

Extract of transcript

Senator WATERS: If you think that people should have the right to be able to lodge an objection to either a mining lease or an environmental authority, will you be opposing the current state government's proposals to remove that right to object?

Mr Singer: I have to say I am not across that part.

Senator WATERS: You are not across that the bill to remove objection rights to projects such as your own?

Mr Singer: No, but I could take it on notice.

Senator WATERS: Thank you, if you could. If your position is, as you say, that you do think people should have that right—and I think that is the correct position—I am interested in what steps you will take with the current proposals to water that down significantly or entirely removing it in some instances.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: You would think that a decision on what the company might do in relation to government legislation would be a board decision. But perhaps the board may not be interested in getting involved in that.

Mr Singer: Following this example, we are on record with the Queensland government as saying that we believe there needs to be some hurdle to entry. Just because somebody writes a letter, it should not be accepted and go in to a full court process.

Rio Tinto Alcan notes that the Queensland Resources Council made a written submission in regard to the bill in question. Rio Tinto Alcan supports the Queensland Resources Council submission in this regard, namely

*“QRC wholly supports the amendments in the Bill to streamline notifications and objections that aim to streamline processes but ensuring **genuine concerns** on matters of environment regarding resource projects have a pathway for comment and consideration. QRC believes that the Queensland Government has a role to play in preventing vexatious objections and appeals against what is a resource that belongs to the people of Queensland.”*