provides for the community to be protected where decisions have to be made quickly and on limited information. This flexibility is one of the measures in place to prevent environmental harm and detrimental impacts on agricultural land.

However, more importantly, water quality—especially drinking water quality—is still an important consideration in deciding whether to approve the licence in the first place. To begin with, as part of an application for a temporary emissions licence, proponents would be required to provide information on any increased risks arising from additional discharges and the proposed monitoring and mitigation strategies to offset these risks. In addition, the decision maker would still be required to consider water quality, environmental health and public health issues in deciding whether to approve the application.

These criteria are spelt out under 'Criteria for decision' in section 357D of the bill, which states that the administering authority must have regard to 'the likelihood that the release will adversely impact the health, safety or wellbeing of another person'. The example given for that subsection of a release that adversely impacts another person is where the release could affect the quality of downstream drinking water. Where there is a high risk to human health from a proposed discharge, the application of the proposed decision criteria would make it highly unlikely that a licence would be granted. This tool is designed to be used as part of a response to an unforeseen emergent event. To fetter this discretion unduly would limit the effectiveness of the tool. However, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is preparing guidance material which will assist decision makers in assessing applications for a temporary emissions licence for particular types of natural disasters and releases.

There has been a lot of confusion between the temporary emissions licences designed to address emergency release situations and the efforts that the government has been making to address the longer term problem of dealing with what is sometimes called the legacy water in Central Queensland's mines. This part of the legislation was not meant to deal with the broader question of the legacy water. The legislation was not introduced retrospectively, and there is no intention to use the new temporary emissions licence to allow mines to release legacy water held from previous floods.

As a result of discussions with industry, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is proposing to address the issue of legacy water in a very different way. That is the process I spoke about in the parliament earlier and it is the process we discussed with the community of Central Queensland in Rockhampton a couple of weeks ago. It is the process that has been the subject of so much misrepresentation and so much scaremongering by the people on the other side of the House. As I said in the parliament earlier, it is gratifying to me that the attempts by the member for South Brisbane, the opposition leader and the member for Rockhampton to run scare campaigns in Central Queensland are simply not working. They are not working because the people of Central Queensland know first and foremost that this issue has to be addressed. Their scare campaigns are not working because the people of Central Queensland know and understand that a whole-of-river management system is at the heart of obtaining a long-term solution to this issue. Their scare campaigns are not working because we have presented to the people of Central Queensland a comprehensive proposal based on precedents that exist around the world. The nearest precedent is in the Hunter River in New South Wales, where a very similar scheme has been operating for some time to ensure that the quality of the river water is monitored and that a series of trigger points is used to determine the release strategies.

We will be moving to implement a pilot program this coming wet season with the intention of eventually establishing a water quality trading scheme in the Fitzroy Basin which will enable the economic drivers to incentivise coal mines and other proponents who want to release water into the river to do so in a way that ensures that the water quality at the most sensitive of the receptors along the river—that is, at the Rockhampton water intake—is always never worse than it is in a natural situation.

I have no doubt that during this debate tonight we are going to hear more irresponsible and ill-informed comments about this issue by members on the other side, including the member for South Brisbane and the member for Rockhampton. But this is an issue where we have to do more than just run scare campaigns. It is an issue that is critical to the economy of Queensland and particularly the economy of Central Queensland. It is critical to the job prospects of many of the people whom the member for Rockhampton represents, yet the best that he and his colleagues can do is continue to run those sorts of scare campaigns.

The other part of the bill I want to comment on is the amendments that are proposed to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. Once again, there has been some ill-informed comment about this. One of the platforms this government was elected on was to restore the role, authority and powers of the Coordinator-General. The objectives of the amendments in this bill are to fast-track project approvals and facilitate project delivery. The amendments are all about what we said we would do. We said we would streamline the approvals process. The Coordinator-General has been implementing a 37-point fast-tracking action plan, and he has radically reformed the whole approach to assessments and decision making. The focus is on time because time is the great cost for proponents proposing these projects. The focus is on time, with the clear target of reducing approvals times by 50 per cent while still maintaining the credibility of the approvals process.

As at 20 November, the Coordinator-General was actively assessing 35 projects which have the potential to contribute to the Queensland economy $78 billion in capital investment and provide 42,000 jobs in construction and 24,000 jobs in ongoing operational roles. As of that date, 20 November, 86 statutory decisions had been made by the new Coordinator-General in his first seven months, compared to just 45 by the previous government in a full year. That is 86 statutory decisions in seven months compared with 45 in 12 months. That is the best indicator of what our government is doing. It is one of the best indicators of what we have changed since we have come to government.

However, the government recognises the need for the Coordinator-General to be supported with strong and efficient legislation that has the flexibility and the capability to empower the Coordinator-General to deliver on the government's objective and drive economic development. The amendments ensure that the Coordinator-General has clearer and more effective powers to manage his key activities, which include: the coordination of declared projects undergoing environmental impact statements, progressing the economic development and management of state development areas, assessing applications for private infrastructure facilities and managing land acquisition associated with major projects. As a result, assessments of applications for coordinated project declarations will be more comprehensive and rigorous, with proponents being made well aware of the requirements.

One of the amendments that has attracted some attention in the last couple of days and more particularly today is the amendment that seeks to change the declaration of a 'significant project' to a different terminology so it would be called a declaration of a 'coordinated project'. This has always been an area where I believe change has been necessary. The 'significant project' title implies that a project has government support or is a state priority. There have been numerous examples over a period of time where proponents have used the fact that their project has been granted significant project status by the Coordinator-General as some sort of marketing advantage. They have produced material that suggests to the market that, because the project has been declared a project of state significance, it has at least an element of state support. We are going to change that in this legislation because it is inappropriate for this declaration to be used in that way. The declaration does not imply any degree of state support. What it does is allows the Coordinator-General to undertake an assessment process. This bill before the House will change the name of that process so that the process will declare projects 'coordinated projects'. However, it is important to note—and to note with some emphasis—that that is the only change that it will make. It will change the name from a 'project of state significance' to a 'coordinated project'. It will ensure that proponents are not able to use the term and the title to misrepresent their projects as having some degree of state support or even some degree of state involvement.

I think it is an issue that is particularly pertinent for people who consider these issues from the other side of the language barrier where these terms are translated into other languages. The meaning of the term is much easier to misrepresent in another language. I would say very clearly tonight to the investment industry that what is being changed here is the name, is the title. We are doing that to ensure that that particular declaration cannot be misrepresented. I am aware that as late as today particular proponents have suggested that they are going to challenge the validity of this legislation because it is unconstitutional. I think the fact that they have sought to do that indicates very clearly that they are the people who have been misrepresenting this declaration and doing so for quite some time. The coordinated project is a much more appropriate term, reflecting what the declaration means. It starts a

comprehensive environmental impact statement process managed by the Coordinator-General. It indicates that the project will undergo whole-of-government coordination of the environmental impact assessment.

The amendments make very small changes to the application and decision-making process. The amendments make the eligibility criteria for a coordinated project more comprehensive. The three key additions are the requirement to provide prefeasibility information on the project, details of the proponent's capacity to complete the environmental impact statement process and other matters that the Coordinator-General considers relevant. Existing criteria are also clarified and strengthened, for example, the need to be consistent with government policies and plans. These changes will lead to a more comprehensive assessment process which will ensure that only those projects that meet the criteria and are likely to happen are declared coordinated projects.

These amendments also assist potential applicants in clearly identifying the type of information which has to be submitted. The need to demonstrate prefeasibility is important in order to reduce the number of speculative projects being declared that do not ever get built but are simply after the title. The need to demonstrate prefeasibility is also important in order to reduce the possibility of government resources being wasted during the EIS process and the creation of unnecessary concern in the community about the impacts of projects that are not likely to proceed. Additionally, with the applicant having to demonstrate its financial and technical capability to complete the EIS process, it is less likely that projects will languish after the declaration period.

There has also been some comment about the amendments that provide an ability for the Coordinator-General to refuse or receive or process an application for a declaration. This allows the Coordinator-General to refuse or receive or process an application if insufficient information is provided in the application to make a decision. It prevents the unnecessary use of the Coordinator-General's resources in considering an incomplete application. The new section also allows the Coordinator-General to give the proponent a reasonable opportunity to provide the information before refusing to receive or process it.

There is also a provision that I think has been misrepresented today that allows the Coordinator-General to cancel a coordinated project declaration. It is a new section that allows for the cancellation of a declaration, for example, firstly, where the proponent requests it, which sometimes happens; the Coordinator-General considers that the proponent lacks the capability to complete the environmental impact statement; there is a public interest to cancel; there is a change to the proponent; or the project substantially changes. It is absurd and ridiculous to suggest, as I have seen suggested today, that the government would seek to cancel a coordinated project declaration for any other reason. We are a government that is intent on driving economic development. It is our intention and our determination to drive economic development, to drive as many of these significant projects as we can using the coordinated project declaration. To suggest that this section of the bill is somehow part of a conspiracy theory to allow us to cancel declarations for some spurious reason is simply nonsensical. It is puerile, childish, absurd and completely without foundation.

The other part of the bill that I would also like to make some comments on is the part that changes the private infrastructure facility declaration. A private infrastructure facility approval is all about compulsory land acquisition by the Coordinator-General for a private sector proponent. That is its only purpose. It enlivens the Coordinator-General's powers to compulsorily acquire land for the benefit of a private sector party where the proponent has been unsuccessful in negotiating a commercial agreement with the landholder for the purchase of the land. A private infrastructure facility approval is considered a last resort and is intended to be used when commercial negotiations have been unsuccessful in providing the land for the infrastructure facility. Section 153 sets out a range of criteria for approval of a project as a private infrastructure facility. Amongst a number of requirements, the project must have economic or social significance and economic or social benefits to Australia, the state or the region in which the project is to be undertaken; it must satisfy an identified need and be consistent with state policies; and the project will be completed in a timely way.

An approval for an 'infrastructure facility of significance' is what this process used to be known as. Once again, the term 'infrastructure facility of significance' was all too often misrepresented in the way that a 'project of state significance' declaration was. Hence, the process is being renamed 'private infrastructure facility' to better reflect its purpose and to reduce the ability of proponents to use the approval as a marketing and negotiating tool and to imply a level of state support for the project which simply does not exist.

The new name and timing of when it may be made available post environmental impact statement approval also reduces the risk that proponents could unduly influence landholders in negotiations. That is an important part of the reason this is in the bill, because there have been times in the past when project proponents have gone to landholders with the opening statement in their negotiation being, 'We have the power to take your land. We are now here to negotiate about buying it.' The ability for private infrastructure providers to compulsorily acquire land should be used as a last resort and it should only be used when every effort has been made and every effort has been demonstrated to acquire that land by commercial negotiations.

I think I have dealt with some of the issues that have been the subject of misinformed and ill-informed debate since this bill was first introduced into the parliament. As I said, I welcome the recommendations of the committee. The government will accept the majority of the recommendations that the committee has made to the parliament. We will enact those recommendations through amendment during consideration of the bill in detail. I look forward to hearing the contributions of members in the House as we consider the bill here tonight. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (8.01 pm): I rise to speak on the Economic Development Bill 2012. In doing so, I would like to register the opposition's severe concerns regarding the bill and to inform the House that we will not be supporting this bill. When the Deputy Premier—

Mr Hart: You do not like economic development, do you?

Ms TRAD: They must be testy after the party room meeting where they tried to expel a member.

When the Deputy Premier introduced this bill only three weeks ago—and even earlier tonight—he stated—

The bill I present today is primarily a process bill.

This is not merely a process bill. The Deputy Premier's statements are just really the 2012 version of 'don't you worry about that'. 'Just a process bill,' the Deputy Premier said when he introduced the bill and earlier tonight. 'Just a process bill,' he said as he attempted to push this legislation through the committee system with minimal public scrutiny or consultation.

To its credit, the committee did not follow the Deputy Premier's wishes and went ahead and held a public meeting on 9 November. It was not very long to give community and other organisations input and proper, genuine, meaningful consultation, but I commend the committee for perservering and holding a public inquiry. On behalf of the opposition I place on record my thanks to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee for all of their work. I particularly note the former chair, Ted Malone, and Dr Kathy Munro, the research director, for all their work.

The committee report made 20 recommendations for amendments to this bill and follow-up actions. The committee of mainly government members supports the position that, in fact, this Deputy Premier is wrong and this is not primarily or merely or in any sense a process bill. The Deputy Premier told us that his amendments around untreated mine water were all procedural and to implement the Floods Commission of Inquiry recommendations. This is not the case. The committee at page 25 of the report states—

... the committee considers this Bill to be more than a procedural Bill to implement recommendations already accepted by the Government.

In fact, what we do know after meeting papers from a Queensland Resources Council meeting surfaced is that the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer specifically met with the Queensland Resources Council about royalty increases before the state budget. What we do know is that during those discussions in relation to the royalty increases offsets were put on the table. We also know that one of the major issues put on the table to offset the royalty increases was in fact dealing with the legacy water issue. For the benefit of the House, I table the meeting papers, the resolutions and the discussion that was had.

Tabled paper: Queensland Resources Council—Notice of Meeting, 10 August 2012 [1754].

For the benefit of the House I shall give some quotes. The meeting paper states that the recommended resolution put to the board was—

That the Board

- Note that the Secretariat has entered into confidential discussions with the State Government around a package of potential royalty increases (focussing currently on the coal sector) and measures that could deliver tangible cost offsets to members;

Further, the papers detail at point 9—

Considerable time was also spent discussing—

with the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer—

what a royalty increase might look like and what cost offsets government could provide industry. The secretariat steered the discussions towards a royalty increase that has a legislated sunset (after three years). In terms of offsets, QRC pushed fiscal stability agreements which lock-in royalty rates for future projects, real action on the legacy water in mines and moving to minimise SIMPs obligations as well as those issues that may have been placed in the 'too hard basket'.

One of those used as an example is 'the union's misuse of the mining OH&S Act as an industrial tool'. Imagine that: the mining union using the OHS act! Outrageous! Further, in terms of communications the paper also states—

At this point in the discussions, the QRC is endeavouring to keep discussions 'closed' and publicly we have been appreciative of government's committed to at least engage in consultation which did not occur under the Bligh government.

That is because the Bligh government would not enter into a dirty deal around dirty mine water like this government is prepared to do.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am happy to take as much time as I can. The Deputy Premier is the same person who as the member for Callide in opposition sat on the Committee System Review Committee in 2010—a review that recommended that legislation lay before the committee for up to six months. This report was supported by the current Deputy Premier, who told this parliament—

I was part of that bipartisan committee and ... it was a very successful committee. It operated in a true bipartisan way, which in itself is a very rare occurrence in politics ...

Additionally—

As I have said before, quite sincerely, it was one of the better experiences that I have had in this parliament. We worked through an issue that affects us all.

But what appears to be the case is that what the member for Callide, the honourable Deputy Premier, says in opposition—

Mr Seeney: Where did the quote end? Are you still quoting? What is the end of the quote?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Deputy Premier—

Mr Seeney: No—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier—

Mr SEENEY: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. If the member is going to quote me, she needs to explain where the quote ends and she did not. I am asking where the end of the quote was.

Ms TRAD: I refer the Deputy Premier to *Hansard* of 12 August 2012. He can go back and look at that.

Mr SEENEY: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Ms TRAD: It is not a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I am perfectly capable of determining myself what a point of order is. The Deputy Premier is on his feet and he is attempting to take a point of order. I do not need to receive instructions from you and I will kindly ask you to stop providing me instructions.

Ms TRAD: I am terribly sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr Young: That was contemptuous.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Keppel, you are not helping.

Mr Young: Sorry.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, what was your point of order?

Mr SEENEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I have two points of order. The first point of order is that I have the call, which means that the member for South Brisbane should resume her seat. Thank you. Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for South Brisbane was quoting me. I do not dispute that they were the words that I said. When the member for South Brisbane, like every other member in this House, quotes another member she has a responsibility to indicate where the quote starts and where it ends. There was no indication of where the quote ended and I insist that the member for South Brisbane indicates where the quote ends, because unless she can do that then she is wrongly quoting me or at least I run the risk of being wrongly quoted.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, it might aid the House and it might aid the debate if you would indicate where the Deputy Premier's quote ends.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, it ended where I ended his quote—with a full stop—and I shall repeat it again for the benefit of the House and for the benefit of your deliberation. The Deputy Premier said—

As I have said before, quite sincerely, it was one of the better experiences that I have had in this parliament. We worked through an issue that affects us all.

That is from *Hansard* of 2 August 2012.

Mr Seeney: And that's the way you do it. You indicate the end of the quote.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, I ask you to rule on whether the Deputy Premier should be addressing me personally across the chamber or through you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, you make many interjections across the chamber through many debates. I would suggest that for the aid of the House and so that we might allow the debate to continue you just continue with your comments.

Ms TRAD: Of course, Madam Deputy Speaker. So it appears, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the Deputy Premier has one position in opposition but another position when in government. He has another position when he has the full power of the responsibility of the Deputy Premiership. He has one different position, as the member for Yeerongpilly has recently found out. He has a different position from the position he held in opposition, as the member for Gaven has recently found out, and he has a different position—

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, will you withdraw?

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. So why is it then that the Deputy Premier really wants this bill rammed through with minimal public scrutiny and consultation?

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane?

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, I have not personally offended the Deputy Premier. I am making a point, Madam Deputy Speaker. They were not a personal affront.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has found your comments offensive and I would ask that for the aid of the debate and for the aid of the House you withdraw.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw them, Madam Deputy Speaker. The opposition would like to see amendments to this bill to respond to public concerns that have been raised repeatedly by stakeholders, community organisations and members of the public in relation to the minimal public scrutiny and consultation that has accompanied this bill. The amendments that the opposition would like to see would go back to the committee for proper consultation and discussion. We cannot support this bill in its current form or with amendments that have not been consulted on. Those amendments we have seen were brought to us here tonight at the commencement of this discussion of the bill. But let me turn back to the reasons we believe the Deputy Premier thought this was merely a process bill. The Deputy Premier has called this bill a process bill because he thought he had the process lined up, as was detailed in the meeting papers from the Queensland Resources Council meeting.

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Of the comments that the member for South Brisbane made, may I seek clarification, Deputy Premier, as to what you found personally offensive?

Mr SEENEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, under the standing orders of this House anything I find offensive the particular speaker has to withdraw. In this case, I am happy to explain. The imputation that the member is making is that somehow there was a conspiracy between the QRC and our government to do something that only the member for South Brisbane can imagine. Irrespective of that, I, like every other member of the House, have the right to ask for comments about me to be withdrawn if I find them offensive. I find the comments made by the member for South Brisbane offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, the Deputy Premier has found your comments offensive and I would ask that you withdraw.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. The Deputy Premier has called this bill a mere process bill because he thought he had an agreement already lined up with the Queensland Resources Council, as was detailed in the meeting papers—

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. Madam Deputy Speaker, that is the same comment. Madam Deputy Speaker, that is repeating the same comment.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, could you please resume your seat.

Mr SEENEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, that is the same comment. I find it offensive and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, the Deputy Premier has found comments offensive and he has asked that you withdraw them.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, I withdraw those comments, but I will draw the Deputy Premier's attention, through you—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane—

Ms TRAD: It is not a qualified—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane—

Ms TRAD: It is not a qualified—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, when I am speaking please do not interrupt me. You do not have the call. I would ask that you withdraw your comments unreservedly.

Ms TRAD: I did. I withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unreservedly.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw unreservedly.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for South Brisbane. You have the call.

Ms TRAD: At the public meeting that I attended on 9 November that the parliamentary committee held the Queensland Resources Council under questioning from me advised that it had received a copy of the legislation perhaps a month earlier. This was in fact a month earlier than anybody else had received the proposed amendments in order to assist in the drafting upon consultation. I call upon the Deputy Premier tonight to release the details—

A government member interjected.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, can I just point to the fact that this was evidence given under oath during the public inquiry by the representative of the Queensland Resources Council.

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, Minister?

Mr POWELL: Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for South Brisbane is suggesting that the QRC alone was provided a copy of the draft bill. I need to draw the House's attention to the fact that a range of stakeholders received a copy of the draft bill. It is therefore inappropriate what the member for South Brisbane—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, that is not a point of order. The member for South Brisbane has the call.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I call on the Deputy Premier tonight to release the details of these discussions and to show what influence the Queensland Resources Council has directly had on the drafting of this bill. I also call on the Deputy Premier to respond to AgForce's requests as detailed during that public hearing to see the initial discussion paper that was released by the government that only the QRC commented on during that public inquiry. This discussion paper was the basis for providing the changes to the Environmental Protection Act that we see here before us today, and I challenge the government and I challenge the Deputy Premier and I challenge the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection to release that discussion paper.

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, what is your point of order?

Mr HART: I was in fact the chair of that inquiry and the only reason that the QRC made that statement was because—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh—

Mr HART:—was because—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, it would appear to me that you are expressing a point of view, not a point of order. Do you have a point of order?

Mr HART: I am clarifying for the House—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, this is not the time for clarifications. You can make comments during your contribution to the debate. Please resume your seat. The member for South Brisbane has the call.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Other stakeholders including the Local Government Association of Queensland and AgForce, as I mentioned earlier, were less than impressed by this one-sided consultation process. The Local Government Association of Queensland advised the committee—

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Environment, what is your point of order?

Mr POWELL: The suggestion that the LGAQ, which did receive a copy of the draft bill, should express such is just superfluous and incorrect. The member for South Brisbane is misleading the House with inaccuracies—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister—

Mr POWELL:—and I would ask you—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, it would appear to me that you are expressing a point of view. If you believe that the member for South Brisbane has misled the House, I would suggest that you write to the Speaker. That is not a point of order.

Mr POWELL: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for South Brisbane has the call.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. To repeat: other stakeholders including the Local Government Association of Queensland and AgForce were less than impressed by this one-sided consultation process. The Local Government Association of Queensland advised the committee publicly that it was asking for guaranteed consultation so that its input into the questioning could be provided to ensure the protection of essential urban water supplies. It does not seem like too much to ask of this government or the Deputy Premier. AgForce told the committee that it did not support this bill in its current form—it could not support it in its current form—and it could not support it without the addition of that information that it had not seen. It is clear in the development of this legislation that if you are not a mining company or a financially powerful developer, you are not part of the Deputy Premier's consultative process.

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for South Brisbane, the Deputy Premier has found comments that you made offensive and I ask that you withdraw them.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw them. We know, Deputy Premier, that this is part of a dodgy dirty deal with mining companies—

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, will you withdraw.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw—a deal that the mining industry would not take out a campaign against the government over royalty increases in exchange for trade-offs, which included the security of our environment and urban water supplies.

The committee's recommendations to change aspects of this legislation that can only be described as shambolic are a welcome first step. You need not take my word for it that this legislation as introduced is shambolic; the submission from AgForce stated—

AgForce is concerned that the proposed Bill if implemented as worded will increase the risk that primary producers will face significant negative environmental impacts flowing from poorly managed discharges of mine contaminants including salts, metals and sediments. AgForce is adamant that in responding to one emergency event we do not create another emergency for other stakeholders in the catchment of the affected mine or mines.

Even the Queensland Resources Council representative at the public hearing, Ms Bowie, stated—

If Temporary Emissions are linked to lack of foresight that would obviously have an unintended consequence in terms of planning. I would have to say that unless that provision is amended to remove the lack of foresight link, the obvious unintended consequence would be to lead to poorer planning and particularly poorer evidence of planning.

The Queensland Farmers Federation submission stated—

Downstream water users and environments could be impacted by the release of water from mine sites into river flows unless both the quality of the discharged water and the receiving water is considered ... QFF is very disappointed at the way in which this consultation process has been managed.

Further, the QRC in its negotiations with the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection was advised that the cumulative impacts of multiple temporary emissions licences could not be assessed, and I quote—

The cumulative impact one was, however, one that they did not think could necessarily be looked at within 24 hours and that is why they included the provision about being able to impose amendments after a TEL had already been granted so as to be able to scale back a TEL.

Here we have the situation where multiple temporary emissions licences can be granted within a 24-hour period without any ability to assess the cumulative impact on the river system. That is not responsible. I put that to the House and I put that to the Deputy Premier.

Mr Powell interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member for South Brisbane is not taking interjections and I would ask that you please cease.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Here we will have field officers—the ever-diminishing number of field officers who work for the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection; half a dozen covering a huge area of Queensland—as given under oath during the inquiry, being compelled to provide temporary emissions licences to release toxic mine water within a 24-hour period. But we can amend the licence afterwards. You cannot amend the environment afterwards. You certainly cannot amend your crop afterwards and you cannot amend your cattle afterwards. There is one thing you cannot amend after the fact and that is certainly the Great Barrier Reef.

The Capricorn Conservation Council, which is an organisation that I know the Deputy Premier likes to quote often, stated in its submission—

> CCC does not support the proposed amendments to the EP Act 1994 due to the high likelihood that the proposed changes ... will result in adverse negative impacts upon the environment, society and the economy in the Fitzroy Basin.

This legislation as it currently stands would allow for any officer in the department or declared person to issue a temporary emissions licence to release contaminated mine water. This direction is to be issued verbally with no follow-up written instruction. The officer and the department would have been required to assess the financial impact—or the economic implications, I understand now—on the mining company of not allowing the release of floodwaters, but not the financial impacts on downstream users such as farmers and graziers of being exposed to contaminated mine water.

The definition of an emergent event—now to be, I think, another watered down term—for which a temporary emissions licence can be issued is also extraordinarily—

Mr Holswich interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, as has been clearly indicated the member for South Brisbane is not taking interjections.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The definition of an emergent event for which a temporary emissions licence can be issued is so extraordinarily broad and is not restricted to the time immediately before, after or during a flood event.

Mr Hart interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, please cease interjecting across the chamber. The member for South Brisbane is not taking interjections. If you wish to make a contribution to this debate, you have your chance to do so.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. To claim that these amendments merely reflect the recommendations of the flood commission of inquiry is wrong. The flood commission of inquiry did not recommend such a broad definition of an emergency. The flood commission of inquiry also recommended that guidelines were to be made public. What we have heard from the Deputy Premier here tonight is that guidelines are being worked on. They are currently being proposed by the department. When I questioned the department about who would be consulted in relation to these guidelines—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, can you please direct your comments through the chair.

Ms TRAD: I am, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane—

Ms TRAD: What did I say that was—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, please do not disrespect the chair.

Ms TRAD: I apologise—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I am still speaking. You do not have the call. I have asked that you direct your comments through the chair. All I ask is that you please respect my ruling. You have shown gross disrespect to the chair earlier in this debate and I name you under standing order 253A.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, thank you. When questioned about the development of these guidelines, it was quite clearly put to me by the departmental officer that they are currently under development and that the industry has been invited to make submissions in relation to these guidelines. When I asked whether the community would be consulted in relation to these guidelines, the departmental officer said that that had not been proposed at this stage. My other challenge to the Deputy Premier is to absolutely fully consult with the community in relation to the development of the guidelines before they get enacted.

The committee's recommendations in relation to the amendments to the Environmental Protection Act request the Deputy Premier to make amendments to fix a hopelessly one-sided and ill-conceived piece of legislation. Recommendation No. 10 from the committee is also welcome by the opposition and draws on the AgForce submission to recommend that temporary emissions licence fees be structured to be an incentive for mining companies to prevent the build-up of floodwater in the mine. Unfortunately, despite its best efforts the committee's recommendations just do not go far enough.

Recommendation No. 9 of the committee report is for the minister to ensure that a robust consultation process is held with all relevant stakeholders in the development of guidelines to support decision making around temporary emissions licences. As I have said earlier, while consultation is necessary, it makes no sense to consider this legislation in isolation from the guidelines that will determine the key elements of its implementation.

In relation to the 24-hour licence provisions, which I have spoken of briefly, I will now go into them in a bit more detail. Obviously, this provision is of particular significance. This committee has ignored concerns in relation to a mandatory 24-hour time period being imposed for the issuing of temporary emission licences.

The issue was raised by the Queensland Conservation Council, the Capricorn Conservation Council, the Fitzroy Basin Association, AgForce Queensland, the Environmental Defenders Office and the Coast and Country Association of Queensland. AgForce Queensland in its submission stated—

A 24-hour period would appear to be too short to robustly undertake the considerations required.

Or, as the Queensland Conservation Council put it in its submission—

As the proposed 24-hour turn around to decide applications will not enable full and detailed assessment of the decision-making criteria, there is a very high-risk and likelihood that a wide range of 'unforeseen' adverse social, economic as well as environmental impacts will occur as a result.

The Local Government Association of Queensland also described it as a stretch to guarantee the safety of urban water supplies through a 24-hour assessment process. As I have said earlier, Ms Leanne Bowie from the Queensland Resources Council revealed that the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, in their select consultations with them, advised that they could not assess the cumulative impact of multiple TELs. This is quite clearly unsatisfactory. It is quite clearly unsafe and it is quite clearly wrong. It is legislation that allows for actions to be taken that have the potential to cause significant public health issues, environmental damage and economic damage to other industries without the knowledge of what these impacts are.

The opposition supports changes to environmental licences to deliver what the Floods Commission of Inquiry has actually recommended. These recommendations are restricted to flooding events and the period immediately before, during or after an event, not to facilitate a dirty, dodgy deal with the resources industry of a series of trade-offs in exchange for royalty increases.

It is not only mining companies that the Deputy Premier will listen to, he also listens to financially powerful property developers and that is why I think that this bill is more appropriately titled the 'Russ Hinze Bill'. Instead of a statutory authority presiding over big planning and development projects in this state and what this state will prioritise in terms of industry development, what we now have is the Deputy Premier presiding over it—or the new Russ Hinze.

Mr SEENEY: I find those comments offensive. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member will withdraw.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. This bill abolishes the Urban Land Development Authority, the ULDA, and replaces it with a corporation sole called the Minister for Economic Development Queensland. We have seen the Deputy Premier travelling to Moranbah and around the state promoting the work of the ULDA—championing it actually—work that was commenced under the previous Labor government, and now he wants to abolish it. This bill removes urban development areas and replaces them with priority development areas. The definition for where these priority development areas can be declared is much broader than for urban development areas. The definition is set out in the main purpose of the act at clause 3: to promote or coordinate activities to facilitate economic development for community purposes. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition set out in his statement of reservation to the committee, it is not just the opposition raising issues with this very broad definition. It is a broad definition which expands the scope for the government to remove community appeal rights under the Sustainable Planning Act against a developer. Greg Hoffman, Executive Director of the Local Government Association of Queensland, advised the committee—

I believe as a result of the presentation by the department's representatives, an apparent intention—that developments currently assessed under the Sustainable Planning Act will be effectively called in under the economic development act. So the ULDA has been reconstituted with a broader remit seemingly at odds with the government's empowering Queensland local government policy.

The Council of Mayors South-East Queensland also raised a similar concern, stating that—

The Economic Development Bill expands the scope of the ULDA Act and the Industrial Development Act that it replaces. It would appear that the ULDA has been reconstituted with a broader mandate inconsistent with the government's 'Empowering Queensland Local Government Policy'.

There are no specific definitions of 'economic development' and 'development for community purposes' meaning they may be interpreted broadly in line with their ordinary meaning. As a result there is the possibility that developments currently assessed under the Sustainable Planning Act will be 'called in' under the Economic Development Act.

The committee's recommendations do not respond to this issue of the act having such a broad application. The Premier in March last year called the ULDA's powers, which are far less broad than the powers for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland 'the sort of intrusion into local democracy that is unnecessary and unneeded in Queensland'. Further, the Premier committed that, 'If elected Premier, we will curtail this organisation that is unaccountable and unelected.' In May this year the Premier told us these changes were about 'empowering local governments to make local planning decisions.'

It seems that local government actually has a different perspective. Instead, what this government has done is create an even more powerful unelected corporation sole with a broader scope to overrule local decision making. The Minister for Economic Development Queensland will be able to consider a relevant local government planning instrument and propose a development that is not consistent with it. While the same could happen under the Urban Land Development Authority, the situations where this could occur were far more limited and focused to providing adequate housing supply and sustainable development. The government insists that this will empower local governments as the bill will require consultation with the local government prior to the declaration of a priority development area. However, the bill has no requirement for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to actually consider this consultation in making a decision.

It is worth noting here that section 11 of the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 requires the minister to both consult with local government and consider that consultation in making a decision about a revocation or reduction of an urban development area. The Economic Development Bill 2012 also includes powers for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to acquire land. These powers were not available under the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 for urban development areas. The justification provided for the broad purpose of the bill and these broad powers is that it is in order to ensure that economic development in Queensland grows. I will let my colleague, the Manager for Opposition Business, address that furphy, but let me just say that Labor never presided over an unemployment level as high as it is today. The Labor government presided over unprecedented investment in the resources industry and in construction and infrastructure.

There is no justification provided by this government for broadening the scope for the removal of local community appeal rights or explanation of how this will increase gross state product or assist to set new records of infrastructure investment. In fact, we have seen this afternoon a former LNP member and major investor in Queensland actually provide some analysis in relation to this bill that it will be counterproductive to industry investing in Queensland. It is blatantly clear from the submissions received by the committee that for all the Deputy Premier's bluster, rhetoric and platitudes about empowering local government, it was not properly consulted in relation to this bill. If proper consultation had occurred, the committee would not have had to make recommendation 2 that further consultation is to occur with local government on priority development areas. If proper consultation had occurred then the committee would not have had to recommend that it be a requirement that local government representatives be put on the Minister for Economic Development Queensland committee.

If proper consultation had occurred, the committee would not have had to make recommendation 4, to make amendments to ensure that local governments are appropriately safeguarded against infrastructure costs in priority development areas. All this comes after the Deputy Premier told us earlier this month that this bill was just a matter of process. The Deputy Premier has been caught out trying to hoodwink the parliament into accepting legislation—

Mr SEENEY: I rise on a point of order. I find those comments offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! I ask the member to withdraw those statements.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. The Deputy Premier has been caught out trying to sell this bill as a process bill when, in fact, it has very little to do with process and much to do with policy. The opposition will not support the changes in this legislation that provide a broad scope to the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, as a corporation sole, to remove the rights of local communities to oppose or have conditions imposed on development through the Sustainable Planning Act. That broad scope is consistent with our position presented on the Local Government and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

This is the second strike in this government's agenda to serve the white shoe brigade. Only two weeks ago we saw this government make changes to the Planning and Environment Court. Despite making some last-minute amendments to make those changes less outrageous, most of the community was supportive of maintaining the existing system that allowed community groups to challenge developers without fear of being financially persecuted. It gave freedom to community organisations and enabled neighbours and residents to challenge in the Planning and Environment Court rampant and unsuitable development in their neighbourhoods. Now that freedom has been taken away from them by the LNP government. The government members came into this chamber and lectured the opposition about how we did not understand their amendments and they said that they had listened. We have listened to the community; it is the government that has not listened to the community. Quite clearly, the government members have not been listening.

The President of the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland, Simon Baltais, said that the government's amendments in consideration in detail would complicate a system that was working well. Before government members all start interjecting with green conspiracy theories, as is their wont, it is also the broader community that is raising these issues. In the *Noosa News*, Johanne Wright said that the government had ignored her advice to the committee that any tinkering could result in an unintended consequence. She further stated—

The changes will keep lawyers in business trying to interpret all the clauses and cost far more than the previous perfectly good system—what a disaster.

Ms Wright also said that the government did not appreciate the level of community concern. That is what we tried to warn the government about two weeks ago and we give the same warnings here today. I make this point because the government will use the same low-rent tactics of lecturing us on their amendments and accusing us of smearing them, for merely providing a voice for the community and not just for the wealthy property developers or mining companies.

I would like to discuss other parts of the bill that are of concern not only to the opposition but also to the community at large. One of those concerns has also been raised by the committee. Recommendation 7 of the committee report is the removal of clause 292 of the bill, which removes the requirement for the Coordinator-General to provide public notice that an EIS is required for a coordinated project and to invite submissions on draft terms of reference for an EIS. The opposition strongly supports this recommendation from the committee. It is important that the community be afforded the opportunity to engage early in the process through making submissions on draft terms of reference.

Another concern mentioned in the committee report is that the matters to be considered by the Coordinator-General in assessing whether to declare a coordinated project have been shortened. While the committee report rightly states that section 27 requirements under the State Development and Public Works Act 1971 are not all mandatory, it still appears that this legislation removes the following from being subject to consideration before declaring a coordinated project: the project's potential effect on relevant infrastructure; employment opportunities that will be provided by the project; the level of investment necessary for the proponent to carry out the project; and the strategic significance of the project to the locality, region or state.

While we recognise that the committee has made a genuine effort to ameliorate the worst aspects of this bill, we cannot support it in its current form and with such limited, insufficient and meaningless consultation. If the government were genuine about moving amendments, firstly it would go out and consult on them independently and then go back to the committee for proper consultation and consideration. As the committee report states at page 4—

> In the time allowed by the House, the committee has not been able to give adequate consideration to many of the very detailed issues raised in submissions—although it has attempted to convey those issues for the benefit of the House. Nor has it been able to undertake its own research into these matters.

Those details ought more properly to have been sought out, conveyed to and considered by the government during the development of this bill. And the Deputy Premier told us that this was just a process bill. Don't you worry about that!

The opposition cannot support elements of what is rushed and poorly conceived legislation that has been drafted with woefully inadequate consultation and that is targeted at two sets of interests, those of powerful mining companies and wealthy developers, to the detriment of the rest of the community. The Deputy Premier commented earlier that the community supported this bill. I challenge the Deputy Premier to go to the communities that will be affected by this legislation and hold community meetings, not closed room meetings with three, four or eight people.

Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (8.46 pm): We have just seen a real case of head-in-the-sand disease. There is no doubt in my mind that the member for South Brisbane is purely pandering to her green tree mates, which is what led the last government into the actions that put this state in such a desperate financial position. It did not look at the economic benefit of any particular issue to the state; it just pandered to wild green attitudes.

This bill is part of a suite of changes designed to get Queensland back on track and working again. This bill will help untangle and dismantle unnecessary Labor red tape, improve government efficiency and help the government to make better and more timely decisions in matters of high importance. The bill will achieve legislative cohesion. It will streamline the relationship and functions of local government and other organisations so that we will be like rowers all pulling in the same direction. That is something that the Labor Party does not quite understand. In that way, we will achieve a better economic performance and outcome for all Queenslanders.

To extend the rowing analogy further, I could say that this LNP bill will be the 'awesome foursome' of legislation. It is a far cry from the lay-down-Sally attitude of the previous Labor government administration, where inefficient red tape held back the Queensland economy. Firstly, this bill will deliver efficiency by integrating and improving the key provisions of the Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Development Authority Act 2007. Under the new Economic Development Act 2012, particular developments will be fast-tracked to meet the priorities for economic and community development, delivering benefits to more Queenslanders in a shorter time frame. The Economic Development Act will also set in place clear transparency with the establishment of a Minister for Economic Development Queensland and improved governance arrangements for the act to include a board of up to six members.

Furthermore, the establishment of the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority will streamline government involvement with regard to creating infrastructure for the Commonwealth Games in 2018. That is something very close to my heart because, as we all know, the Commonwealth Games

will be held on the Gold Coast in 2018. In short, this new government structure is a better use of resources which allows the government to get better game bang for its buck. It will deliver better planning, development and production of critical Commonwealth Games infrastructure like the games village and other venues. Not only that, but because of the streamlining and collaboration the government will be better placed to create infrastructure which will deliver a lasting economic, social and cultural legacy from which the Gold Coast can leverage well after the athletes have gone home.

There are other components to the bill, including the amendments to the South Bank Corporation Act 1989. In line with finding efficiencies and streamlining the functions of government, the bill amends the South Bank Corporation Act to transition the statutory planning powers of the South Bank Corporation to the Brisbane City Council in accordance with the Newman government's election commitment. This transfer back to the Brisbane City Council empowers Australia's new world city to better meet the needs of the second half of the 21st century.

In addition, the Economic Development Bill also amends the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 to clarify and streamline the powers of the Coordinator-General. Importantly, these amendments will deliver a more robust criteria for deciding which projects should be undertaken by the Coordinator-General and the streamlining of environmental impact processes, to name just two examples.

This bill will also make changes to the title of such things as 'projects of state significance' and 'infrastructure facilities of significance' to prevent those proponents from using these declarations to wrongly indicate that they have some level of state support when those declarations may not be in fact accurate. The bill also recognises the impact of the 2011 floods and takes important and timely steps to implement the recommendations set out in the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry.

This bill acknowledges the important work of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority in rebuilding vital community infrastructure. The bill will ensure that the tenure of the authority is extended by lengthening the expiry date of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011 to 30 June 2014. The authority will then cease in line with the government's previous commitment.

The bill also amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Disaster Management Act 2003 to implement specific recommendations of the report of the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry. These amendments provide the issue of temporary emissions licences to allow for temporary discharges as part of the response to an emergency event. This bill helps the mines mitigate risk through provisions made for emergency releases in times of flood.

The implementation of this bill is timely with Queensland now entering its wettest part of the year and the increased potential for flood events. The amendments to this bill create a fair balance between economic and environmental imperatives by allowing more flexible decision making in times of extreme flood events like those seen in early 2011. Should a flood event like 2011 occur again, this bill will mean $2 billion could be kept in the Queensland economy through the granting of temporary emissions licences instead of lost production. I stress that the government will take the issuing of these permits extremely seriously. Each application will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. In the case of mine water releases, these would be assessed against the mine's ability to meet strict environmental and water-quality standards and demonstrated levels of dilution.

The committee—and I chaired the public meetings—made 20 recommendations. We have already heard from the Deputy Premier tonight that he has accepted the vast majority of those recommendations. I would just like to speak to a couple of those.

We did hear from interested parties, in particular local governments, about having an additional briefing from the department with regard to priority development areas. They were also concerned that the MEDQ could appoint a local government representative, they were concerned who that representative might be and they were concerned whether local councils then had the authority to delegate that responsibility to somebody else within their organisation. Had the member for South Brisbane bothered to read the amendments that the Deputy Premier is proposing to move she would know that those recommendations have been accepted. The Deputy Premier will be moving amendments to that effect.

There was quite a bit of concern raised by proponents that, where they may have already entered into an environmental impact study, the new legislation might prevent them from moving forward with that study because the legislation actually requires that they start the environmental impact statement under the provisions of this legislation. The committee recommended that the minister have a look to see whether it was appropriate if somebody had already proceeded through the majority of an environmental impact study that they be allowed to have that as their starting point under this legislation. I am glad to see that the Deputy Premier has accepted that recommendation and an amendment will be moved in that regard.

The member for South Brisbane raised the issue of advertising under the provisions of the Economic Development Bill 2012 and the fact that the Coordinator-General was not required to advertise anymore. We have already heard from the Leader of Government Business and the Premier

on numerous occasions that the government is moving forward with an e-data system. I would suggest to the member for South Brisbane that all of this information will be available on the internet. It will only take someone to have a look at that and keep an eye on that. I am sure they can subscribe to get notification.

We all know that our newspaper circulations are dwindling and that it is no longer appropriate for these sorts of advertisements to be placed in newspapers. I would suggest to the member for South Brisbane that she is living in the past. It is time to come into the future. The future is emails. The future is e-data. That is what this government is proposing.

A government member interjected.

Mr HART: Yes. I am not sure whether they are on the NBN or not, but she can talk to her mates about that.

The member raised the issue of the term 'emerging conditions'. Again, had she bothered to read the amendments that are proposed to be moved by the Deputy Premier—and I think he covered this quite well in his speech—she would be aware that the government is changing the wording so it reads 'emergency and applicable event'. I think that fixes all of the issues that the member for South Brisbane raised. It is really only a matter of reading the amendments to get on top of exactly what it is that we are talking about here.

The member for South Brisbane attended our public meeting on 9 November. She quite clearly asked questions that she thought were applicable—very green questions. One of those was directed at the QRC and related to the notice they had of this bill and how long they had had the bill. Then she stood in this place and told us that the QRC were the only people who were in fact notified in advance. I can tell members from firsthand experience that they were the only ones that she asked that question of. That is why she got that answer. The record of the meeting will show that they were the only ones that brought that up because they were the only ones she asked that question of.

I think the member for South Brisbane also raised the implication that this government was looking at individuals and their economic circumstances with regard to our temporary emissions licence proposal. The committee did consider all of this. Broadly speaking, we would like to see the total impact on Queensland taken into account when any of these sorts of things are considered. The Deputy Premier again has considered that and will be moving amendments to make sure that the bill does not refer to any individual but refers to the whole of the state and to any economic impact that that might have on the whole of the state.

I will just raise one last point because I have been talking for quite a while. The member for South Brisbane mentioned the 24-hour period. It was discussed quite heavily in the committee and at our public meetings. We really need to think about what happened in 2011 and the flood event that we had, the amount of water that fell from the sky and the way that changed things. Over a 24-hour period things can change pretty dramatically. I suggest to the member for South Brisbane that it is no good sitting on our hands for 24 hours and just waiting to see what happens. If we do that, we could all end up underwater. Under the previous Labor government, this state very nearly ended up underwater, both financially and in every other fashion.

I thank the members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee and our staff—Kathy Munro, Bernice, Margaret, Mary and Rhia—for their input, and I thank the people who came along on the 9th and gave us very valuable evidence. I think the committee deliberated over a lot of those things. It is a bit of a shame that the Labor Party did not have a bit more input into our recommendations. Had they been there when we made those recommendations perhaps they might not have put in the dissenting report, which really does not make a great deal of sense.

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (9.01 pm): I, too, rise to support the Economic Development Bill 2012—

Mr Bleijie: And correct the rubbish that came out of the member for South Brisbane.

Mr POWELL: And correct the rubbish that came out of the mouth of the member for South Brisbane for starters.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find that remark personally offensive and I ask the minister to withdraw it, please.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! I ask the member to withdraw the comment.

Mr POWELL: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. This evening I would particularly like to focus on those amendments which are being made to the legislation in my portfolio. The amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994, which are made by chapter 8, part 2 of this bill, are necessary to implement recommendations of the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry about licensing discharge of mine water and emergency powers. But I will come back to that in a moment.

At this point, I wish to correct a number of blatant mistruths and perhaps some more genuine misunderstandings and issues raised not only by the member for South Brisbane but by a number of other interest groups and certainly by the media in recent times. All we have heard from Labor in particular on this is more of the same old scare tactics and sensational headlines as they desperately

fight for relevance. It is fast becoming apparent that the member for South Brisbane wants to become the self-appointed Queensland chief conspiracy theorist. The next thing we know is she will be walking in here declaring that man never walked on the moon and that Elvis is still alive.

Mr Bleijie: Elvis is sitting in front of you!

Mr POWELL: My goodness, I take that back. Perhaps the member for Kawana, the Attorney-General, is up there also with the member for South Brisbane as Queensland's chief conspiracy theorist.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find the association with the member for Kawana offensive.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I, too, find the association with the member for South Brisbane offensive. I ask the honourable minister to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, members. Can we just make sure that points of order are genuine points of order. It is a little light-hearted. It is probably good to have a little light-heartedness, but I am very concerned that the minister has the call and has the opportunity to be heard. I call the minister.

Mr POWELL: For the safety and health and wellbeing of the Attorney-General, I withdraw. But I do want to be clear: the member for South Brisbane has gone out there seeking a conspiracy and has now made an attempt to manufacture one out of nothing. Let me be clear: the Queensland Resources Council has been approaching the previous government trying to address water in mines. They made a lengthy submission last year to the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry regarding water in mines. They spoke to me as the shadow minister for environment late last year regarding water in mines. They made an election statement asking both parties to address water in mines. And in the first meeting that I had with Michael Roche from the QRC in April this year they raised the matter of water in mines.

But let me be clear: what we are talking about tonight does not deliver what the member for South Brisbane has somehow manufactured in her brain. What we are talking about tonight is this government taking the necessary steps to reduce the risk of a major environmental incident in the event of another flood. Members in the House will well remember Ensham. Why did that occur? Because those on the other side put their head in the sand and failed to do anything. What did the Floods Commission of Inquiry do? It has asked us to bring forward legislation that meets the requirements to ensure that something like that does not happen again. But perhaps that is a little too simple. So let me be very clear about what actually does occur through these amendments this evening.

There are three very different tools in the Environmental Protection Act. Firstly, there are the emergency powers which permit an authorised person—in other words, an officer of my department—to take action or to issue an emergency direction which requires another person to take action. This is in response to a recommendation by the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry—the very same Floods Commission of Inquiry that the former member for South Brisbane, the former Premier, said that she supported 'lock, stock and barrel'. So my question to the member for South Brisbane, my question to those opposite, is: if you do not support these emergency powers, if you do not support the provisions in this bill, how then would you have delivered the recommendations of the Floods Commission of Inquiry 'lock, stock and barrel'?

These emergency directions are very limited—very limited—and can only be issued where serious or material environmental harm is threatened or where human health or safety is threatened and urgent action is needed. These powers can only be used in a true emergency situation. For the members representing the Fitzroy Basin, for the member for Rockhampton, let me repeat that again: these powers can only be used in a true emergency situation. As a result, the government did not support the committee's recommendation that the legislation require that the emergency direction must be confirmed in writing within an hour because it would risk diverting the skills of authorised officers away from essential response activities.

The confirmation of the direction is an issue that is best left to business rules and administrative processes which can build in the type of flexibility needed for an emergency tool. The committee also recommended that the legislation be changed so that only senior officers could direct the release of contaminants into the environment during an emergency. Again, this is an issue which is best addressed by business rules. Limiting the authorisation to only senior officers has the potential to restrict the ability of the officer who is on the spot.

The second tool, which has been confused with the emergency direction, is the new tool—the temporary emissions licence. This licence is not a direction by the department. Instead, the operator must make an application in writing—I want the member for South Brisbane to hear that again: in writing—and the authorised person must make a decision on set decision criteria. Written notice of the decision is then provided by either issuing the temporary emissions licence complete with conditions or giving notice of refusal. As part of an application for a temporary emissions licence, proponents would be required to provide information on any increased risks arising from additional discharges and the proposed monitoring and mitigation strategies to offset these risks.

While the decision criteria are limited, we are not walking away from our role as a strong environmental regulator. The criteria still include essential considerations such as the likelihood that the release will adversely impact the health, safety or wellbeing of another person and the likelihood of environmental harm being caused by the release.

In addition, to balance the quick decision time frame, the licence is fully flexible. It can be immediately amended, cancelled or suspended without receiving and considering submissions from the operator if, for example, downstream drinking water is adversely affected by the release. The tool is also designed to be in effect for only a short period of time, possibly as little as hours and for no longer than months. We are preparing guidance material and that material will be available on the department's website so that the department's decision can be anticipated by operators, concerned landholders and the community.

The third tool that we use in the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection around these matters is the transitional environmental program, which was used to authorise the release of water from mines during the recent flood emergencies. The Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry identified a number of concerns about the use of this tool for the emergency response. That is why we are introducing in this legislation the temporary emissions licence. This tool would not be used—that is, the TEP—for the immediate response to an emergency situation but is about the ongoing management of a site such as upgrading on-site water management infrastructure to ensure that the site is flood ready.

The legislative framework for the use of transitional environmental programs has not been watered down. It is as robust as ever. The other issue raised by the media is whether the water still in the mines as a legacy of the 2010-11 floods would be released under the new temporary emissions licence.

Mr Newman: Who did that pun? Is that deliberate?

Mr POWELL: The Premier would be very pleased to note that the short answer is no.

Mr Newman: It is no that it was a pun?

Mr POWELL: It is 'no'. The legislation was not introduced retrospectively and there is no intention to use the temporary emissions licence to allow mines to release legacy water held from previous floods. As the Deputy Premier and I have said in this House on a number of occasions, unlike those opposite who put their head in the sand and refuse to do anything, we are looking for a permanent solution to deal with mine water issues on an ongoing basis. We are committed to developing a rigorous, science based management system for salinity management that will sustain continued economic development while ensuring water quality. I give my commitment to the member for Rockhampton that his constituents in Rockhampton city will not notice any difference as a result of those discussions.

Let me also be clear that the discussions we had, despite the member for South Brisbane saying that there was no consultation with the Fitzroy Water Quality Advisory Group, meant that we got support from a range of stakeholders including landholders and the Conservation Council.

The amendments to the Environmental Protection Act are sensible changes which will permit realistic decisions to be made in response to an emergency. It is worth noting that, despite what the member for South Brisbane has said, this draft bill has been shared far more broadly than simply the QRC. It has gone to a range of groups including the Queensland Farmers Federation and the Waste Contractors and Recyclers Association. We have consulted broadly and we are delivering an outcome for Queensland.

Mr YOUNG (Keppel—LNP) (9.13 pm): I wish to thank the honourable minister for that clarification. I rise to speak in support of the Economic Development Bill 2012. As an election commitment, the Newman government is committed to the economic development of Queensland. This bill amends legislation administered under the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning portfolio. The bill establishes an economic development act and the role of the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to facilitate economic development for community purposes in Queensland and ensure priorities can be responded to in a timely manner.

The MEDQ will have a board of up to six members and be called the Economic Development Board and have powers to deal commercially in land, property and infrastructure. The board, chaired by the director-general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, will also have the flexibility to appoint local representative committees on a case-by-case basis, allowing a mechanism for local government engagement in planning and development assessment activities to the Minister for Economic Development Queensland. The bill also allows the minister to sell surplus land at market value and to facilitate the grant of an appropriate lease under the Land Act 1994 for an undertaking that supports economic development for community purposes, and I do stress 'community purposes'.

To achieve this act, the bill will repeal the Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 and integrate the powers and functions of the existing Minister for Industrial Development Queensland and the Urban Land Development Authority into one act. The bill also amends the South Bank Corporation Act 1989, with objectives to commence the process for the transfer of planning powers of the South Bank Corporation to the Brisbane City Council. Other objectives are to streamline the make-up of the South Bank Corporation Board, enable the South Bank Corporation to transfer a freehold interest of land and ensure there is no impediment to South Bank Corporation's entry into a lease of the parklands to the Brisbane City Council.

Other important amendments required to clarify and improve the powers of the Coordinator-General are to fast-track projects, streamline assessment and prevent proponents from misusing the intent of the Coordinator-General's statutory powers to promote their individual projects, diverting limited government resources and causing confusion to landholders and industry. This can be achieved by amending the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

The bill will also amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 by inserting provisions which allow holders of environmental approval to apply for a temporary emissions licence in response to an emergent event. This is a recommendation identified in the final report of the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry. The proposed temporary emissions licence will enable quick decisions to be made, and in the case of mine water discharges the main benefit is to take maximum advantage of passing flows to reduce the risk of damage to downstream habitat. Strict water quality management parameters will be met.

Another important recommendation from the Floods Commission of Inquiry is to amend the Disaster Management Act 2003 to enable the appointment of an officer of Emergency Management Queensland to coordinate State Emergency Service operations in extraordinary services. This will assist the cooperative approach between state and local governments, recognising that local disaster management is the cornerstone of disaster response. Whilst on the subject of disaster management, this bill will acknowledge the work of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority in rebuilding vital Queensland infrastructure by extending the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011 to 30 June 2014.

I wish to thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee, its chair, Ted Malone, and the research officers for their work and comment on this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr HOLSWICH (Pine Rivers—LNP) (9.17 pm): I rise to offer a contribution to the debate on the Economic Development Bill 2012. I would like to start my contribution by commending the Deputy Premier for introducing this bill. The reason I commend the Deputy Premier is that what is contained within this bill epitomises the Newman government and sets it apart from other recent Queensland governments. The things that set this government apart from previous governments in this place in recent years is two things: common-sense decisions that have been brought forward in legislation and an ability to tackle the hard issues—hard issues that previous governments did not have the intestinal fortitude to tackle. It is apparent that they still want to have their head in the sand even whilst in opposition.

In my short contribution today I want to touch on one particular aspect of this bill, because it was an important issue and possibly one of the most contentious in this bill and I think it highlights significantly the differences between the opposition and the Newman government. I talk particularly of the issue of temporary emissions licences, TELs. This bill looks to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to allow a TEL to be granted in emergency situations, allowing for the release of water from mines during an emergency event in a way that balances environmental outcomes and economic considerations. I would surmise from the member for South Brisbane's contribution tonight that balancing these different priorities—environmental outcomes and economic considerations—is not something that is particularly high on the priority list for the opposition. It seems to be interested in green extremism at the expense of all else.

This particular issue of legacy water in mines and water in mines from flood events was put in the too-hard basket by the former Labor government for way too long. Their plan, it would seem, was to have no plan, to let the water just sit in mines and not do anything with it because they could not bring themselves to make a decision. Leadership requires the ability to make tough decisions, and that was simply something the former government could not bring itself to do. So, as a result, we see mines across Queensland today that are still having to deal with the ongoing aftermath of the 2010-11 floods. Whilst I acknowledge that this bill does not address those legacy issues, it does assure that in future flood events there will be a clearly defined plan and process to be followed to ensure mine water can be released in the safest possible manner.

On issues of balancing environmental and economic considerations, it is interesting to note that opposition members seemed to assert during the committee deliberations that economic considerations of mining companies or the broader economy should not be a huge consideration in these decisions and that environmental considerations should trump all else. I would suggest that that attitude is one of the

reasons they left our state in the debt and deficit mess that our government inherited from them earlier this year. The former government, as has been evidenced many times over, was one that was captive not to those with genuine environmental concerns but to the extreme green fringe. I have no problems with those who have concerns about the environment—I share those concerns myself—but when you pander to the extreme green fringe then you are entering dangerous waters.

When you look at the economic impact of the 2010-11 floods on Queensland you see there was a loss of $5.7 billion in gross state product for the year ending June 2011 and a significant reduction in mining royalties for the state government. What it showed is that, when you put extreme green views ahead of all else, when you fail to take legitimate and economic considerations into account and when you fail to make decisions at all, you put the state's economy in a precarious position, and we cannot afford to do that. The Floods Commission of Inquiry recommended that action be taken on these issues, and the Newman government is pleased to be acting on those recommendations.

It appeared from the member for South Brisbane's speech tonight that she and her speechwriter must not have read many of the amendments because a number of the issues that she mentioned were actually covered in the recommendations, and I thank the minister for the environment for pointing out a few of those things tonight. She seemed to be full of conspiracy theories and full of condemnation, but do you know what the member for South Brisbane was not full of? She was not full of answers, she was not full of amendments and she was not full of constructive input. It was green extremism at the expense of all else.

If my memory serves me correctly, when we sat in this chamber for the public hearings, one of the environmental groups tabled a submission to the committee—as they had not had time to submit that beforehand—but from what I saw the member for South Brisbane already had a copy of that submission. The member for South Brisbane wants to stand in this place and suggest that we are beholden to particular interests, but I would suggest that there is extremism happening that she is not willing to acknowledge.

I would like to thank the Deputy Premier for accepting many of the recommendations of the committee and particularly for taking on board recommendation 14, which is one I want to point out briefly. It changes the word 'emergent' to 'applicable'. Whilst it might seem like a very minor change, this change will hopefully eliminate any confusion that is caused by the use of terms 'emergent' and 'emergency' in different parts of the bill.

I realise that I have not touched on much of this bill tonight, and it is quite a diverse bill. I want to pay tribute to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee and the committee secretariat for the work that went into the committee stage of this bill. Whilst it might have been a tight time frame that the committee was working within, we still received 22 written submissions and had very positive and productive public briefings and hearings. I believe we have provided a strong set of recommendations for consideration, and again I think this is shown by the fact that many of these recommendations have been taken on board.

I particularly want to place on record my thanks to our outgoing committee chair, the member for Mirani. As a newcomer to this place this year, I have been consistently impressed by the leadership of the member for Mirani and the way he has guided the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee. Whilst he will be missed from our committee, our loss is a huge gain for Queensland's emergency volunteers, and I wish him well in his new role as assistant minister.

As I said at the outset, this is an important bill for Queensland. It is about getting our state back on track. It is about building a better Queensland. I am pleased to be part of a government that is actually putting up answers and not burying its head in the sand. I am pleased to commend the bill to the House.

Ms MILLARD (Sandgate—LNP) (9.25 pm): I rise today to thank our Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning for commending to us the Economic Development Bill. I also acknowledge the committee chair, committee members and the secretariat. Not only do I support this bill but I also wholeheartedly support the resulting creation of Economic Development Queensland to assume single-entity status under the jurisdiction of the newly termed Minister for Economic Development Queensland, or MEDQ. Not only will the MEDQ have the ability to deal commercially in land, property and infrastructure to encourage economic and community development simultaneously but I note it will take over the planning and development functions of the Urban Land Development Authority in order to achieve a more comprehensive approach to development in our state. Importantly, provisions of the bill will be activated in circumstances of market failure, complexity or where local government or industry requests assistance.

The new MEDQ will establish local representative committees as appropriate and where local government clearly has a role in planning and development processes. While the ULDA must be commended for the impressive work it has achieved—for example, in areas of my electorate such as Fitzgibbon Chase—this streamlining of functions, fully utilising councils' development expertise where called for, does make perfect sense.

Local representative committees will work with the MEDQ within priority development areas within a streamlined framework, where this clearly enhances development potential. The identification of priority development areas, or PDAs, will bring development to the market quickly where there are minimal adverse impacts on the local community and consistent with the local government's planning scheme for an area. This creates efficiency, utilises resources and eliminates waste—and that is what the LNP is about.

I commend also the fact that the bill will implement specific recommendations from the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry report. I note the term 'emergency' will now be better defined and, with the allowance for temporary emissions discharges in response to emergencies, we will be better equipped to handle a future tragedy even as significant as the Queensland floods. The Economic Development Bill also seeks to clarify and streamline chains of command and management in emergency response. Whilst I would sincerely like to think that such events would never be repeated, nature cannot be controlled. What we can control is our responses and the way in which we learn from our mistakes. I am confident this bill demonstrates the government's responsive and willingness to learn from past mistakes.

Some of the other areas that this bill incorporates are as follows. It establishes the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority. It amends the South Bank Corporation Act 1989. It clarifies and streamlines the powers of the Coordinator-General. It recognises the work of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority and so much more.

I support the Economic Development Bill in its objectives of taking a strategic and streamlined approach to economic development in Queensland. Economic development in this context is not presented as a stand-alone phenomenon driven by numbers with the goal of benefiting a mere subsection of Queensland's population. More importantly, it takes a comprehensive approach to equipping us for a four-pillar economy, where building structures go hand in hand with building communities. The Economic Development Bill, if enacted, is a successful illustration of government coordination and local community development at all levels through strategic targeting. No longer will development happen in silos with narrow benefits. This bill paves the way for all Queenslanders to reap the benefits. I support the bill.

Mr BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (9.29 pm): The Economic Development Bill was introduced into the parliament by the Deputy Premier as essentially a procedural bill. Unfortunately, and despite assurances, elements of the bill have raised serious concerns with me as the member for Rockhampton. I am particularly focused on the provisions of the bill dealing with mining company wastewater discharges into the Fitzroy Basin. Government ministers have repeatedly couched this element of the bill as a response to the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry final report. I contend that the bill goes well beyond any of the recommendations provided by the inquiry. The State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee reflected on these concerns within its report. It stated—

> The very limited consultation in the development of this Bill has given rise to the large number of issues, both significant policy issues and technical issues ...

The committee also said—

> In the time allowed by the House, the committee has not been able to give adequate consideration to many of the very detailed issues raised in submissions ...

In light of the committee's comments I cannot reconcile the notion that this is a procedural bill. I doubt that any member of the committee, if asked freely and honestly, would actually believe that, given the substance of their report, this is a procedural bill. To go out and provide draft legislation to the Queensland Resources Council for feedback and input but not to the likes of Rockhampton Regional Council nor apparently AgForce, the Farmers Federation or the Capricorn Conservation Council, to name but a few, is a disgrace. I have heard this evening that the minister had circulated a consultation plan prior to the presentation of this bill. If so, I invite him to table it this evening along with the names of the people he consulted prior to the bill being introduced into this House. I would like to know who has been consulted on this bill prior to its tabling in the House. So take that one away!

People should be rightly worried about the way this government has gone about this and about the consultation process in general, particularly in light of what the committee has said. It is not just me criticising the government; it is also the government's own members of the committee. As the committee report at page 4 sets out, the consideration of a bill by the parliament—being them—should not be seen as being part of the government consultation process. The government's consultation process on this bill has been grossly inadequate. This is where half the problems originate in the first place. This was a committee report dominated by government members. On a number of occasions the government has suggested that no secret deals were done with miners. Again, I ask it to table the consultation program for the bill. This has been asked repeatedly.

The mines minister refused to even answer questions at estimates about this issue or give any details because discharges from mines belong to the environment minister. I find it very hard to believe—and nobody living in the real world would consider this possible—that this bill and the opinions

underpinning it have not been extensively discussed among the Deputy Premier, the Treasurer, the mines minister and the environment minister. That is common sense and any denial of that is just unbelievable. Despite the denials from all quarters, it was interesting to note that at the public hearing held on this bill comments were made by the Resources Council representative. She said—

Queensland Resources Council did see a draft of those sections of the bill before it went to the Parliament.

She went on to say that there are a couple of issues regarding consultation. You bet there are a few issues with consultation as far as this bill is concerned! Firstly, the evidence clearly demonstrates a detailed and perhaps covert working relationship between this government and the Queensland Resources Council leading up to the introduction of this bill, and that relationship was exclusive and existed prior to the presentation of the budget. By definition this demonstrates who is the key stakeholder for this section of the bill as far as the government is concerned. It certainly was not, and is not, the people who live downstream and who have no choice but to take the water. They should have been the first people to be engaged, not the last as part of some retrofit to cover people's backsides. The Resources Council said that in their view there are a couple of issues with consultation. They stated—

One is that we would have liked to have seen other stakeholders consulted to a greater degree because it would have avoided some of the concern that has occurred afterwards.

Whacko! Even the miners get it. What is the matter with this government? Even vested interests have a greater sense of balance when it comes to dealing with appropriate and rightful stakeholders. I do acknowledge some of the late efforts of the Deputy Premier to engage key regional stakeholders on this broader issue, but this should have been front-end loaded and not given the appearance of being an afterthought.

I must commend the work of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee, particularly the outgoing chair, the member for Mirani, and the new chair, the member for Gympie. Given the evident limitations associated with this piece of legislation and the time frames, the committee has certainly done its very best to provide the considered opinion to this House. However, the committee's report does not address the issue of the mandatory 24-hour time frame for consideration of a request for a temporary emissions licence. Once again, the government has tried to hide behind the Floods Commission of Inquiry report. That report does not say anywhere that it should be a mandatory 24-hour time frame for consideration of temporary emissions licences. What the flood report does say is—

Quick approvals would be required, some in less than 24 hours, to respond to a particular rainfall forecast.

This does not suggest that every approval should occur within the 24 hours, regardless of whether a proper assessment of the impacts on residential water supplies or other downstream users has occurred. The Queensland Resources Council has advised the committee that the cumulative effects on other water users cannot always been assessed within 24 hours. The LGAQ has said that the time frame will be a stretch for consulting with local government to ensure the protection of water supplies. In their submission, the Fitzroy Basin Association also expressed concern about this time frame. They said—

FBA submits that 24 hours is too short a period for the administering authority to properly consider the current environmental conditions and the potential impact that a temporary emissions licence will have, and that once impacts are detected that necessitate a change or cancellation of a TEL, it is already too late for remedial action as the damage has occurred.

The Capricorn Conservation Council said in their submission—

A 24 hour turnaround does not allow the administering authority sufficient time to properly assess an application.

The opposition also shares these widely held concerns. We call on the government to listen to the members of its own committee and stop hiding behind the Floods Commission of Inquiry report. For the Deputy Premier's benefit, I point out that the recommendations do not go beyond an event of a flood and are specific to recommending the relaxation of temporary emissions licences when there are large amounts of water flowing past a mine so great that the contaminated water is diluted to safe levels. It is not about allowing the discharge of contaminated water during periods when there is no flooding occurring. However, the new definition of 'emergent event' as per the amendments seems to set out circumstances that allow this. I imagine it would allow any officer in the department to verbally authorise a temporary emissions licence with no written follow-up, no proper assessment of impacts on nearby water supplies and with the economic impacts of various stakeholders being considered but not those of the downstream users.

In summary, this bill does not represent the implementation of the flood commission's recommendation. It goes further and seeks to advantage a particular stakeholder to the possible detriment of others. This stakeholder was given preferential treatment in terms of the consultation leading up to the introduction of the bill as well as preferential treatment regarding the body of the bill. I oppose certain sections, particularly those relating to the expansion of instances where temporary emissions licences can be issued as the net effect of that has not been proven.

Finally, the problems associated with this issue come down to one thing: a failure to have a thorough consultation plan in the development of the bill. Perhaps if consultation 101 had been approached in a different manner, the government might have got a different result. Ultimately, the government should stop mucking around with getting rid of wastewater and start treating it on site.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (9.38 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Economic Development Bill 2012. The way this government carries on with its endless spin and rhetoric one would think that the economy was in recession. Queensland's economy is currently growing at four per cent, ahead of the nation. The biggest risk to growth in this state is this LNP government. Even the LNP's own budget papers state that their savage cuts will contribute to the economy slowing next financial year to a weaker result than was recorded under Labor last financial year. As I outlined yesterday in this parliament, the Commonwealth Bank economics research team has made an assessment that this government's budget cuts will weigh on the economy over the years to come.

This is just another voice against this government when it comes to management of the economy and in particular this legislation. And there is another voice—the voice of someone who once invested in and believed in this government. Of course, we all know who I am referring to. It is Professor Clive F Palmer. Professor Palmer has indicated today that he will take legal action against this bill. He said—

It means that the Government will have the power to take away State Significance status from projects leaving no right of appeal, making sovereign risk worse than any country in the world.

He went on further to say—

I think Queenslanders need to be very concerned about this legislation and the fact that it is being rushed through so quickly before anybody has a chance to understand it fully.

And the Deputy Premier says that this is just about process. What a laughable statement. Professor Palmer went on further to say—

The Bill is supposed to be about promoting economic development, but because it has not been done properly it only undermines investment and creates uncertainty.

While I do not have access to legal advice that Professor Palmer has to assess this statement in depth, I wholeheartedly agree with his sentiments about the lack of consultation. What the Deputy Premier fails to understand is that if you do not properly consult you will only create legacy issues and uncertainty. Neither of these outcomes is conducive to economic growth. I thought the Deputy Premier would have learned from this mistake the first time, when the submissions to the committee made it blindingly obvious that this is more than a process bill, but he has not. Instead, the Deputy Premier has put forward a series of amendments at the 11th hour with no opportunity for the committee to consider them—amendments that disregard many recommendations from the committee.

There has been no refinement of the scope in this bill for declaring priority development areas. This is a concern raised by the Local Government Association of Queensland and the Council of Mayors (SEQ), who both point out in submissions that it is inconsistent with the LNP's election agenda of re-empowering local government. It is a little like the farce that dashed expectations right across the state when it came to deamalgamation. The LNP promises one thing and delivers another. There are so many councils disappointed with the LNP and what it promised before the election. It is disgraceful.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr PITT: You broke your promise, Deputy Premier. You broke your promise and now you've got to lie—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order!

Mr PITT: You made your bed and now you have to lie in it. You are just going to have to put up with it. These powers will provide a broad scope for the corporation sole, known as the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, to overrule local government planning schemes—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, order.

Mr PITT: The dark horse has fired up—and to remove appeal rights under the Sustainable Planning Act. The Minister for Economic Development Queensland, not to be confused with the portfolio held by the member for Callide, provides powers much broader than for urban development areas under the Urban Land Development Authority Act. The previous government's legislation specifically restricted powers to the development of affordable housing. The previous legislation, as far as I am aware, did not include powers to acquire land that the Minister for Economic Development Queensland has in this bill. These powers go much, much further and there has been no evidence provided—

Mr Seeney: How?

Mr PITT: You have had your go, Deputy Premier. It is my turn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mulgrave, please address your comments through the chair.

Mr PITT: The Deputy Premier has had his turn. He is going to have to sit there and listen to what the opposition has to contribute to this debate.

These powers go much, much further, and there has been no evidence provided of how they will support economic growth. For all the talk of consultation with local government, there is no requirement in this bill for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to consider the outcome of consultation with local government in the decision to declare a priority development area. This is merely saying, 'We will legislate to consult,' but nothing further. The Urban Land Development Authority Act at least, at section 11, required a minister to consult with local government about a revocation or reduction of an urban development area and required that it be considered in making a decision.

Labor left private infrastructure investment in this state at record levels. The Deloitte Access Investment Monitor in March found that there were $102.9 billion in projects underway in Queensland when Labor left office, with another $91.7 billion in the pipeline. Back then we had an unemployment rate of 5.5 per cent and there were 26,600 more jobs in the Queensland economy. The Deputy Premier has provided no evidence that these priority development areas will increase gross state product or set new records of private investment. All we get from the Deputy Premier is more 'don't you worry about that' statements.

I also found it a bit curious that this bill changes the title of 'significant projects' to 'coordinated projects'. The justification provided is that it allows proponents to present their project to investors as more advanced than it actually is. To me this seems a bit incongruous with the Deputy Premier's talk of growing the economy and attracting foreign investment.

The legislation also curiously removes matters for consideration for the Coordinator-General in declaring a coordinated project. These include the potential effect on relevant infrastructure, employment opportunities, the level of investment and strategic significance of the project. This will lead to fewer projects being declared coordinated projects. The department advised—

The intention of the amendment is to ensure that only projects that are regarded as truly significant, are consistent with government policies and plans and are likely to happen are declared.

While I understand the need to support only projects that are viable or likely to proceed, there has not been any evidence of the existing criteria leading to nonmeritorious projects being declared of state significance. There has been no evidence provided to support the removal of these matters of consideration for the Coordinator-General in declaring a coordinated project. Nor has there been any acknowledgement of the committee's recommendation that public notification requirements for draft terms of reference for an EIS are being removed. This removes the ability for stakeholders to engage early in the EIS process.

The criticisms of this bill come from all quarters—from AgForce and the Farmers Federation, from local governments and from environment groups. The concerns raised are genuine and they should be listened to, much like the concerns of some of the government backbenchers in this parliament. To conclude, when the Deputy Premier introduced this legislation he said—

It is very appropriate that this bill not spend a long time before the committee. It is not a bill that requires those types of examinations. It is not a bill that requires the detailed public submissions and detailed opportunities for public input that some of the other bills that are currently before the House do.

What a laughable statement. Not only is the Deputy Premier wrong; he failed to learn his lesson. If the Deputy Premier were genuine about listening to anyone but himself he would refer his amendments back to the committee for proper consultation and consideration. But this Deputy Premier will not listen. He will not listen to his own backbench or the recommendations of the committee, let alone the concerns of Queensland's agricultural industry, local community groups and certainly not the opposition. The opposition will not be supporting this legislation. It strips away community and local government appeal rights. It is ill-considered, has been pushed through with minimal consultation and has the potential to create a perception of sovereign risk.

Mr PUCCI (Logan—LNP) (9.46 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Economic Development Bill 2012. This bill is primarily a process bill that seeks to amend legislation administered in the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning portfolio to assist government to drive economic development in Queensland. At its core is a re-emphasis on supporting, facilitating and fast-tracking economic development in the state by refining and improving existing processes.

This bill will repeal the Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 to establish a single Economic Development Act. By integrating and modernising key provisions of these acts, the bill will enable particular developments to be fast-tracked to meet the government's priorities for economic development and development for community purposes. This bill intends that the activities under the bill will be focused on intervention in circumstances of market failure, complexity or where local government or industry requests assistance.

This bill establishes the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, MEDQ, a corporation sole with the ability to deal commercially in land, property and infrastructure, to encourage economic development and development for community purposes. The bill also establishes the Economic Development Board. Operationally, the work of the board will be carried out by a departmental commercialised business unit called Economic Development Queensland within the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. Both the Economic Development Board and the commercialised business unit Economic Development Queensland will exercise functions of the MEDQ under instruments of delegation. The Economic Development Board has a specific function to ensure the MEDQ adopts best-practice corporate governance and financial management and accountability arrangements. This board and Economic Development Queensland sit within a government department and therefore remain subject to the same scrutiny and constraints of public sector agencies.

This bill provides that any provisional priority development areas that are declared will cease to be such a declared area after three years. The bill also allows for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to, before that three years expires, approve an amendment of the local government's planning instrument to provide for land in the provisional priority development area. This ensures that we have responsive and contemporary planning for our communities.

This bill also amends the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. This amendment will clarify and improve the powers of proponents from misusing the intent of the Coordinator-General's statutory powers to promote their individual projects, sometimes diverting limited government resources and causing confusion for landowners and industry.

These amendments will include the renaming of significant projects to coordinated projects to remove any perception that they have an approval or level of state support. It also goes further to adopt a more robust criteria for consideration of which projects should be declared as coordinated projects. It also allows for the renaming and a substantial restructuring process for consideration of an infrastructure facility of significance to provide greater certainty for landowners and provide a more logical sequence of planning activities. Another amendment to this act will provide a process for improvements to enable the Coordinator-General to streamline the environmental impact statement assessment process. The amendments to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act will assist the Coordinator-General to implement his 37 fast-track plans to ensure that the assessment process continues to be streamlined and reduce approval times by 50 per cent.

This bill will also see a shift in powers and responsibility from the South Bank Corporation to, where appropriate, the Brisbane City Council. The amendments to the South Bank Corporation Act will transfer the power to receive and assess development applications to the council from a date to be proclaimed. In general, current applications will remain with the South Bank Corporation to ensure existing applicants have certainty about the progress of their applications and management of their approvals. In addition, all planning powers in respect of sites 9A and 9B in the approved development plan, known as Southpoint, will remain with the South Bank Corporation while the current approval holder continues to hold an approval in respect of the site.

The South Bank Corporation Act will also be amended to confirm the validity of existing uses and buildings. To facilitate the transition of the role of the corporation, it is important that the responsible minister has flexibility to adjust the structure of the South Bank Corporation Board from time to time to reflect a shift in focus for the corporation—for example, from the roles of place manager, developer and landowner towards winding down. The majority of land within the corporation area is owned in freehold by South Bank Corporation. Both residential and commercial occupiers in general hold long-term leases of their units or buildings. The South Bank Corporation Act contemplates and supports these arrangements. By empowering the South Bank Corporation to dispose of a freehold interest in land with the responsible minister's consent, land and buildings can be disposed of at any time. The ability to dispose of a freehold interest in land provides government with the opportunity to sell corporation real property assets, with proceeds used to reduce corporation debt to Treasury.

This bill is about planning for the future. It is about cutting red tape, empowering local councils and driving the economic development of our state into the next decade. Through a strong economy investing in the development of our infrastructure, our broader community will reap the rewards. This will no doubt enhance the employment opportunities and utilisation of local resources.

No greater development can be seen than our state's long-term investment in the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games. This development, supported by the establishment of the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority, will see the state government support the intensive build-up to the games in 2018. This commitment, as mentioned before, will deliver many opportunities for employees and employers throughout the south-east. I hope that the many businesses and organisations within my electorate of Logan will seize this opportunity to not only build their business but also participate in a once-in-a-lifetime event.

I am proud to support this bill and the steps it will take to support the economic development of our great state. I also want to commend the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, the Assistant Minister for Planning Reform and their ministerial staff for their work on this legislation. I commend this bill to the House.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (9.53 pm): I rise to speak on the Economic Development Bill because it is a critically important piece of legislation in relation to the state. The community that I represent has been party to significant economic development, significant land acquisitions and compulsory acquisitions and it should be remembered in this chamber that any of that occurring in a person's life is disruptive and traumatic. Certainly, the limitation of the disruption and trauma is in great measure limited by the people who are involved in the consultation, their humanity and generosity of spirit. This bill covers a great deal of issues and in 10 minutes I certainly will not be able to deal with all of it.

The committee in its report talked about the limited consultation in the development of the bill and states that that has given rise to a large number of issues. I am sure that there is disquiet in the community and amongst instrumentalities and organisations when dealing with these sorts of powers. They are intrusive and I understand that the Deputy Premier said that it is a process bill—I believe those were his words—but in a fairly short look at the bill it does have the potential to impact on landowners and communities quite significantly, so it is important that proper consultation occur. That also applies in relation to development of projects in a region, particularly the major projects that under this bill the MEDQ will be looking out for. The committee notes—

> The primary planning legislation in Queensland is the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*. The purpose of the MEDQ, like the ULDA before it, is to 'carve out' from the general planning scheme, land to be developed for the specific purpose of progressing the state's objectives of economic development and development for community purposes. It is the 'special' nature of approved PDAs—

priority development areas—

> that warrant them being treated under a different process from those that generally apply for developments.
>
> The committee notes that SPA processes are being reformed with a view to increasing efficiencies for planning and development more broadly.

I would seek clarification as to whether the MEDQ will be covering only matters covered by the ULDA. The information that I gleaned from a reading of the bill was that the MEDQ would be covering much greater projects than housing projects under the ULDA. If that is the case, the two cannot be equated. The ULDA only developed housing; it did not develop industry development areas and it did not develop major proponent works. It was housing only. If I have misunderstood the legislation, I am happy to accept that. But if the MEDQ is going to be dealing with major projects, it cannot be equated to the ULDA in isolation.

With regard to provisional PDAs, the bill's provision for provisional PDAs is new. The department advised the committee that investigated this bill that provisional PDA declarations are designed to apply in circumstances where there is an overriding economic or community need to start development quickly—and this is the key I believe—and where the proposed development is consistent with the local government's planning scheme. Over the past few years local governments have been noticeably excluded from development. They have lost their voice in great measure and the local government communities, at least in my area, have had to cover costs for major developments that they should not have had to, that the Coordinator-General should have better recognised in conditioning. If these provisional PDAs are only going to be declared where the proposed development is consistent with the local government planning scheme and in consultation with the local government, then I believe the community will be comforted by that process.

Also in relation to that same matter, the LGAQ raised a matter of conflict with regard to legal advice relating to the local government potentially being left with a shortfall providing infrastructure to a UDA property development, and I am assuming that the LGAQ is projecting that it could occur to PDAs or to developments under the MEDQ. The legal advice, however, that was provided to the department conflicted with that and the committee commented—

> The committee believes that it is reasonable for local governments to be able to levy charges to recover shortfalls in the provision of infrastructure when local governments are not party to, and may not have input into, the infrastructure agreement between the MEDQ and the developer.

Unless that is allowed for, local governments and, by default, the local community will be left with costs that they should not have to bear. It is occurring in councils now—it has occurred in Gladstone Regional Council—where the Coordinator-General has not liaised well with local government. It has an advisory body status in the EIS process, but often its concerns and issues are not well translated into the conditioning.

So local councils are left to pay for infrastructure, sometimes outside of the development area but relating to the development area, and that by necessity means that local constituents are paying for industry development, and they should not be. So that liaison between council and the MEDQ—the approving agency—must be transparent and it must be alive to ensure that residents are not caught and that councils are not caught in that nexus.

I note that earlier there was some comment that the powers of the Coordinator-General had changed to enable the Coordinator-General to streamline the EIS process and approve short-term leases for land held by the Coordinator-General in state development areas. I think there are two state development areas in my electorate. They have received preliminary approval for light or heavy industries. So much of the preliminary work has been done. The process up home is that there is this underpinning EIS process and the industry has to do a site specific EIS, and that is appropriate, too. But the EIS process—even the terms of reference process—really still needs to have community input. Terms of references are now pretty well standard, and I acknowledge that. But the community has to have ownership of the process, otherwise they will not only feel alienated but also more readily object to the proposal because they do not have any ownership of the process at all.

I know that other members talked about getting up to speed, not relying on the local paper, and doing things electronically through the internet. Not everybody has access to the internet and not everybody is internet proficient. Many people in the community are comforted by being able to see what is happening and what comment opportunities there are through the local media—the local rag, the local paper. For the cost of the advertising in the local paper I think it begs the question why the community could not be involved in that EIS process fairly consistently.

In relation to the compulsory acquisition of land, the committee comment in the report states—

It is a serious and significant power to compulsorily acquire land.

During the term of previous governments third-party access powers were given. The government could acquire land compulsorily for a third party. That drew some concern from the community not only about the impact on them as landowners but also on the ability of the government to acquire land perhaps as rural land and then sell it as developmental land, making a huge profit. More importantly, the compulsory acquisition of land needs to be done sensitively. These are people who hurt. These are people who lose generational contact with this property. It has to be done sensitively. People who are sent in to acquire land need to have a personality to start off with and they need to be able to communicate compassionately with landowners. That has not always been the case and the fallout from that poor communication is a lot of pain.

I am going to run out of time before I even get on to the water release matters, which I will raise in consideration in detail, because they were raised with me. I have talked to the Hon. Andrew Powell, and he has answered my questions, but I would like that to be on the record. I will do that in the consideration in detail.

Through all of these changes it has to be remembered that people have to be considered. They have to be consulted and the dealings that the government and industry have with them have to be fair, transparent and equitable.

Mr DRISCOLL (Redcliffe—LNP) (10.03 pm): I am very proud to be able to rise tonight to speak to the Economic Development Bill 2012. As a member of the committee that assisted with some of the amendments that the minister has opted to take on board, I certainly want to thank and recognise the chair of the committee, Ted Malone, and the secretariat for their hard work and all the other members of the committee for the work that went into this legislation.

The bill establishes the Minister for Economic Development Queensland—or MEDQ—a corporation sole, as we heard, to replace the Minister for Industrial Development of Queensland. The thrust of this bill, and one which the Labor opposition seems to have some difficulty with, is ensuring that we see economic development in Queensland. As the member to proudly represent Redcliffe—an electorate that was neglected by Labor for many years—I know that economic development across this state is something that is critical to Queenslanders. It is about jobs, it is about opportunity, it is about growth that is sustainable for Queensland and it is about this government moving forward to ensure that those opportunities are assured and locked in for Queenslanders and that, under an LNP government, they are no longer neglected. Operationally, a new entity—the Minister for Economic Development Queensland—will assume responsibility for bringing developments to market under the guidance and direction of a board and the MEDQ.

Other aspects of this bill also establish the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority—a board that will work with the MEDQ through the Economic Development Board. Importantly, the powers and functions of the MEDQ will be utilised for the planning and development of the 2018 Commonwealth Games village and other venues. Again, that shows that this government is focused on tourism, growth and jobs and is about ensuring the future of Queensland and making sure that Queenslanders can be proud of this great state.

I must say that I have been absolutely amazed to hear some of the comments so far from the opposition members, who are feigning some sort of interest in the wellbeing and welfare of local councils in this state. What an absolute joke for anyone who sits on the Labor side of the House to even pretend to care about the interests of councils. On the other hand, this government is focused on making sure that there is a collaborative and cooperative approach with local government and state

government. I am sure that in the fullness of time this legislation will also show that cooperation at work whilst not missing out on those economic opportunities that the opposition so readily turned its back on when it was in government.

Other elements of this bill will put the government in a position to facilitate economic development and development for community purposes, particularly where there are identified and persistent market gaps. Again, this government is not shy to put forward legislation that will specifically generate growth and jobs. It is not shy to be for Queenslanders and to make sure that those opportunities that the LNP promised throughout the election campaign are delivered upon.

This government will continue to support economic development in Queensland. We proudly believe that Queensland is a great state. Under the LNP Newman government, we are focused on generating the opportunities that Queenslanders deserve. They are great opportunities for Queenslanders and we look forward to seeing more of them. I certainly commend this bill to the House.

Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (10.07 pm): I rise in this chamber to contribute to the debate on the Economic Development Bill 2012. I commend the Deputy Premier for his hard work and efforts in putting together such an essential piece of legislation that this state so desperately needs. It is certainly no easy feat to put together a bill that will be instrumental in rebuilding our great state of Queensland.

With the legacy of debt left by those economic illiterates sitting opposite the chamber and the struggling Queensland economy, this bill will most certainly get Queensland back on track. Queenslanders can rest assured that the Newman government is committed to fiscal responsibility without worrying about the waste that had occurred with the previous government of the day. It is time to introduce a bill that will assist Queensland to develop its economy to its full potential. The Economic Development Bill 2012 will help establish initiatives that will ensure that the Queensland economy has a step in the right direction.

It will mean that my constituents in the Chatsworth electorate will have faith that they have elected a representative who is part of a government that will deliver robust economic development. By building a strong economy in Queensland, we can ensure that we can keep the cost of living at a reasonable level—something that the previous government failed to do so miserably—to ensure that, most importantly, a solid economic foundation is left for our children instead of a cracking foundation of increasing debt.

It will ensure that this government is making sure that Queensland is really going places. The Newman government is committed to delivering on its election promises. The Economic Development Bill 2012 will amend legislation that is under the portfolio of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. It will ensure the creation of an Economic Development Act as well as the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, a corporation sole, to make economic development actually happen, instead of the typical hype and spin seen by the previous Labor government. The ALP produced great shiny coffee table brochures that promised the world but delivered little. Governments are judged by what they actually do deliver, not by what they continually promise with hollow rhetoric and never-ending spin. Not only will this corporation strive to achieve economic development, it will ensure that community development is not neglected.

The Economic Development Bill 2012 will also play an important role in the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games. By establishing the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority, together with the Minister for Economic Development, this bill will assist with planning and development of the Commonwealth Games village and other supporting infrastructure. By reporting through the channels of the Economic Development Board, it will ensure that Queensland delivers the best games possible, showcasing this wonderful state to the world.

The Chatsworth electorate will play an important part in the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games. Some in this House might not be aware that the Belmont Shooting Range located in my electorate will be one of the host venues during the games.

Government members interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: I take all those interjections. Instead of building flashy new infrastructure, paid for with more debt, the Newman government is making great use of infrastructure that is—shock, horror!—already in place. That is far more practical than an indoor ski jump from the geniuses on the left.

Mr Newman interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: I take the interjection from the Premier. Queensland will be on show in 2018 with the Commonwealth Games and I am proud that my electorate will have the opportunity to host a small number of events in our little patch of Queensland. That is why it is important to me, like my colleagues surrounding me in the chamber, to support wholeheartedly the Economic Development Bill 2012.

The creation of the corporation called the Minister for Economic Development Queensland will replace the Minister for Industrial Development Queensland. It means that a sole corporation will be in place to promote and make it easier for Queenslanders to participate in economic development. It will

streamline the processes to get infrastructure building again in this great state. By streamlining the planning processes it ensures that everyone knows that Queensland is well and truly again open for business.

With a background in property development, I know firsthand the red tape and duplication I suffered under the previous government. At times I often wondered why any sane person would want to develop and build in Queensland if all you were faced with was constant inefficient processes. As I have said in this House previously on many occasions, unlike this side of the chamber, those economic illiterates on that side, those seven soulless souls, know absolutely nothing about the real world of development, economics, terminal yields, capitalisation rates or internal rates of return. I may as well be speaking Martian! Time is money in the property development industry and the incompetence of the previous government was, in fact, costing businesses money. Holding costs that businesses simply could not afford, along with never-ending red tape, were driving people to invest their money elsewhere, certainly anywhere but in Queensland.

I wholeheartedly support the Economic Development Bill 2012 as I want to make sure the Newman government is able to make Queensland a far more attractive place for people to invest in economic development. With the Minister for Economic Development Queensland's powers derived from this bill, it will ensure processes are in place to deal with competing priorities when complexity hampers opportunity for development in Queensland to benefit all. It will ensure that gaps or situations where planning provisions are no longer sufficient are properly dealt with to ensure that an essential development is able to proceed from a business perspective in a very timely manner.

The Economic Development Bill 2012 will also make much needed amendments to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. It will give much needed change to the processes that are required for infrastructure facilities of significance to be considered. With a background in property development and a masters degree in property economics, I am particularly pleased that the Coordinator-General will be tasked with streamlining the environmental impact statement assessment processes. In the previous government this pile of papers seemed to get higher, making it near impossible to progress without costly delays or red tape. I thoroughly commend this important bill to the House, and I congratulate the Deputy Premier for showing true strategic vision. Thank you.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Albert—LNP) (10.15 pm): My contribution will be far more modest than that of the member for Chatsworth which was very informative and well said. This bill is about building economic development in our great state of Queensland. It is about firmly placing Queensland as the state envied by all others. For too long our state has been focused on one section of our economy, a legacy left by the previous government. This new legislation is not about blame, it is about getting on with the job. Current economic conditions across the globe are precarious at best. We are continually buffeted by concerning economic news from around the world. No longer can governments afford to sit back and hope economic issues will automatically sort themselves out. These head-in-the-sand philosophies have crippled many a great nation and placed additional burden on taxpayers. Sound economic policy which creates economic development can no longer be ignored. Planning for tomorrow takes planning today.

The Economic Development Bill is a proactive approach to remove the Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007. The functions of these two separate acts will be integrated into the auspices of the new Minister for Economic Development Queensland, or MEDQ. This will create improved operational efficiencies and facilitate bringing development to the market.

The first thing that comes to mind when I think of South Bank is Expo 88. It was famous across our great state. South Bank formed as a direct result of Expo 88, which certainly put Queensland well and truly on the map and made Brisbane an international city. I can still remember when Expo 88 first came to Brisbane. It was certainly a very exciting time in my youth. This bill amends the South Bank Corporation Act 1989 to transfer statutory planning to the Brisbane City Council. The bill also protects any existing approvals and also allows the transfer of interest in freehold land with the minister's consent. This will help the South Bank Corporation reduce debt by the sale of commercial premises.

The bill includes the establishment of the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority. This authority will report to the Minister for Economic Development Queensland and the MEDQ will assist the authority in relation to planning and development of the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, something we are excited about in my electorate of Albert because, fingers crossed, we will have a couple of events held in the local Oxenford area.

This bill also amends the Disaster Management Act 2003. I am a very proud member of the State Emergency Service and I am deeply proud of the achievements of the State Emergency Service. For eight years I have been a member of this truly great organisation, an organisation that has touched so many lives throughout our great state. Before I talk about the amendments, I just want to say thank you to the Logan and Gold Coast SES units which fall within my electorate. Your service to the community will not be forgotten and everyone in this parliament and throughout Queensland certainly owes you a debt of gratitude.

The amendments to the Disaster Management Act 2003 focus on the FCoI report recommendation that the Disaster Management Authority be amended to give the chief executive of the Department of Community Safety the ability to appoint an EMQ officer to be an SES coordinator. The SES coordinator will be able to direct SES operations in the event of extraordinary circumstances, thus providing command and control arrangements above a local controller. A crucial aspect of this bill is to allow local disaster coordinators for disaster management within local government areas the ability to coordinate large scale activations whilst utilising their local knowledge. No-one knows a local area like the local disaster coordinator. They know the area, they know the landscape and they are on the front line. They know the resources that are in that area. It is plain logic to do that.

Mr Crandon: Sorry, did I put you off there?

Mr BOOTHMAN: Yes, you did, Mr Crandon. I thank the Deputy Premier, Jeff Seeney, and the assistant minister, Ian Walker, for this fantastic piece of legislation. This bill will be good for the electorate of Albert in respect of the Commonwealth Games. It will help to build a lot of economic development throughout the area. With the storm season upon us, the new legislation will be beneficial as in this area we are susceptible to supercells. The legislation will go a long way to coordinating local SES activities. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (10.22 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Economic Development Bill 2012. While the bill presented today is primarily a process bill, its aim is much larger than that. Its aim is to facilitate economic and community development within Queensland in good times and in times of disaster. I am proud to be part of a government that recognises economic development as a vitally important part of our state. Many of the processes in this bill will heavily support the regions and the four-pillar economy that we are so dedicated to building. The bill will equip us with the legislative tools necessary to identify and drive development projects that contribute to a strong and sustainable state economy.

Whilst there are many aspects covered in this bill, I feel compelled to talk about the benefits to local government, because I sat in this House and listened to the rot that was spoken by members on the other side of the House on this subject. The bill proposes to increase local government input into the planning and development of land within areas that have been declared priority development areas. The bill repeals the Urban Development Authority Act 2007, as that act did not explicitly allow for input by local governments. What a novel idea to have input by local governments! That is a fantastic idea of the Deputy Premier.

Our government empowers local governments and we listen to local governments. This bill will allow vital projects to get off the ground through the reduction of red tape. The bill also expands the role of local government in the planning and development of land in the priority development areas. The bill explicitly provides for consultation by the Minister for Economic Development Queensland with the relevant local government. This will ensure that local governments have a greater say in the planning and development of those areas within their communities. It allows for greater flexibility for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to delegate powers and functions to a local government directly or to a local government representative committee that may have local government membership.

Councils have seriously welcomed the Economic Development Bill. In front of me I have a letter from the Redlands City Council that states—

> Council commends the government for introducing this bill, which local government will see as a potential accelerant for stalled local projects.

It also states—

> The proposed legislation will be particularly welcomed by councils that have battled for years to get major projects off the ground.

The bill is designed specifically to deliver and facilitate economic development by creating the MEDQ, which will have the ability to deal commercially with land, property and infrastructure, which will encourage economic development and development for community purposes. I commend the Deputy Premier for his contribution to this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (10.25 pm): I have great pleasure in rising to support the Economic Development Bill and to congratulate the Deputy Premier on the measures contained in it. Firstly, I want to deal with some of the comments made by the member for Mulgrave, who has kindly come to join us up here to hear this firsthand. He said that this side of the House was overestimating, overexaggerating and overemphasising the problems facing the Queensland economy. I make the point that we are not doing so at all.

The Property Council of Australia puts out a quarterly summary of property sentiment around the country. Although I will not go into the detail of that sentiment around the country, needless to say the property and construction industries in this country are all concerned about the future and are all performing well under their potential capacity. One of the challenges facing this government is to ensure that those industries once again are given the confidence they need to contribute as one of the four

pillars of our economy. One interesting set of figures that the member for Mulgrave did not refer to is the Property Council survey of government performance. It is an interesting survey. I table a copy of the survey, to which I refer.

Tabled paper: Table in relation to government performance index, December quarter 2012 [1755].

To evaluate the government performance index for the Property Council survey, the question asked of the property industry was: is the state or territory government where you primarily operate doing a good job planning and managing growth? The interesting thing about the graph is the performance of this government since it took office. I will run through a few of the figures. Since the June quarter, when this government took office, through to the December quarter, the current quarter under consideration, the confidence index in New South Wales has risen four points; in Victoria, it has risen seven points; in Western Australia, it is steady; in South Australia, it has fallen two points—I think they only produced two lots last year; and in Tasmania, it has risen 10 points from minus 73 to minus 63, which is hardly what one would call tremendous ratings. The biggest growth and the biggest turnaround for the property industry's confidence in what the government is doing is in Queensland. In Queensland, when we took office the confidence index was minus 29; this quarter it is plus four, which is a turnaround of 33 points. That shows the confidence that the property and construction industries have in the Newman government, in our reliance upon the four pillars and in our absolute determination to ensure that the property and construction industries are given the support that they need. It is in that context that I want to speak about the Economic Development Bill. Many members who have spoken tonight have very assiduously gone into the specific provisions of the bill.

But I think it needs to be seen in the context of the total approach that this government is taking to ensure that the property industry is getting the support that it needs, that we are removing the unnecessary red tape—the unnecessary barriers to development—and that we are not casting care to the winds and still protecting what the community values and needs, that we are still protecting our environment but letting the property and construction industry get on with the job. I will remind the House of a couple of the measures that the Deputy Premier has brought to this House or has promulgated by regulation which are achieving just this effect.

The first of them is our temporary state planning policy which is planning for prosperity. As I have raised in the House before, this requires and enables local government and state agencies to ensure that economic growth is part of the planning decision process. Instead of having a raft of negative planning policies, all with the word 'not' in them, that have been brought in by the previous government, we have a balancing element—an element that says, as the Sustainable Planning Act itself says but has never been acted upon until now, that economic development must be an outcome of our planning system. Planning for prosperity ensures that when local governments are making their planning schemes and when state agencies are making decisions that economic development of our community is part of what the planning scheme delivers. That is a very important part of what we have done.

We have been able to bring through to the House the Sustainable Planning Act amendments. Those amendments are also there to ensure that we de-risk the planning process as best we can for the proponents of development within our communities—that is, those who are trying to get things done. Members will recall that the Deputy Premier's legislation does things at every stage of the planning process to ensure that the proponent is given a fair go in the process.

It de-risks the application stage. It takes away the technical things that can bring an application undone, even at the very end of the process—the properly made application issue, the state resource entitlement issue. It creates a single state planning concurrence agency that takes away the conflict we have had with state agencies all saying different things. Proponents have had to take their application around to a number of planning agencies instead of one. It creates a single state concurrence agency that will mean that this government speaks with one voice as to the issues it wants addressed in a planning scheme or in a planning application.

It also deals with the dispute resolution section of planning matters and ensures that the reintroduction of discretion as to costs gives some significant rigour to that process. At the same time, it will ensure that if a person goes to mediation they are not going to cop costs and, in fact, that the mediator may be able to judge and determine some cases with no implication as to cost. That is a tremendous advance within our system.

That brings us to this legislation—the Economic Development Bill. I would suggest that of all of the measures that the Deputy Premier has brought to this chamber this is the great sleeper. I am a bit concerned—and I have mentioned this to the Deputy Premier and others in the department—that the community has not yet realised the impact of this legislation. I hope that the speeches that have been made here tonight go out into the community and that people do realise what significant changes the Deputy Premier is making by virtue of this legislation. Many of them have been enumerated tonight.

The particular one that I want to concentrate on is the ability of the government to declare PDAs, particular development areas. This is a very different process from that which was used in the ULDA legislation where local governments had urban development areas thrust upon them. Under this

legislation, the priority development areas—the PDAs—will only be introduced after consultation with local government. So it is not going to be a matter of an arrogant state government forcing its planning wishes on to local government.

The Premier himself has said and this government has entered into an agreement with local government to ensure that there is cooperation, that things happen hand in hand and that things are not thrust upon and forced upon local government. This act will be the way forward in terms of allowing priority development areas in all sorts of areas, be it for affordable housing, be it for a city centre that needs rejuvenation, be it for a major development, be it for whatever economic interest is served by having development occur rapidly and with as little fuss as possible. This bill enables that to occur. This bill enables that to happen. It gives the Deputy Premier and his department the power to move forward in terms of priority planning areas which will benefit the state, benefit the state's economy and deliver for the four pillars that are so dear to the heart of the Newman government.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this legislation. I encourage the House to support it. I congratulate the Deputy Premier on the steps that he has taken to ensure that it has come to the House so quickly and that it completes what, I think, is a great set of planning initiatives that have been brought to the House in the first six months of this government. We can go to Christmas knowing that so much has been done in giving us a fresh start for next year.

Hon. JA STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (10.35 pm): I rise to join the debate on the Economic Development Bill 2012 introduced by the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning on 1 November 2012. As the Deputy Premier has pointed out, the bill combines the provisions of the Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 into a single Economic Development Act that will establish the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, MEDQ, as a corporation sole, and the Economic Development Board, in place of the current Minister for Industrial Development Queensland and Urban Land Development Authority.

My particular interest is in what the bill achieves for the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. This is a simple, sensible, coordinated approach to developing infrastructure for the games. My department collaborated with the Deputy Premier's department in the drafting of provisions for the Commonwealth Games Infrastructure Authority, the CGIA, which will facilitate the planning and development of the games village, and other venues, by providing advice to the MEDQ and performing functions delegated to it by the MEDQ such as planning and assessment functions.

The directors-general of my department and the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning will be members of the authority. The chief executive officer of the Gold Coast City Council and the chairperson of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games Corporation, GOLDOC, will also be members, subject to their appointment by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council may also appoint other members with appropriate knowledge and experience. As I have said many times in this chamber, the Newman government is determined to deliver the best Commonwealth Games ever, and we will do this on time and on budget. This new authority will help us do just that.

We have just passed the one-year mark since the Gold Coast won the bid to host the games and preparations are on track. I would like to congratulate the board chairman, Nigel Chamier, and all those at GOLDOC for their efforts to date. Preparing for an event the size of the Commonwealth Games is a massive task. The Gold Coast Commonwealth Games will be the largest multisport event in Australia this decade. It will be the equal largest event in Asia Pacific, alongside the Winter Olympics in South Korea, and will involve a workforce of more than 1,000 people and a massive 15,000 volunteers.

Not only do we need to provide world-class facilities for the 6,500 athletes and 1,000 technical officials, but we must ensure we leave a lasting, positive legacy for the Gold Coast and Queensland. Without doubt, the largest infrastructure project of the games will be the development of the athletes village at Parklands. The business case for the village has recently been completed and I look forward to seeing the early works commence in 2013. The Gold Coast Aquatic Centre will also be upgraded, as I announced just weeks ago, two years early, in time for the 2014 Pan Pacific Swimming Championships.

Both of these developments will require a great deal of coordination and planning. I am very confident this new authority, under the guidance of the Deputy Premier, will provide the additional mechanism to ensure this happens. Specifications for these and other games developments will be provided by my department, in accordance with our obligations under the host city contract and other relevant requirements. Those specifications will be given to MEDQ through the CGIA so development can occur. This follows the government's sensible approach to organising other aspects of the games.

While my department is responsible for coordinating the overall games program, various other agencies and entities will play their parts. GOLDOC is organising the games event and police will be responsible for security. Transport and Main Roads, the Gold Coast City Council, the Commonwealth government and others will also play critical roles.

Upon passage of this bill, I look forward to working with the Deputy Premier in his role as MEDQ and the infrastructure experts in his department to plan and deliver the village and other games infrastructure on time and as efficiently as practicable. Honourable members, I am excited by the imminent commencement of the village and the aquatic centre upgrade, as they will contribute significantly to the Gold Coast economy and the end products will be something that will showcase the Gold Coast and Queensland to the world.

Mr MALONE (Mirani—LNP) (10.39 pm): I only want to speak for a short period of time as the former chair of the committee during its deliberations of the Economic Development Bill 2012. Firstly, I congratulate the members on the team that put together the summary in this committee report. I also thank and congratulate the staff of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee—Kathy Munro, who is the research director; Bernice Watson, who did most of the work in respect of this bill; Margaret Telford; Mary Westcott and Rhia Campillo.

This bill is a very significant bill that will be passing through the House tonight. It actually underpins economic development in Queensland. The way in which the bill is drafted will actually push forward development. We have been waiting for over 20 years for land to be developed in Moranbah, Blackwater and other areas in mining towns where the previous government sat on pieces of land and they were not developed for housing. Under this bill, we can now develop those blocks for housing in those areas where people have been paying up to $3,500 per week rent for a house.

I do not need to speak at length on the bill. I thank the team and thank the staff who put the summary together. I am sure that well into the future people will talk about this bill passing through the House tonight.

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (10.41 pm), in reply: I want to thank all of the honourable members who contributed to the debate here tonight. I recall that I said at the beginning of my second reading speech that I expected some conspiracy theories and some ill-informed and misleading contributions from the members of the opposition. Well, honourable members, they certainly did not disappoint us. What a load of rubbish that we heard from the members of the opposition—conspiracy theories that would do well with the confused folk who sit up in the back corner of this chamber. What a load of nonsense.

No matter how many assurances were given about those particular issues, they stood up and repeated them over and over again. No matter how many assurances I gave in the second reading speech, no matter how many times the points were made in the government, they were determined to continue on those same old tired lines about conspiracy theories, not to mention the absolute hypocrisy for the members of the Labor Party to talk about taking away the powers of local governments! It is difficult to sit here and think that anyone in Queensland can be so ill-informed about the history of this state and the history of the legislation that has passed through this House as to think that a member of the Australian Labor Party can come in here and stand up and talk about disenfranchising local councils or taking away the rights of local councils. It is absurd to the extreme.

I want to thank the members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee once again for their examination of the bill. I noted in my earlier remarks that the Economic Development Bill 2012 is primarily a process bill. It is nevertheless important legislation that will refine and improve existing requirements and assist the government to drive economic development in Queensland and remove red tape.

I referred to the bill as a process bill because its main effect is to integrate the existing Industrial Development Act 1963 and the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 and the entities that have carried out the functions under those two pieces of legislation. As detailed in the explanatory notes to the bill, the relevant government agencies were consulted during its development. This level of consultation is entirely appropriate for a bill that largely reframes procedural legislation and re-establishes and streamlines internal government arrangements.

To the best of my knowledge, the Industrial Development Act has operated without any fundamental issues for nearly 50 years—and the opposition did not point to any fundamental issues with the operation of that bill over the last 50 years—while the single most common complaint relating to the Urban Land Development Authority Act has been a lack of engagement with local governments under the former state Labor government when the powers and functions of that act were exercised. But of course members of the opposition did not mention that in their criticism of the bill tonight. As the member for Mansfield quite rightly pointed out, this bill requires a completely different approach.

Integrating the two acts, the Economic Development Bill modernises the provisions of the existing Industrial Development Act, expanding their scope beyond industrial land to enable the government to unlock and drive opportunities for economic development, together with opportunities to develop land, property and infrastructure for community purposes. When it comes to planning and development functions relating to the declaration of priority development areas, the bill mandates consultation with local governments, addressing the concerns of councils with the existing legislation—concerns that were ignored by the former government, concerns that were completely ignored by any of the members of the opposition in their contributions here in the parliament tonight.

It is understandable, in my opinion, that local governments did not trust the former Labor government. The Urban Land Development Authority Act was forced on them without consultation regarding urban development in their particular areas. However, this bill mandates consultation with local governments. It reflects this government's commitment to open dialogue with local governments and reflects our ongoing commitment to recognise the autonomy and the role that local governments play in their communities.

Noting the committee's recommendations about consultation with local government, the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning has consulted with the SEQ Council of Mayors and the Local Government Association of Queensland about the bill. No new issues with the bill were identified to the department during these briefings that have not already been addressed.

I thank those opposite and the committee for their interest in ensuring adequate consultation is undertaken in developing good legislation. But at the same time I must stress how important it is that the limited resources of government are not deployed on consultation for consultation's sake or, as the former government did, consultation just so they could tick the box.

Before making any concluding remarks, I will address some of the points raised during the debate and by the committee. The member for South Brisbane was critical about how quickly the bill was progressed through the committee system. This is a bit rich given some of the occasions we have seen in this House when legislation was gagged and guillotined and legislation that had not even been to a committee! For the benefit of the member for South Brisbane, who has been in this place about five nanoseconds, it has only been in recent times that legislation went to the committees at all. Before then, legislation used to be brought in here and rammed through the House using the guillotine or the gag, which the member for Hinchinbrook was protesting so loudly, and quite rightly, about earlier tonight. That was the way the Labor Party did it. That was the way the Labor Party did it for years and years and years.

It has only been in very recent times—I think four or five months before the state election—that we had a proper committee system, and we were insistent in drawing up that committee system that the committees had the authority and the power to consider legislation. So, once again, how absurd is it, honourable members—how absurd, how ridiculously laughably absurd—that a member of the Australian Labor Party would come in here and talk about the short period of time for a bill to be referred to a committee? She knows absolutely nothing about what she is talking about. I can assure the House once again—and I can assure the member for South Brisbane and all the other conspiracy theorists over there—that there is no Machiavellian conspiracy here. There is no smoking gun. There is no grand conspiracy.

The member for South Brisbane is simply not right when she says there was no consultation on the draft bill, nor were the members for Rockhampton or Mulgrave who parroted her point over and over. It seems to have escaped the attention of those opposite that this is an omnibus bill. That means it is a bill with a number of different parts. Each of the parts were the subject of consultation with the appropriate stakeholders. So while the bill in its entirety was not the specific of broad consultation, specific components of the bill were the subject of consultation, each in their own area. For example, the amendments to the South Bank Corporation Act, which I did not hear mentioned a heck of a lot in the debate, were the subject of extensive consultation with the Brisbane City Council. The amendments to the Environmental Protection Act were the subject of consultation with the Queensland Resources Council as well as a substantial list of other stakeholders which, as is required, was detailed in the explanatory notes.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SEENEY: Page 21, member for South Brisbane. Read the material. It is listed. For the benefit of the House, the other stakeholders named were the Australian Industry Group, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland, the Queensland Farmers Federation, the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association, the Waste Contractors and Recyclers Association of Queensland, the Local Government Association of Queensland and a range of government departments. What the member for South Brisbane has shown is that she simply did not understand the bill. She came in here with a speech that had been written for somebody else and stood up and demonstrated quite clearly that she did not understand—

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find the imputation that I did not write my own speech personally offensive, and I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Berry): Order! The member has found offence in the—

Mr SEENEY: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for South Brisbane has also shown that she has not understood the bill when she talked about the removal of the appeal rights that existed under the Urban Land Development Authority Act. There were no appeal rights in the Urban Land Development Authority Act relating to the declaration of urban development areas—the equivalent of

priority development areas in the new bill. There were no appeal rights under the legislation introduced by the former Labor government. These provisions were transferred across and there were no appeal rights for the priority development areas.

Concern has been expressed that moving the functions of the Urban Land Development Authority into the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning would remove the transparency and accountability that existed by having an authority with independence from government. I am able to assure all members that the bill will require the MEDQ, through the departments, to maintain all of the processes, all of the administrative and reporting functions of the ULDA including the need for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, or MEDQ, to keep registers which must be available to the public via the department's website.

Transparency is also achieved through broad representation in advising and making recommendations to the MEDQ through the Economic Development Board established by the bill. As I said in my second reading speech, the board will be made up of four of the most senior public servants in Queensland. Exercising the functions of the MEDQ through the department will ensure that all of the accountability mechanisms applying to state departments apply to the exercise of these functions, including oversight by the Auditor-General of Queensland. Furthermore, it will firmly place responsibility for the performance of these functions with the responsible minister and the responsible departmental heads.

The member for South Brisbane has also accused the government of having a lack of regard for the environment, lacking concern for agricultural industries and for public health and safety when it comes to the release of water from the flooded mines under temporary emission licences.

Mr Powell: More conspiracy theories.

Mr SEENEY: As the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection says, it was an address based almost entirely on conspiracy theories—almost entirely on scary stories that had no basis at all.

The temporary emissions licence is designed, as I said in my second reading contribution, to enable a quick decision on limited criteria to permit a release for a limited time period. The licence might only allow for the release over a number of hours. However, where the emissions are required for longer, such as the temporary authorisation of a waste transfer station to operate beyond its usual condition, it can be granted for months. It is in fact aimed at preserving and, in many cases, preventing further damage to the environment. It is about managing environmental issues, not ignoring them.

As this is an emergency tool, the decision on whether to approve the licence must be made within 24 hours. The member also raised concerns that cumulative emissions cannot be assessed within 24 hours. Cumulative impacts include both the existing emissions and the potential future emissions. The existing emissions are known and, while true that potential future emissions are not known, particularly where multiple applications for temporary licences are made, this is one of the reasons why the licence is fully flexible. Flexibility is one of the measures in place to prevent environmental harm and detrimental impacts on agricultural land. However, more importantly, water quality, especially drinking water quality, is still the most important consideration in deciding whether to approve the licence in the first place.

Mr Cripps: Hear, hear! Did you hear that, Bill?

Mr SEENEY: We have said that over and over and over again. To begin with, as part of the application for temporary emission licences, proponents would be required to provide information on any increased risks arising from additional discharges and the proposed monitoring and mitigation strategies to offset these risks. In addition, the decision maker would still be required to consider water quality, environmental health and public health issues in deciding whether to approve the application. These criteria are specifically spelt out in the criteria for the decision in proposed section 357D of the Environmental Protection Act, particularly subsection (f), which states that the administering authority must have regard to 'the likelihood that the release will adversely impact the health, safety or wellbeing of another person'.

No matter how many times it is pointed out to the members of the opposition, they come in here and parrot speeches that completely ignore the facts and that completely ignore the black-and-white words in the bill. As I said, this is a tool. It is designed to be used as part of a response to unforeseen emergent events. It is a responsible use of regulation and it was in response to the Floods Commission of Inquiry.

The members for South Brisbane and Gladstone also spoke about the acquisition of land powers. Let me make it clear: in combining the existing legislation to establish an economic development act, the bill does not introduce powers to compulsorily acquire land. What it does is allow the government to deal in land, infrastructure and property like any other member of the community or any other entity. Those members who have been in this House for any particular length of time will well know the concern I have around the powers of compulsory acquisition as it affects landholders. They well know the long history I have of talking in here about the issue of private property rights and the impact on those private property

rights of public infrastructure. Some may well even remember the fact that I have introduced four private members' bills in regard to that particular issue. It is beyond my power to describe how it makes me feel to be lectured tonight by the member for South Brisbane.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The Deputy Premier has the call.

Mr SEENEY: Over 14 years in this place there is no single issue that has been a more central plank to my political identity than the protection of private property rights. The member for South Brisbane comes in here—here for five nanoseconds on a Socialist Left platform—and suggests to me that I need to be aware of the private property rights of private landholders. I struggle, colleagues, to find words to adequately describe the absurdity of such a situation and the sheer ignorant gall of a member who would advance such a proposition in such a reckless way and then sit there and laugh about it. It shows a complete disrespect for any sort of argument that another member might put forward.

Having said that, I acknowledge that the concerns raised by the member for Gladstone were very sincere because I have heard the member for Gladstone raise those concerns before and I share the concerns that I think were the motivations for the things she raised. We will always as a government be very careful to recognise the impacts on private property owners.

The other provision in this bill that goes to the heart of that philosophy is what we are doing with the declarations for infrastructure facilities of significance. As I said in my second reaching speech, the only purpose of such a declaration is to allow for the compulsory acquisition of private land by the Coordinator-General for a private entity, for a private infrastructure facility. It is a provision that is in the legislation at the moment, and we are doing two things with that. We are changing the name of it so that the infrastructure facility of significance cannot be misrepresented as something that has the support of the state. But, more importantly, when we look at it from the perspective of private property owners' rights, we are ensuring that a proponent does not have access to that compulsory acquisition power until such time as extensive efforts have been made to acquire the land through commercial negotiation.

I said in my second reading contribution that I am well aware of situations where companies or company representatives have come to landholders and put the authority to compulsorily acquire on the table and said, 'Now let's negotiate,' and that is not a fair situation. The compulsory acquisition powers should be the last resort in any situation, and particularly more so when that situation involves the compulsory acquisition of land for a private infrastructure facility, such as the situation that is anticipated by this bill.

Once again, I acknowledge the contributions that were made by the committee members. I have the highest regard for our developing committee structure and the process used by the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to consider this bill. I thank the committee for rising to the challenge and giving substantive consideration to the bill within a relatively short period of time.

I will be moving a number of amendments in response to the committee's recommendations and stakeholder feedback that will support the intended operation of the legislation. I will do that, just as I have done with previous pieces of legislation I have brought into this House. As I have said before, a number of us—and my colleague the member for Southern Downs was one—were involved in putting the committee system in place. There were a number of sceptical points of view at the time that ministers would not allow the committee system to operate in the way that it should. The committee system in this parliament will only operate if ministers make a genuine attempt to take account of the recommendations that the committee makes. I have done that and I intend to continue to do that. The suggestion from members of the opposition that, in taking notice of the committee, a minister is somehow acknowledging that the legislation is deficient is a repugnant suggestion and it strikes at the heart of the committee system itself. If that suggestion takes hold, then all honourable members who sit on committees will be wasting their time.

I encourage each and every minister in this government to take due account of the committee system and the recommendations that the committees put forward and reject completely the absurd notion that, in so doing, they are somehow confirming that the legislation they introduced into the parliament was deficient or somehow not up to scratch. It is an absurdity from the member for South Brisbane, and it is one of the more absurd suggestions in the long list of absurdities that she has brought to this parliament tonight. It shows an appalling lack of understanding of the committee system, an appalling lack of understanding of the processes of this parliament and an appalling attitude to go with it.

I commend this bill to the members of the parliament tonight. I thank the members of the parliament for the kind comments they made and I thank those who recognised the significance of some of the provisions of this bill. I particularly acknowledge the comments that were made by my colleague the member for Currumbin and Minister for Tourism in regard to the Commonwealth Games village. Meeting our state's obligations in regard to the Commonwealth Games will be a huge challenge. It was a challenge that was totally unrecognised by the former government when they made the commitment to have the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast. It is a project that we anticipate with some—

Mrs Stuckey: Trepidation?

Mr SEENEY: That is not the word I wanted.

Mrs Stuckey: Enthusiasm.

Mr SEENEY: Yes, we anticipate that project with some enthusiasm, but in anticipating that event with that enthusiasm we do not for one moment underestimate the challenge that will be involved in delivering that event for the people of Queensland and the people of Australia. A critical part of delivering that event will be delivering the infrastructure that is necessary, including the athletes' village and all of the sporting infrastructure that is necessary. A particular part of this bill has been designed specifically for that purpose—that is, to ensure that we meet our obligations in regard to the Commonwealth Games. I look forward to working with the Minister for Tourism in that task in the years ahead. Again, I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate this evening. I commend the bill to the House.

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

AYES, 72—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 9—Byrne, Hopper, Knuth, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Ms TRAD (11.14 pm): This clause establishes the main purpose of the act. The opposition does not support legislation that is more about empowering the Deputy Premier than empowering Queenslanders. Clause 87 sets out that the Minister for Economic Development Queensland must consider the purpose of the act when making a decision. The purpose of the act is far broader than it was under the Urban Land Development Authority Act and provides the Minister for Economic Development Queensland with broad discretion to declare a priority development area where urban development areas cannot be declared. This bill provides this corporation sole with broad discretion to overrule local government and to remove community appeal rights in the Sustainable Planning Act. This is all about empowering the white shoe brigade and not local government or community groups.

Government members interjected.

Mr SEENEY: I think the parliament greeted the suggestion of the member for South Brisbane with an appropriate level of disdain. What an absurd suggestion! Clause 3 sets out the purpose of the act. The terms 'economic development' and 'development for community purposes' are, I think, self-explanatory. It suggests that the powers that the ULDA formally use to establish affordable housing can be used for other purposes as well. It could only be someone from the Socialist Left of the Labor Party who would suggest that what a government can do to provide affordable housing is somehow inappropriate if you then use the same mechanisms to provide for economic development or development for community purposes.

A government member: Twisted logic.

Mr SEENEY: 'Twisted logic' would be the kindest description. I think the member's suggestion is absurd and the clause should stand as it is written.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

Ms TRAD (11.17 pm): Again, this clause sets out how the main purpose of the act is primarily achieved by establishing the Minister for Economic Development Queensland. This is about concentrating power in the hands of one politician and slashing an authority that is independent, that provides expert advice, that goes to planning and affordable housing throughout the state. The Deputy Premier comes in here and asks how dare I come into this place and lecture him. I dare come into this place by the grace of the people of South Brisbane. I come in here with their authority—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! There is too much interjecting in the chamber.

Ms TRAD: I come into this place with the authority of my electorate to hold this government to account, to hold this massive majority to account. What do we have here? We have a piece of legislation that seeks to take all of the power from the ULDA and more, and ride roughshod over local councils who have expressed concerns throughout the consultation process about the concentration of power—

Mr Crandon: Give us names and addresses.

Ms TRAD: I would like to take the interjection and say: read the submissions, read the transcript; if you want to have a say, read the content of the submissions.

The concentration of power in the hands of the Deputy Premier is something of concern to those people who have taken the time to not only make submissions to this inquiry but also to other inquiries about other bills that have been presented to this parliament and referred to committees to consider and respond to within days. This is an outrageous abuse and concentration of power. I dare come into this place and continue to object about it day in and day out.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the Deputy Premier, if members want to interject, they need to return to their seats. There is too much interjection from those standing up and those not in their own seat. I instruct the House.

Mr SEENEY: The member's assertions are obviously absurd. As was pointed out a number of times in the debate, this bill puts together two existing acts, the powers under which have existed for many years—since 1963 in one instance and since 2007 in another.

Division: Question put—That clause 4, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 71—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 7—Byrne, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—

Ms TRAD (11.27 pm): I rise to speak on clause 8 as it establishes the corporation sole superpower, the Minister for Economic Development Queensland. It is an absurdity to put the Deputy Premier in charge of urban land development, of industry development across the state, when as Deputy Premier he cannot even manage a quavering backbencher. This is the biggest joke of all. Throughout the whole week he had one job—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! If members are going to interject they need to return to their allocated seats.

Ms TRAD: That job was to keep the member for Yeerongpilly solid. That was his only job this week, because we know that the bureaucrats wrote the speaking points for him to use tonight and we know that his department was busily working away on the spin about how this bill is good for Queensland.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Could you please rule on relevance to the clause.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for South Brisbane will stay relevant to the clause.

Ms TRAD: Of course I will stay relevant to the clause. As I outlined earlier—

Ms Palaszczuk: The claws are out today!

Ms TRAD: Yes, the claws are certainly out today. As I outlined earlier, this clause provides powers that are far too broad and overreaching for someone who obviously cannot do the simplest of tasks. This follows amendments to the Planning and Environment Court, as I have covered extensively, that make it harder for community members, for neighbourhoods, for residents to launch appeals against financially powerful developers. This is something that many people in Queensland worked hard for over two decades—something that was repealed as soon as Labor came into power in 1989 and something that is, again, taken back to the good old days under the LNP, straightaway. They try to curtail the community as quickly as possible so that—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the chamber.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will cease interjecting. The member for South Brisbane has the call.

Ms TRAD: This clause is nothing more than the LNP making a power grab to buy up land to develop it at its will and to give it away to its developer mates. We will not be supporting this clause.

Mr SEENEY: The contribution is so absurd it hardly warrants a response. However, I would point out that the Minister for Industrial Development was a corporation sole that has been established since 1963. This clause simply changes the name of that corporation sole to the Minister for Economic Development Queensland. It has been around since 1963.

Division: Question put—That clause 8, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 71—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 7—Byrne, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—

Ms TRAD (11.37 pm): Clause 16 provides the Minister for Economic Development Queensland with the power to deal in land or other property and sell property. These powers appear to be broader than the Urban Land Development Authority, as I covered extensively in my earlier speech. The government has not established a proper justification for why these powers have been provided to the Deputy Premier's corporation sole. It was an issue that was significantly criticised throughout various submissions to the committee. For these reasons, the Labor opposition cannot support this clause.

Mr SEENEY: These are exactly the same powers that were exercised by the ULDA.

Division: Question put—That clause 16, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 71—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 7—Byrne, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 168, as read, agreed to.

Clause 169—

Mr SEENEY (11.44 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 169 (Delegations)

Page 113, after line 22—

insert—

'(4) A local government may subdelegate a function or power of MEDQ delegated to it under subsection (1) to an appropriately qualified employee of the local government.

'(5) However, subsection (4) does not apply to a function or power if MEDQ has, when delegating the function or power to the local government, directed that the function or power can not be subdelegated.'.

2 Clause 169 (Delegations)

Page 113, line 23, '(4)'—

omit, insert—

'(6)'.

I table the explanatory notes to the amendments.

Tabled paper: Economic Development Bill 2012, explanatory notes to Hon. Jeff Seeney's amendments [1756].

Amendments Nos 1 and 2 amend clause 169 of the bill. The purpose of the amendments is to clarify that, where the Minister for Economic Development Queensland—or MEDQ—has delegated functions or powers to the local government, it may subdelegate those to an employee of the local government. The amendments also amend the clause to provide for circumstances where MEDQ can identify powers and functions that may be subdelegated.

The amendments are consistent with the existing practice of delegating powers to local governments under section 136 of the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007. I commend amendments Nos 1 and 2 to the House.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 169, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 170 to 231, as read, agreed to.

Clause 232—

Ms TRAD (11.46 pm): And here we come to the deal. This part of the bill provides a definition that is far too broad for where a temporary emissions licence can be issued and goes much, much further than the recommendations of the flood commission of inquiry, which specifically refer to a flooding event and it is a disgrace. It is an absolute disgrace for this government to come in here and put this outrageous bill on the table and hide behind the skirts of the flood commission of inquiry. It is an absolute disgrace.

Mr Choat: You caused the flood.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I take personal offence to that remark and I ask the member to withdraw it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member will withdraw the comment.

Mr CHOAT: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: And the member will, if he wishes to interject, return to his seat.

Ms TRAD: The change of definition from 'emergent' to 'applicable' is a farce. It disregards the recommendations of the committee. This is the parliamentary committee of which the majority are government members, a parliamentary committee that the Deputy Premier came in here today—as he has done repeatedly in the past—and espoused the virtues of. This parliamentary committee stated—

The concern expressed by stakeholders about the potential for TELs to be approved in situations that are not 'emergency' but simply unforeseen, is understandable.

This clause does not address the recommendations of the flood inquiry. This is a farce. Why would you move from 'emergent' to 'applicable'? Why would you even put it up without guidelines? Why are we even looking at this clause without the accompanying guidelines that will tell people, companies, the people who are making the assessment about the TELs when, where, how they will issue these TELs during an event? Where are the guidelines?

This is an outrageous abuse of parliamentary procedure. This is an outrageous example of this government, once again, riding roughshod over the community. The change of the word to 'applicable' does not respond to those concerns. It is obvious why the Deputy Premier will not be sending these amendments back to the committee. It is obvious why these amendments were tabled so late today. It is obvious that these amendments will not be floated with the many organisations. We will not be supporting this clause.

(Time expired)

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe we are still dealing with the substantive clause. The amendment has not been moved yet?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Then I am not speaking to the amendment; I am speaking to clause 232, which states—

An ***emergent event*** is an event, or series of events, either natural or caused by sabotage, that was not foreseen when—

(a) particular conditions were imposed on an environmental authority; or

(b) particular development conditions were imposed on a development approval.

And the clause goes on. Throughout the debate and from advice that I have received, we have been talking about events such as floods and the like. Certainly, the concern that was raised with me in my electorate was in relation to flooding. The conversation that I had with the group that was concerned was in the context of emissions from either industry or mines—and that is an industry—where they have an accumulation of water and they are going to be allowed to release that water in a flooding condition, which would dilute any environmental impacts significantly.

I would seek clarification, again, that we are dealing with clause 232 as it appears in the bill, not as it appears in the amendment. What other than flooding events are to be covered by this emergent event? Could it be just the normal process of an industry in dry rather than inclement conditions—flooding conditions? What potential detrimental impact on the environment could approving a temporary emissions licence have?

Mr SEENEY: Perhaps it would help if I moved the amendments to clause 232. I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 151, line 15, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'***applicable***'.

4 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 151, line 16, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'***applicable***'.

5 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 152, line 4, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

6 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 152, line 9, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

7 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 152, line 10, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

8 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 152, line 11, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

9 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 152, line 14, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

10 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 153, lines 9 to 11—

omit, insert—

'(b) the extent and impact of the applicable event, including the potential economic impact of granting or not granting the licence;'.

11 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 153, line 13, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

12 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 153, line 14, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

13 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 153, line 16, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'applicable'.

14 Clause 232 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 4A)

Page 155, line 12, before 'a condition'—

insert—

'a transitional environmental program or'.

The purpose of these amendments is to provide a term other than 'emergent' to describe when a temporary emissions licence may be approved that more clearly reflects the intent and does not give rise to confusion. These amendments give effect to the committee's recommendation No. 14. These amendments are made to sections 357A, 357B and 357D of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 as inserted by clause 232.

Amendment 10 also amends clause 232 of the bill to give effect to the committee's recommendation No. 15. The purpose of this amendment is to reword section 357D to ensure that broader economic considerations are a consideration in whether or not to grant a temporary emissions licence. Financial impacts on an individual applicant are not. This will allow the consideration of the financial impacts on an applicant if, for example, the applicant was a major employer in the region and the financial impost would result in a significant loss of employment. It would also ensure that the impact on a local or state economy of not allowing a relaxation of the environmental authority to allow a release of a contaminant is considered and that the potential for economic impact on adversely affected downstream users such as agriculture is also considered.

In addition, amendment 14 amends clause 232 of the bill where it inserts section 357G into the Environmental Protection Act 1994. The purpose of this amendment is to specify that the temporary emissions licence approves the activity despite both the transitional environmental program itself as well as the condition of a transitional environmental program. I commend the amendments to the House.

Mr POWELL: I will quickly touch on the amendments and then touch on the issue raised by the member for Gladstone. As the Deputy Premier said, the two amendments in particular reflect the recommendations of the committee. We have been harangued by the member for South Brisbane all evening about referring to committee's recommendations. We are amending the definition of 'emergent' to 'an applicable event' so that we can deal with localised events which are not catastrophic enough to fit the definition of emergent. And we are also picking up, as the member for South Brisbane pointed out, a change to the extent and impact of the applicable event including the potential economic impacts.

To turn to the issue raised by the member for Gladstone, I can be very clear that these changes do not apply to any legacy water in mines. A temporary emissions licence could apply to any type of emergent event, and that could include flood, cyclone or fire. It could allow a change in emission to respond to an event. For example, we could allow an asphalt plant to operate at night to repair roads quickly with different air and noise emissions to the licence. We are taking the floods commission recommendations and the lessons learnt from the flood to create a tool that will help make Queensland disaster ready in the future.

To pick up the issues raised by the member for South Brisbane, yes this is going beyond what the floods commission has said, but the reality is we want to be able to put Queensland in a position so that we can respond to a disaster. If that means that we need to work with asphalt plants out of hours to provide enough asphalt to repair roads that desperately need it, then so be it.

I need to clarify a couple of other things. We are not talking about the emergency powers in the Environmental Protection Act. They are in the act already. We are not changing them. They do not allow conditioning, they are very quick powers to be put in place. What we are adding is this temporary emissions licence. It still allows us, as the environmental regulator, to appropriately condition any emission at all and that is to a necessary or desirable level. As I said, it is not carte blanche. We still can condition that emission. As we have said before, we can amend it if necessary along the track. It is very temporary in nature. It may be as short as a couple of hours or it could be up to a couple of months, as I said, depending on our ability to respond to a disaster. I hope that addresses the concerns raised by the member for Gladstone. If not, I am happy to continue that discussion, member for Gladstone.

Ms TRAD: That is a very reasonable explanation put forward by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and of course it would be reasonable because he has probably had access to the guidelines which should be accompanying this piece of legislation so that stakeholders and members of the community can make an informed decision about what these laws mean.

Mr Powell interjected.

Ms TRAD: I take the interjection from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. If you cannot supply sufficient information to stakeholders, including AgForce, the Local Government Association of Queensland, the Queensland Conservation Council or the Capricorn Conservation Council, or feedback to organisations to quell their fears then the minister is the only one to blame in this respect. The guidelines should be with the bill. Consultation should have happened at length. What you are saying now is we need to take your word. This government wants us to take its word that this is what these laws mean. I am sorry, Minister, and I am sorry, Deputy Premier, but your word means nothing and most Queenslanders know that. We will not be supporting these amendments.

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

AYES, 69—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 8—Byrne, Cunningham, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Division: Question put—That clause 232, as amended, be agreed to.

AYES, 69—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 8—Byrne, Cunningham, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 232, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 233 to 253—

Mr SEENEY(12.07 am): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr SEENEY: I move the following amendments—

15 Clause 234 (Amendment of s 467 (Emergency powers))

Page 157, after line 13—

insert—

'(3) Section 467—

insert—

'(11) A person who takes an action in compliance with an emergency direction does not commit an offence against this Act merely because the person takes the action.'.'.

16 After clause 238

Page 158, after line 10—

insert—

'238A Amendment of s 540 (Required registers)

Section 540(1)—

insert—

'(la) temporary emissions licences;'.'.

17 Clause 240 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 159, line 9, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'***applicable***'.

18 Clause 243 (Insertion of new ss 24A–24C)

Page 160, line 21, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'***applicable***'.

19 Clause 243 (Insertion of new ss 24A–24C)

Page 160, line 24, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'***applicable***'.

20 Clause 243 (Insertion of new ss 24A–24C)

Page 160, line 25, 'emergent'—

omit, insert—

'***applicable***'.

21 After clause 244

Page 162, after line 2—

insert—

'244A Amendment of s 47 (Replacement of ss 540 and 541)

Section 47, inserted section 540(1)—

insert—

'(ea) temporary emissions licences;'.'.

22 Clause 250 (Amendment of s 3 (Definitions))

Page 164, line 7, after '*lawful use*,'—

insert—

'*operational work*,'.

23 Clause 250 (Amendment of s 3 (Definitions))

Page 164, after line 22—

insert—

'***operational work*** has the meaning given in the Sustainable Planning Act, section 10(1) but does not include placing an advertising device on premises.'.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 233 to 253, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 254—

Ms TRAD (12.07 am): Obviously it is no surprise that one of the first things this government does when it comes into power is abolish or change the most successful urban management program in Queensland's history. South Bank is the biggest success story that Brisbane has seen in modern times. South Bank is in my electorate of South Brisbane and it is much loved.

A government member: Sit down!

Ms TRAD: To the member who interjected I say this: I will not sit down; I will speak my mind on behalf of the residents of South Brisbane, thank you very much. In relation to clause 254, I draw the attention of the parliament to a submission from the Brisbane City Council signed by Lord Mayor Graham Quirk, who stated that this will—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! There is too much audible noise in the chamber. Please keep your conversations down. If you need to interject, you need to be seated in your proper seat.

Ms TRAD: The submission from the former colleague of the Premier, Lord Mayor Graham Quirk, states that this section will expand the corporation's ability to dispose of land in the corporation area to any entity. That is with specific reference to the public riverside parkland. The department's response refers to section 18 of the act and says that the area for riverside parkland is not changed within the definition moved from section 3 to section 18 of the act. It is not apparent how this response to Brisbane City Council's concerns of riverside parkland being sold to an entity other than council with the removal of section 26(2) is acceptable or adequate.

We cannot support this part of the legislation without proper reassurance that riverside parkland is protected from being flogged off to the highest bidder. This is fundamentally about protecting the public space at South Bank from being sold off to potential developers. Put plain and simple: make no mistake, if the Deputy Premier cannot give any assurance tonight to the Labor opposition and the people of Queensland that every single inch of public parkland is protected, even though this act expands the ability for the land to be sold to someone other than the council, then the Labor opposition has no other choice but to vote against this clause. I ask the Deputy Premier to expand, to clarify and to commit to keeping the public parklands public, free and accessible at South Bank, full stop.

Mr NEWMAN: I rise to speak in relation to the comments from the member for South Brisbane. Clearly, the member for South Brisbane either has a very short memory or does not recall facts in very recent years. I recall that, in the not too distant past, the very dear and close friend of the member for South Brisbane made a call behind closed doors to do a deal with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. An area of land that was zoned public open space—it was a plaza between the Conservatorium and the end of the QPAC complex, which was public open space—was handed over to the ABC to build a great big building on. What was once a public space was disposed of for a very worthwhile and worthy organisation, the ABC, but it was taken away from the people of Queensland behind closed doors.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: I hear the interjections from the member for South Brisbane and I ask: where was the member for South Brisbane when the dirty dodgy deal was done? She was nowhere to be seen. That shows the hypocrisy we see. The member for South Brisbane comes in here this evening, she beats her chest and carries on about how outrageous these changes are, but the reality is that the only

people who, in the past 20 years, have disposed of public open space, to my knowledge, are those of the Australian Labor Party. What absolute hypocrites they are, what totally fraudulent statements we have heard, what crocodile tears we have seen. Why didn't the member for South Brisbane or, indeed, all members of the Labor Party stand up and save that precious open space? That is why I support this clause. The comments we have heard this evening are humbug.

Division: Question put—That clause 254, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 69—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 7—Byrne, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 254, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 255 to 273, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr SEENEY (12.19 am): I move the following amendment—

24 After clause 273

Page 171, after line 22—

insert—

'273A Amendment of s 86 (Court may exclude person from the site)

'Section 86(1) and (3), after 'corporation'—

insert—

'or council'.'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 274 to 284, as read, agreed to.

Clause 285—

Ms TRAD (12.19 am): This clause amends section 27 of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act which sets out the matters the Coordinator-General considers before making a declaration of a coordinated project. While the committee report rightly points out that these are not all mandatory matters currently, the opposition still has reservations that the following matters will be removed from consideration. These matters are: the project's potential effect on relevant infrastructure; the employment opportunities that will be provided by the project; the level of investment necessary for the proponent to carry out the project; and the strategic significance of the project to the locality, region or state. These are matters I believe most Queenslanders would consider worthy of consideration in providing coordinated project status. We will not be supporting this clause.

Mr SEENEY: I think these matters were well and truly canvassed in the second reading debate. The clause should be accepted as it stands.

Division: Question put—That clause 285, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 69—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 7—Byrne, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 285, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 286 to 291, as read, agreed to.

Clause 292—

Ms TRAD (12.27 am): Clause 292 drew a bit of attention in the committee report, and at recommendation 7 we can see advice to the government to remove this clause. It is a clause that seeks to remove the requirement for the Coordinator-General to provide public notice that an EIS is required for a coordinated project and to invite submissions on the draft terms of reference for an EIS. The opposition strongly opposes this clause, which would stand to remove community input into the EIS process from the start, early on, as community should be involved—early on, at the start. We condemn the government for not accepting the committee's recommendation in this respect.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I also express concern about this. EISs are one of the only mechanisms that are now available to communities to articulate their concerns. It is a long and drawn out process, and I understand that. But in the scheme of a project that requires an EIS, advertising in local media—whether that includes your local paper and the *Courier-Mail*, the state major paper—is a very, very, very infinitesimal cost. I am assuming that removing the requirement for advertising will not remove the need for the EIS process to occur. I am hoping it will not reduce any obligation on a proponent to go through a full EIS process, as has always been required. So I do not understand why the Coordinator-General is removing this requirement on a proponent, as I said, given the cost is small and the need for public information and input is of critical importance.

Mr SEENEY: The amendment to section 29 deals with the advertising of the terms of reference for an EIS. It does not deal with the actual EIS itself. The amendment gives the Coordinator-General the discretion to decide whether or not to advertise the draft terms of reference. The draft terms of reference for an environmental impact statement are comprehensive but are becoming increasingly generic. That means that there is a standard being developed for terms of reference. The requirement to publicly notify these terms of reference has time and cost implications for the project and is often of little or no benefit because of the generic nature of the terms of reference.

The intention of providing the Coordinator-General with the discretion is to allow projects to proceed directly to the preparation of an EIS in circumstances where the types of impacts of the project are relatively well known and can be addressed through generic terms of reference. It allows the EIS work to start without delay. The draft terms of reference will be publicly notified for more complex projects and also for projects that are 'controlled actions' under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999—which is most of the larger projects—and being assessed through the bilateral agreement with the Commonwealth. It is intended that the generic terms of reference will be available and will become well known to all interest groups operating in this area.

Division: Question put—That clause 292, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 68—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 8—Byrne, Cunningham, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 292, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 293 to 321—

Hon. JW SEENEY (12.37 am): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr SEENEY: I move the following amendments—

25 After clause 300

Page 188, after line 29—

insert—

'300A Amendment of s 76L (When step in notice may be given)

'Section 76L(1)—

omit, insert—

'(1) Subject to subsection (3), the Coordinator-General may give a step in notice for a prescribed decision or process only if—

(a) a progression notice or notice to decide has been given for the decision or process; or

(b) the Coordinator-General is satisfied that a step in notice is required to ensure timely decision-making for the decision or process.'.'.

26 Clause 310 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 7, sdivs 2–4)

Page 193, lines 23 to 27 and page 194, lines 1 to 3—

omit, insert—

'(a) each of the following apply—

(i) the project has been declared a coordinated project for which an EIS is required under section 26(1)(a);

(ii) the Coordinator-General has publicly notified the Coordinator-General's report for the project;

(iii) the report has not lapsed;

(iv) the area of land identified as required for the infrastructure facility is consistent with the land assessed in the EIS for the project; or

(b) both of the following apply—

(i) the Coordinator-General is satisfied that adequate environmental assessment has been carried out for the project in accordance with an environmental assessment process under an Act, other than this Act, or under a Commonwealth Act;

(ii) the area of land identified as required for the infrastructure facility is consistent with the land assessed in the document, similar to an EIS, to which the process relates.'.

27 Clause 310 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 7, sdivs 2–4)

Page 195, line 18, '4 months'—

omit, insert—

'6 months'.

28 Clause 312 (Amendment of s 173 (Regulation-making power))

Page 202, lines 18 and 19—

omit, insert—

'(2) Without limiting subsection (1)(h), a regulation may—

(a) prescribe a fee for monitoring compliance with an imposed condition; and

(b) prescribe a fee that is a stated amount, CPI indexed for the year the fee becomes payable.'.'.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 293 to 321, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (12.39 am): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (12.39 am): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

AYES, 70—Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

NOES, 6—Byrne, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Unparliamentary Language

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I received a complaint from the member for Dalrymple regarding contributions in the parliament on Tuesday, 27 November 2012 by the Treasurer and Attorney-General. The member for Dalrymple contends that the ministers referred to his name in the House with language which could be mistaken for coarse language and that this was unparliamentary language. I have reviewed the Hansard video and written record and have concluded that the language used could be construed to mimic unparliamentary language. I ask the Treasurer and the Attorney-General to withdraw the offending language.

Mr Nicholls: I withdraw, Madam Speaker.

Mr Bleijie: I withdraw, Madam Speaker.