PROOF ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard
E-mail: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
Phone (07) 3406 7314 Fax (07) 3210 0182

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 6 August 2013

Subject Page

FS SIMPSON
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

LJ OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 6 August 2013

TUESDAY, 6 AUGUST 2013

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Madam Speaker (Hon. Fiona Simpson, Maroochydore) read prayers and took the chair.

For the sitting week, Madam Speaker acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land upon which this parliament is assembled.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor letters in respect of assent to certain bills, the contents of which will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letters for the information of members.

The Honourable F. Simpson MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, was assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of assent: 12 June 2013

> "A Bill for An Act to amend the Duties Act 2001, the Electricity Act 1994, the Financial Accountability Act 2009, the Fire and Rescue Service Act 1990, the First Home Owner Grant Act 2000, the Payroll Tax Act 1971 and the Taxation Administration Act 2001 for particular purposes, to repeal the Future Growth Fund Act 2006, and to provide for an Act to establish Trade and Investment Queensland and to amend the Industrial Relations Regulation 2011 for related purposes"

This Bill is hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

Governor

12 June 2013

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 12 June 2013, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 12 June 2013 [2969].

The Honourable F. Simpson MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, was assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of assent: 20 June 2013

> "A Bill for An Act to amend the Industrial Relations Act 1999, the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950, the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Criminal Code, the Drug Court Act 2000, the Judicial Remuneration Act 2007, the Justices Act 1886, the Local Government Act 2009, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Public Service Act 2008, the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008, the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990 and the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 for particular purposes"

This Bill is hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

Governor

20 June 2013

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 20 June 2013, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 20 June 2013 [2968].

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Member; Apology

Mr DOWLING (Redlands—LNP) (9.31 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Madam Speaker, I understand you have received a letter of complaint about me. Firstly, can I say that I owe my family an apology. To Helen, my children, mum, brother and sister, my extended family and friends, I am sorry for the shame and embarrassment I have caused you. I am not proud of the events plastered all over today's paper and I cannot and will not defend any part of it. I owe my staff an apology for the calls and emails they will no doubt be fielding. I owe my colleagues, my fellow members, an apology for any embarrassment or any poor reflection on the party.

In relation to the allegations made about the use of travel allowances, I can assure the House that I have complied fully with all of the guidelines and requirements of the parliament. However, I do not wish for this issue and for my family to be dragged through the media any longer than necessary. As such, today I am voluntarily stepping aside from both committee roles so that this matter can be fully investigated and considered by the Clerk of the Parliament.

I do not want pity. I only ask that my family be left alone while this matter is considered by the Clerk. I will answer any questions, front any investigation and inquiry as it relates to my work as the member for Redlands. I look forward to a swift resolution to this matter and I thank, in anticipation, the media for respecting my family's privacy.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petitions, lodged by the honourable members indicated—

Nambour Railway Station

Mr Wellington, from 48 petitioners, requesting the House to allocate funds so that the upgrade to the Nambour train station to provide access services for disabled customers and to look at upgrading other train stations, like the Dakabin station can go ahead [2970].

Hartwig, Mr WC

Mr Krause, from 222 petitioners, requesting the House to appeal the sentence of Wayne Charles Hartwig and to look at ways at strengthening the laws in regards to animal cruelty to ensure perpetrators receive a more relevant sentence to the crime committed [2971].

Friends of the Burrum River System Group

Mrs Maddern, from 149 petitioners, requesting the House to pass a motion to co-operate with the Friends of the Burrum River System Group and put in place their flood mitigation and prevention solution [2972].

Colleges Crossing, Upgrade

Mr Choat, from 908 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade Colleges Crossing with a suitable structure that will remain open and accessible during flood mitigation from the Wivenhoe catchment [2973].

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

Old Yarranlea State School, Closure

Hon. Walker, from 3,620 petitioners, requesting the House to not close Old Yarranlea State School and to honour the agreement with Griffith University; ensure this unique school continues to operate to provide education to existing and new primary students; recognise the school as a Centre of Excellence for multi-age teaching; and ensure the school, in partnership with Griffith University, continues to provide quality teacher training and research opportunities for the future teachers of Queensland [2974] [2975].

Bruce Highway, Upgrade

Hon. Powell, from 2,910 petitioners, requesting the House to make the entire Sunshine Coast to Caboolture stretch of the Bruce Highway a priority section for six lanes when lobbying for Federal funding [2976] [2977].

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, sponsored and lodged by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Orders 119(3) and the following e-petition, lodged and sponsored by the honourable member indicated which is now closed and presented—

Kin Kin Quarry, Haulage Route

1,099 petitioners, requesting the House to commission a full impact assessment regarding local state controlled roads used by the Neilsen Group as the haulage route between their Kin Kin quarry and the Bruce Highway and a complete evaluation of any costs likely to be incurred in upgrading these roads and maintaining them for the lifespan of the quarry [2978] [2979].

The Clerk presented the following paper lodged by the member indicated and the following e-petition, sponsored and lodged by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Orders 119(4)—

Gold Coast Beaches, Repairs

From 3,352 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the State Government to pledge half of the $30 million the Council has advised it will cost to make the Gold Coast beaches fully operational again [2980] [2981].

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the honourable members indicated—

Inclusion Support Subsidy Funding

Ms France, from 63 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the Federal Minister for Early Childhood and Childcare, the Hon Kate Ellis MP, to reinstate Inclusion Support Subsidy funding used by day care services [2982].

Colleges Crossing, Upgrade

Mr Choat, from 212 petitioners, requesting the House to implement a process for the planned upgrade of Colleges Crossing with a suitable structure that will remain open and accessible during flood mitigation from the Wivenhoe catchment [2983].

Stillborn babies, Recognition

Mr Sorensen, 209 petitioners, requesting the House to recognise babies born from 16 weeks gestation by issuing a birth certificate [2984].

Nyanda State High School, Closure

Mr Judge, from 141 petitioners, requesting the House to not close Nyanda SHS and to ensure the school continues to provide education to existing and new students into the future [2985].

Rules Beach, Access

Mr Bennett, from 164 petitioners, requesting the House to take appropriate action to ensure that vehicle access to Rules Beach is re-opened as quickly as possible, or an alternative site for access to the beach is identified [2986].

Watercraft, Management Plan

Hon. McArdle, from 131 petitioners, requesting the House to urgently identify, support and resource the implementation of a management plan for the use of watercraft, including jet skis, in Pumicestone Passage [2987].

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4)—

Burnett River, Dredging

78 petitioners, requesting the House to urgently conduct a study to dredge, or otherwise, the Burnett River which is heavily silted, as a matter of urgency, as a flood mitigation strategy to assist in preventing a repeat of the tragic flooding of 2013 [2988].

Health Royal Commission

64 petitioners, requesting the House to pass a motion that calls on the Queensland Government to immediately establish a Health Royal Commission [2989].

Queensland Public Trustee, Inquiry

94 petitioners, requesting the House to pass a motion that calls on the Queensland Government to immediately hold an independent public inquiry which examines, details and justifies the fees and charges levied by the Queensland Public Trustee on all clients; and the officially acknowledged negative returns incurred by the Queensland Public Trustee for the last 5 years [2990].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

11 June 2013—

2883 Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to an ePetition (2008-13) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 431 petitioners, requesting the House to conduct a referendum on the proposal to de-amalgamate the former Redcliffe City Council from the current amalgamated local government area known as Moreton Bay Regional Council

2884 Notice of Decision: Application to Change Development Approval, pursuant to s.369 of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009, in relation to the Ministerial Call-In of a development application at 3496-3498 Main Beach Parade, Main Beach

12 June 2013—

2885 Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 8 for 2012-13—Online Service Delivery: Erratum

2886 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 26—Subordinate legislation tabled between 17 April 2013 and 21 May 2013

14 June 2013—

2887 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Premier (Mr Newman) to Papua New Guinea, 14-15 May 2013

2888 Report on the Impact of Australian Skills Quality Authority Fees on Queensland School Registered Training Organisations for 2012-13

2889 Queensland Bulk Water Transport Authority—Final Annual Report 2012-13

17 June 2013—

2890 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 25—Directors' Liability Reform Amendment Bill 2012: Government Response

2891 Response from the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney) to an ePetition (2064-13) sponsored by Mr Wellington, from 14 petitioners, requesting the House to put the Mary Valley properties onto the open market to get the best result for all Queenslanders

2892 Response from the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games (Mrs Stuckey) to a paper petition (2121-13) presented by Mr Hathaway, from 271 petitioners, requesting the House to continue the V8 Supercar event in Townsville

18 June 2013—

2893 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Hon. Dr McVeigh) to Indonesia, 12-15 May 2013

2894 Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to a paper petition (2114-12) and an ePetition (2035-13) presented by Ms Palaszczuk, from 158 and 222 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to continue the vital funding for Advisory Visiting Teacher-Hearing Impaired support to non-state and independent schools

2895 Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to a paper petition (2118-12) presented by Mrs Cunningham, from 1,045 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the parcel of land at 55 Don Cameron Drive, Lot 126 Calliope is not sold but retained as government land for the proposed Calliope State High School

19 June 2013—

2896 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 26—Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013

2897 Response from the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney) to a paper petition (2113-13) presented by Mr Trout, from 349 petitioners, requesting the House to remove the State requirement for Tablelands Regional Council to impose flood overlays as part of their Planning Scheme until and unless the overlays accurately reflect the situation

2898 Queensland Water Commission—Final Report for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2012

20 June 2013—

2899 Urban Land Development Authority—Final Report for the period 1 July 2011 to 31 January 2013

2900 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2115-13) presented by Ms Palaszczuk, from 301 petitioners, requesting the House to fund the Sumners Road interchange project

2901 Response from the Minister Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to an ePetition (2040-13) sponsored by Hon Cripps, from 14 petitioners, requesting the House to reduce the speed limit on the Bruce Highway, El Arish 4855 from 80 kph to 60 kph

21 June 2013—

2902 Major Rail Incident Investigation: Serious Injury Collision, St Vincents Road, Banyo, 14 September 2012—Final Report

2903 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2117-13) presented by Mrs Cunningham, from 76 petitioners, requesting the House to resume the old bus routes and timetables for the Gladstone and Boyne-Tannum bus network until a solution to the unacceptable new timetables can be found

2904 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2120-13) presented by Mr Bennett, from 1,888 petitioners, requesting the House to give consideration to re-opening the Isis Junction Railway Station for passengers from Buxton, Childers and surrounding towns to access train

2905 Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to a paper petition (2119-13) presented by Mrs Frecklington, from 2,105 petitioners, requesting the House to support mental illness, clinical depression and addictions by providing the level of help sufferers need at the onset of diagnosis by ongoing therapeutic counselling and specialised residential programs

24 June 2013—

2906 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Deputy Speaker (Dr Robinson) to Singapore, 27-31 May 2013—Report to the Queensland Parliament on the Overseas Trip to Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) Annual Seminar 2013 and the Singapore Parliament

2907 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to an ePetition (2063-13) sponsored by Mr Wellington from 71 petitioners, requesting the House to allocate funds for the upgrade to the Nambour train station to provide access services for disabled customers and to look at upgrading other train stations, like the Dakabin station

26 June 2013—

2908 Crime and Misconduct Commission: Report titled 'Multiple and prolonged Taser deployments', dated June 2013

2909 Marine Incidents in Queensland 2012

27 June 2013—

2910 Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament 15: 2012-13—Enforcement and collection of parking fines

2911 Electricity Industry Code made under the Electricity Act 1994 (Thirteenth Edition: approved 26 February 2013, effective 1 March 2013)

28 June 2013—

2912 Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to a paper petition (2116-13) presented by Mr Knuth, from 1,000 petitioners, requesting the House to oppose any plans or proposals to sell off, close down or privatise the Eventide Aged Care Facility in Charters Towers

2913 Economic Development Act 2012: Proclamation—commencing certain provisions, No. 257—Erratum to Explanatory Notes

2914 State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971: State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2012, No. 258—Erratum to Explanatory Notes

2915 Economic Development Act 2012: Economic Development (Vegetation Management) By-Law 2013, No. 3—Erratum to Explanatory Notes

1 July 2013—

2916 Response from the Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr McArdle) to an ePetition (2083-13) sponsored by Mr Pitt, from 214 petitioners, requesting the House to keep the election commitment to Queenslanders to address rising energy bills

2917 Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry: Taking Responsibility: A for Queensland Child Protection, dated June 2013: Volume 1 and 2

2918 Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry: 3(e) Report, dated June 2013

2 July 2013—

2919 Response from the Minister Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to an ePetition (2082-13) sponsored by Ms Palaszczuk, from 473 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate the model previously used to calculate staffing resources for Queensland State schools

2920 Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 26—Oversight of the Queensland Integrity Commissioner 2012 and Review of Lobbyists Code of Conduct: Government response

2921 Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to a paper petition (2126-13) presented by Ms Palaszczuk, from 610 petitioners, requesting the House to reverse the decision to close facilities at Eventide Nursing Home and Zillmere's Ashworth House but if the facilities do close to rule out selling the land to developers for purposes such as high-rise units

2922 Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to an ePetition (2062-13) sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 77 petitioners, requesting the House to ask the Federal Treasurer to reinstate Commonwealth health funding of $6.5 million to the Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service

3 July 2013—

2923 Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee: Report No. 90—Inquiry into the Crime and Misconduct Commission's release and destruction of Fitzgerald Inquiry documents and Review of the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001 and Related matters, by the Honourable Ian Callinan AC and Professor Nicholas Aroney: Government response

4 July 2013—

2924 Response from the Minister Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services (Ms Davis) to an ePetition (2061-13) sponsored by Mrs Miller, from 158 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate the Home and Community Care Services that have been recently closed

2925 Response from the Minister for Local Government Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to a paper petition (2130-13) presented Mr Trout, from 985 petitioners, requesting the House to allow a local government boundary change that will enable Kuranda District to separate from the Mareeba Shire Council

2926 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2125-13) presented by Mr Dowling, from 947 petitioners, requesting the House to place the Southern Moreton Bay Islands into TransLink's Zone 8

2927 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2127-13) presented by Mrs Maddern, from 742 petitioners, requesting the House to install flashing school signs to alert drivers to the reduced speed limit during school arrival and departure times at St Helens School, Maryborough

2928 Response from the Minister Health (Mr Springborg) to an ePetition (2048-13) sponsored by Mrs Miller, from 260 petitioners, requesting the House to guarantee continuation of vital frontline health services at Morven Outpatient Clinic located in Morven, South-West Queensland; protect the position and reinstate the Director of Nursing and reverse the decision to service the clinic from Augathella

5 July 2013—

2929 Notice of Appointment of Mr Mitchell Kunde as Acting Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner

8 July 2013—

2930 Response from the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Mr McVeigh) to an ePetition (2038-12) presented to Mr Grimwade, from 136 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008 so that dog owners are held accountable for their animal's actions and not able to move their animals to another area to escape punishment

9 July 2013—

2931 Report of the Third Review of the National Environment Protection Council Acts (Commonwealth, State and Territory), December 2012 and the National Environment Protection Council Response to the Report of the Third Review of the National Environment Protection Council Acts (Commonwealth, State and Territory), April 2013

10 July 2013—

2932 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 27—Subordinate legislation tabled between 22 May 2013 and 4 June 2013

11 July 2013—

2933 Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament 1: 2013-14—Right of private practice in Queensland public hospitals

16 July 2013—

2934 Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 16—Education Legislation Amendment Bill 2013

18 July 2013—

2935 Review of the Regulation of Restrictive Practices in the Disability Services Act 2006 and the Guardianship and Administration Act 2000—Discussion Paper

2936 Letter, dated 18 July 2013 from the Minister for Health (Hon Springborg) to the Clerk of the Parliament regarding the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Amendment (Midwife Insurance Exemption) Regulation 2013

2937 Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Amendment (Midwife Insurance Exemption) Regulation 2013, made by the Australian Health Workforce Ministerial Council under section 245 of the Health Practitioner National Law and published by the Victorian Government Printer on 20 June 2013

22 July 2013—

2938 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek), 15-23 June 2013 (refer to tabled paper number 5413T2944)

25 July 2013—

2939 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 24—Oversight of the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian

2940 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 8—Inquiry into the Motorcycle Licensing Process in Queensland 2012: Additional Government Response

26 July 2013—

2941 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 21—Oversight of the Health Quality and Complaints Commission: Government response

2942 Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 7—Consideration of the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill 2013

2943 Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 24—Subordinate legislation tabled between 30 April 2013 and 4 June 2013

29 July 2013—

2944 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to the People's Republic of China, 15-23 June 2013 (replacement report)

31 July 2013—

2945 Queensland Law Reform Commission: A Review of the Trusts Act 1973 (Qld)—Interim Report

2946 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 27—Queensland Building Services Authority Amendment Bill 2013

2947 Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 30—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2948 Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 30—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information

2949 Ethics Committee: Interim Report No. 134 Proceeding with suspended matters—Matter of privilege referred by the Registrar on 19 March 2013 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests; and Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 4 June 2013 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by a member; and other suspended matters

2 August 2013—

2950 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 28—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2951 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 28—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information

2952 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 28—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2953 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 28—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information

2954 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 29—Subordinate legislation tabled on 16 April 2013 and 30 April 2013

2955 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 23—Subordinate legislation tabled on 12 February 2013 (SL234-250) (SL9-16): Government Response

2956 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 32—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2957 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 32—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information

2958 Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 17—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2959 Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 17—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information

2960 Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 25—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2961 Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 25—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information

2962 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 25—2013-14 Budget Estimates

2963 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 25—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information Volume 1

2964 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 25—2013-14 Budget Estimates: Additional Information Volume 2

5 August 2013—

2965 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Speaker (Hon Simpson) to the Scottish Parliament, 13-14 June 2013

2966 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Speaker (Hon Simpson) to the Westminster Seminar on Parliamentary Practice and Procedures, United Kingdom, 9-26 June 2013

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Professional Standards Act 2004—

2991 Professional Standards (Law Institute of Victoria Limited Scheme) Notice 2013, No. 88

2992 Professional Standards (Law Institute of Victoria Limited Scheme) Notice 2013, No. 88, Explanatory Notes

2993 Professional Standards Act 2004: Document titled 'Amendment Instrument: Instrument Amending the Law Institute of Victoria Limited Scheme ' made under the Professional Standards Act 2003 (VIC) (Refer Subordinate Legislation No. 88 tabled on 6 August 2013)

Duties Act 2001, Land Tax Act 2010, Mineral Resources Act 1989, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999—

2994 Revenue Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 89

2995 Revenue Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 89, Explanatory Notes

Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Act 2000—

2996 Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 90

2997 Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 90, Explanatory Notes

Adoption Act 2009—

2998 Adoption Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 91

2999 Adoption Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 91, Explanatory Notes

Disability Services Act 2006—

3000 Disability Services Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 92

3001 Disability Services Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 92, Explanatory Notes

Economic Development Act 2012—

3002 Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 93

3003 Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 93, Explanatory Notes

3004 Document, dated June 2013 titled 'Toondah Harbour Priority Development Area Interim Land Use Plan' (refer Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013: Subordinate Legislation No. 93 of 2013)

3005 Document, Regulatory Map Toondah Harbour (refer Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013: Subordinate Legislation No. 93 of 2013)

3006 Document, dated June 2013 titled 'Weinam Creek Priority Development Area Interim Land Use Plan' (refer Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013: Subordinate Legislation No. 93 of 2013 tabled 6 August 2013)

3007 Document, Regulatory Map, Weinam Creek (refer Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013: Subordinate Legislation No. 93 of 2013 tabled 6 August 2013)

3008 Document, dated June 2013 titled 'Blackwater East Priority Development Area Interim Land Use Plan' (refer Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013: Subordinate Legislation No. 93 of 2013 tabled 6 August 2013)

3009 Document, Regulatory Map Blackwater East (refer Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013: Subordinate Legislation No. 93 of 2013 tabled 6 August 2013)

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990—

3010 Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment of Deed Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 94

3011 Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment of Deed Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 94, Explanatory Notes

Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994—

3012 Motor Accident Insurance Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 95

3013 Motor Accident Insurance Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 95, Explanatory Notes

Childrens Court Act 1992—

3014 Childrens Court Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 96

3015 Childrens Court Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 96, Explanatory Notes

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991—

3016 Criminal Practice Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 97

3017 Criminal Practice Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 97, Explanatory Notes

Industrial Relations Act 1999—

3018 Industrial Relations (Tribunals) Amendment Rule (No. 2) 2013, No. 98

3019 Industrial Relations (Tribunals) Amendment Rule (No. 2) 2013, No. 98, Explanatory Notes

Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

3020 Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 99

3021 Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 99, Explanatory Notes

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991—

3022 Uniform Civil Procedure Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 100

3023 Uniform Civil Procedure Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 100, Explanatory Notes

Weapons and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2012—

3024 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 101

3025 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 101, Explanatory Notes

Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966, Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008, Apiaries Act 1982, Brands Act 1915, Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988, Drugs Misuse Act 1986, Fisheries Act 1994, Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Stock Act 1915, Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936—

3026 Agriculture and Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 102

3027 Agriculture and Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 102, Explanatory Notes

Animal Care and Protection Act 2001—

3028 Animal Care and Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 103

3029 Animal Care and Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 103, Explanatory Notes

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002—

3030 Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 104

3031 Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 104, Explanatory Notes

Electricity Act 1994, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

3032 Electricity and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1), 2013, No. 105

3033 Electricity and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1), 2013, No. 105, Explanatory Notes

Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

3034 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 106

3035 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 106, Explanatory Notes

Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000—

3036 Vocational Education, Training and Employment Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 107

3037 Vocational Education, Training and Employment Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 107, Explanatory Notes

TAFE Queensland Act 2013—

3038 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 108

3039 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 108, Explanatory Notes

Civil Liability Act 2003, Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982, TAFE Queensland Act 2013, Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000, Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003—

3040 TAFE Queensland Regulation 2013, No. 109

3041 TAFE Queensland Regulation 2013, No. 109, Explanatory Notes

Ambulance Service Act 1991, Building Act 1975, Fire and Rescue Service Act 1990—

3042 Community Safety Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 110

3043 Community Safety Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 110, Explanatory Notes

Professional Standards Act 2004—

3044 Professional Standards (Bar Association of Queensland Scheme) Notice 2013, No. 111

3045 Professional Standards (Bar Association of Queensland Scheme) Notice 2013, No. 111, Explanatory Notes

3046 Professional Standards Act 2004: Document titled 'The Bar Association of Queensland, A Scheme under the Professional Standards Act 2004 (Qld)' (Refer Subordinate Legislation No. 111 tabled on 6 August 2013)

Financial Accountability Act 2009—

3047 Finance and Performance Management Amendment Standard (No. 1) 2013, No. 112

3048 Finance and Performance Management Amendment Standard (No. 1) 2013, No. 112, Explanatory Notes

Sustainable Planning and Other Legislation Amendment Act (No. 2) 2012—

3049 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 113

3050 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 113, Explanatory Notes

Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

3051 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 114

3052 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 114, Explanatory Notes

Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Act 1992—

3053 Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 115

3054 Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 115, Explanatory Notes

Work Health and Safety Act 2011—

3055 Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 116

3056 Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 116, Explanatory Notes

Safety in Recreational Water Activities Act 2011—

3057 Safety in Recreational Water Activities Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 117

3058 Safety in Recreational Water Activities Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 117, Explanatory Notes

Civil Liability Act 2003, Personal Injuries Proceedings Act 2002, Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003—

3059 Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 118

3060 Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 118, Explanatory Notes

Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

3061 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 119

3062 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 119, Explanatory Notes

Gaming Machine Act 1991, Liquor Act 1992—

3063 Gaming Machine and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 120

3064 Gaming Machine and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 120, Explanatory Notes

Casino Control Act 1982, Gaming Machine Act 1991, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, Keno Act 1996, Lotteries Act 1997, Wagering Act 1998—

3065 Gaming Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 121

3066 Gaming Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 121, Explanatory Notes

Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973, Associations Incorporation Act 1981, Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003, Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997, Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980, Casino Control Act 1982, Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999, Collections Act 1966, Cooperatives Act 1997, Coroners Act 2003, Dispute Resolution Centres Act 1990, Electoral Act 1992, Electrical Safety Act 2002, Evidence Act 1977, Funeral Benefit Business Act 1982, Gaming Machine Act 1991, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, Introduction Agents Act 2001, Jury Act 1995, Justices Act 1886, Justices of the Peace and Commissioners for Declarations Act 1991, Keno Act 1996, Land Court Act 2000, Land Sales Act 1984, Legal Profession Act 2007, Liquor Act 1992, Lotteries Act 1997, Partnership Act 1891, Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, Personal Property Securities (Ancillary Provisions) Act 2010, Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act 2000, Property Law Act 1974, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Recording of Evidence Act 1962, Relationships Act 2011, Retail Shop Leases Act 1994, Right to Information Act 2009, Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003, Security Providers Act 1993, Status of Children Act 1978, Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991, Tourism Services Act 2003, Travel Agents Act 1988, Wagering Act 1998, Wine Industry Act 1994, Work Health and Safety Act 2011—

3067 Justice Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 122

3068 Justice Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 122, Explanatory Notes

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991—

3069 Uniform Civil Procedure and Another Rule Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 123

3070 Uniform Civil Procedure and Another Rule Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2013, No. 123, Explanatory Notes

Public Trustee Act 1978—

3071 Public Trustee Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 124

3072 Public Trustee Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 124, Explanatory Notes

Prostitution Act 1999, Weapons Act 1990—

3073 Police Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 125

3074 Police Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 125, Explanatory Notes

Land, Water and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

3075 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 126

3076 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 126, Explanatory Notes

Vegetation Management Act 1999—

3077 Vegetation Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 127

3078 Vegetation Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 127, Explanatory Notes

Architects Act 2002, Building Act 1975, Building and Construction Industry Payments Act 2004, Domestic Building Contracts Act 2000, Housing Act 2003, Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, Professional Engineers Act 2002, Queensland Building Services Authority Act 1991, Residential Services (Accreditation) Act 2002, Retirement Villages Act 1999—

3079 Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 128

3080 Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 128, Explanatory Notes

Public Records Act 2002—

3081 Public Records Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 129

3082 Public Records Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 129, Explanatory Notes

Safety in Recreational Water Activities Act 2011—

3083 Safety in Recreational Water Activities (Codes of Practice) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2013, No. 130

3084 Safety in Recreational Water Activities (Codes of Practice) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2013, No. 130, Explanatory Notes

Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Act 2003—

3085 Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Endorsement) Notice (No. 1) 2013, No. 131

3086 Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Endorsement) Notice (No. 1) 2013, No. 131, Explanatory Notes

Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Act 2013—

3087 Proclamation commencement of certain provisions, No. 132

3088 Proclamation commencement of certain provisions, No. 132, Explanatory Notes

Industrial Relations Act 1999—

3089 Industrial Relations Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 133

3090 Industrial Relations Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 133, Explanatory Notes

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971—

3091 State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 134

3092 State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 134, Explanatory Notes

Body Corporate and Community Management and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

3093 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions 2013, No. 135

3094 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions 2013, No. 135, Explanatory Notes

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

3095 Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 136

3096 Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 136, Explanatory Notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991, Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991

3097 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 137

3098 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 137, Explanatory Notes

Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002—

3099 Standard Plumbing and Drainage Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 138

3100 Standard Plumbing and Drainage Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 138, Explanatory Notes

Economic Development Act 2012—

3101 Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 139

3102 Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 139, Explanatory Notes

Funeral Benefit Business Act 1982—

3103 Funeral Benefit Business Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 140

3104 Funeral Benefit Business Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 140, Explanatory Notes

Plant Protection Act 1989—

3105 Plant Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 141

3106 Plant Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 141, Explanatory Notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991—

3107 Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 142

3108 Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 142, Explanatory Notes

Plant Protection Act 1989—

3109 Plant Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2013, No. 143

3110 Plant Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2013, No. 143, Explanatory Notes

Land Act 1994—

3111 Land Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 144

3112 Land Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 144, Explanatory Notes

Liquor Act 1992—

3113 Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 145

3114 Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 145, Explanatory Notes

Justices Act 1886—

3115 Justices Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 146

3116 Justices Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 146, Explanatory Notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991—

3117 Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2013, No. 147

3118 Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2013, No. 147, Explanatory Notes

City of Brisbane Act 2010, Local Government Act 2009—

3119 Local Government Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 148

3120 Local Government Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2013, No. 148, Explanatory Notes

Racing and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2012—

3121 Proclamation—commencing remaining provisions, No. 149

3122 Proclamation—commencing remaining provisions, No. 149, Explanatory Notes

State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

3123 Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 150

3124 Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 150, Explanatory Notes

Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

3125 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 151

3126 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 151, Explanatory Notes

Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988—

3127 Foreign Ownership of Land Register Regulation 2013, No. 152

3128 Foreign Ownership of Land Register Regulation 2013, No. 152, Explanatory Notes

Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

3129 Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 153

3130 Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 153, Explanatory Notes

EXEMPT STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Information Privacy Act 2009—

3131 Waiver of privacy principle obligations in the public interest No. 4 (2013)

3132 Waiver of privacy principle obligations in the public interest No. 4 (2013), Explanatory Notes

Public Trustee Act 1978—

3133 Public Trustee (Fees & Charges Notice) (No. 1) 2013

3134 Public Trustee (Fees & Charges Notice) (No. 1) 2013, Explanatory Notes

MINISTERIAL PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Police and Community Safety (Mr Dempsey)—

3135 Queensland Police Service—Authorities for Assumed Identities: Annual Report 2012-13

MEMBERS' PAPERS TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Inala (Ms Palaszczuk)—

3136 Letter dated 11 June 2013, from the Leader of the Opposition (Ms Palaszczuk) to the Integrity Commissioner (Dr Solomon)

3137 Opposition Diary—Leader of the Opposition, 1 April 2013 to 30 April 2013

3138 Letter dated 8 July 2013, from the Leader of the Opposition (Ms Palaszczuk) to the Integrity Commissioner (Dr Solomon)

3139 Opposition Diary—Leader of the Opposition, 1 May 2013 to 31 May 2013

Member for Nanango (Mrs Frecklington)—

3140 Non-conforming petition regarding the proposed increases to electricity tariffs

Member for Bundamba (Mrs Miller)—

3141 Non-conforming petition regarding the proposed increases to electricity tariffs

Member for Sandgate (Ms Millard)—

3142 Non-conforming petition regarding the proposed increases to electricity tariffs

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Member for Redlands

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.37 am): Madam Speaker, in this morning's *Courier-Mail* there is a story that details a number of complaints to you regarding the member for Redlands. I understand that you have appropriately referred the matter to the Clerk as the responsible officer to investigate these matters as (a) the register of interests in accordance with the complaints procedure regarding declarations of interest in section 16 of schedule 2 of the standing orders; and (b) the accountable officer under section 66 of the Financial Accountability Act 2009. I further understand that the Clerk is currently considering these matters.

I note that the Clerk has a duty in accordance with schedule 2 of the standing orders to refer to the Ethics Committee any matter where there is reasonable grounds and evidence to support an allegation of failure to comply with any disclosure requirements. I also note that the Clerk has an obligation under section 38 of the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001 to notify the CMC if the Clerk suspects that a complaint or information or matter, also a complaint, involves or may involve official misconduct.

Whilst the Clerk is considering these matters, the member for Redlands will stand down in accordance with standing order 202 from his position as chair of the Ethics Committee and the Leader of the House will appoint a replacement chair in accordance with that provision. The House can be assured that the appropriate action is being undertaken in respect of this matter by the appropriate authorities. I would hope that all members respect the procedures and allow the matter to be dealt with in a proper and fair manner.

Baird, Corporal CS, Motion to Take Note

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.40 am): This morning it is with deep regret that I reflect upon the death of Corporal Cameron Stewart Baird MG, who, on 22 June 2013, became the 40th Australian soldier to be killed while serving in Afghanistan. Born in Burnie, Tasmania in 1981, Corporal Baird was a decorated member of the Special Operations Task Group and was from the 2nd Commando Regiment based at Holsworthy Barracks in Sydney. Corporal Baird joined the Army in January 2000 and, upon completion of his initial employment training, was posted to the then 4th Battalion (Commando) The Royal Australian Regiment, now the 2nd Commando Regiment.

It is reported that Commando Baird was an outstanding Special Forces soldier who exemplified what it meant to be a commando, living by the attributes of uncompromising spirit and honour that, in turn, earned him the unconditional respect of his fellow commandos. In November 2007, while still a lance corporal, he led members of his unit forward into an enemy compound through heavy fire in order to recover a fallen comrade and return him to a safe position. Lance Corporal Baird then led his team back into the compound to re-engage the enemy, winning the close-quarter battle and successfully clearing the compound. Corporal Baird's leadership and composure in that perilous situation were without doubt what prevented his unit from suffering further casualties and earned him the Medal for Gallantry for extreme courage under fire.

Corporal Baird was again leading a commando team in a raid on an insurgent position in the Khod Valley in Uruzgan Province when he was killed by small arms fire. In a statement from the Australian Defence Force, Corporal Baird was said to have died as he had lived with unfailing courage, giving it his all and always striving for excellence.

Corporal Baird was said to have inspired greatness in his fellow soldiers. I am certainly inspired by his bravery and his example. It is always a source of great comfort and pride to know as a society that people such as Corporal Baird have walked among us, if only for a short time.

On behalf of the House, I place on record our deepest regret for the death of Corporal Cameron Stewart Baird MG and thank him for his service to our nation. I also take this opportunity to extend my sympathy and that of this House to Corporal Baird's family and friends. I move—

1. That the House take note of the statement; and

2. That the House acknowledges agreement by observing a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.42 am): I echo the Premier's sentiments this morning. I rise in this House to pay tribute to Corporal Cameron Baird who was the 40th Australian soldier to lose his life in Afghanistan when he was killed by insurgents on 22 June this year whilst serving with the Australian Special Operations Task Group. Corporal Baird was from the 2nd Commando Regiment based at Holsworthy Barracks in Sydney, New South Wales.

He has been described by his family as a 'very humble man and a straight shooter, who told you what he thought but never held a grudge'. His colleagues described him as 'an outstanding special forces soldier.' This is evidenced by his receipt of the Medal for Gallantry awarded for gallantry in action during close-quarters combat in Afghanistan on Operation Slipper.

The description of his conduct during this operation, which was a clearance and search mission of a Taliban stronghold, illustrates the qualities that exemplify the conduct of so many Australian soldiers who have gone before him. His tenacity and courage under fire, the leadership he displayed and his composure were an example to all men who served with him.

Corporal Baird gave the ultimate sacrifice for his family, his friends, his comrades and his country. Even those of us who have never had the privilege of meeting him are changed forever for having known of his bravery and sacrifice. We owe a debt of gratitude not only to Corporal Baird and his family but to the 39 soldiers before him who have lost their lives in Afghanistan. We also owe a debt of gratitude to all Australian soldiers who have served and who are still serving in Afghanistan. We pledge today, as we do on every Anzac Day—we will remember them.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Whereupon honourable members stood in silence.

Liu, Dr JE, Motion to Take Note

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.45 am): I was greatly saddened by the recent death of a great Queenslander, Dr Eddie Liu. There have been many monikers used in tribute to Eddie—gentleman, community leader, successful businessman, philanthropist and multicultural trailblazer—and all of them are befitting of this man. As Lord Mayor of Brisbane I had the privilege to get to know Eddie very well. Affectionately called the 'Father of Brisbane's Chinatown', Eddie was a passionate advocate for Chinatown and for small business and commerce in the Fortitude Valley precinct generally.

After a childhood marked by poverty and oppression in Hong Kong, Eddie came to Australia in 1937 at the age of 14 and became a successful businessman and widely respected community leader. As his son Peter said so eloquently in his eulogy, his father never asked for anything other than opportunity. Opportunity is what he found after settling in Brisbane during World War II.

There has not been a more passionate and devoted advocate for the Chinese community not just in Brisbane but right across Australia. Eddie was also a tireless volunteer and generous philanthropist. The list of causes which Eddie supported is long. He fundraised for wartime refugees during World War II, the Guide Dogs, the Leukaemia Foundation and both the Mater and Royal Brisbane Children's hospitals, just to name a few.

He was a pioneer of modern Australian multiculturalism, at a time when there was barely even a word for it. Eddie even married his sweetheart, Elizabeth, herself of Irish Catholic descent, at a time when inter-racial marriages were certainly not the norm in Brisbane. Their union was long and loving, and they raised a family of six children.

For his unflinching service to the community and promotion of multiculturalism in Australia, Eddie was awarded the Order of the British Empire in 1980, awarded the Order of Australia in 2001, made an Honorary Ambassador for Brisbane in 1987, named Senior Citizen of the Year in 2007, named Australian of the Year Local Hero in 2004, made an Honorary Ambassador for Queensland for Australia Day in 2008 and named a Queensland Great in 2010.

The love and admiration that so many had for Eddie was clearly evident through the outpouring of stories that were shared at his recent funeral. While Eddie's passing is a sad time for those who knew and loved him, his enduring legacies will be a comfort. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the government to place on record our thanks for the years of service that Eddie gave to the Queensland community. On behalf of the government, I extend my sympathy and that of this House to Dr Liu's family and friends. I move—

That the House take note of this statement.

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.48 am): On behalf of the opposition and the broader Queensland community, I join with the Premier and the government today in expressing our sincere condolences for the loss of Dr James Edward 'Eddie' Liu OBE OAM. Mr Liu, as I am sure all members will be aware, was an integral part of the very fabric of our Chinese community—indeed he was an integral part of the very fabric of our diverse multicultural Queensland. I know that his passing has had a profound effect on that community. I know he will be sadly missed.

Eddie Liu was born in Hong Kong and arrived in Australia in 1937, when he was just a teenager. From an early age he was dedicated to the community. As he moved into adulthood Mr Liu was renowned for his tireless dedication and commitment to Brisbane's cultural fabric, particularly the Chinese community. He co-founded the Chinese Club of Queensland in the 1950s and he is best remembered as the 'Father of Chinatown', a title he deservedly earned. Eddie once said, 'The best thing you can achieve is to do something for your community'—and he certainly practised what he preached. He worked tirelessly for Queensland's Chinese community and raised much needed funds for a wide variety of charities. As the former minister for multicultural affairs, I also had the privilege of meeting Eddie Liu on a number of occasions and I was very impressed that he was at so many multicultural events right across South-East Queensland.

I attended the funeral service for Eddie at City Hall last month, and it was a tribute to this great man that so many hundreds of people came to pay their respects. I think the lines spoken at that service by his son Peter said it all. I know the Premier has quoted some of them. Peter said of his father—

He didn't feel sorry for himself and during his life he never asked for anything other than an opportunity.

So his sense of self-worth would be anchored on the traditional Chinese principle of self-provision.

That is something the Chinese really believe in. Self provision.

Peter went on to say that all of his life his father had strived to become a gentleman. 'He came from abject poverty,' he said. 'So he dressed up, he looked like a gentleman, he spoke like a gentleman, he behaved like a gentleman and he treated people like a gentleman.' Madam Speaker, that is a quality we should encourage in young Queenslanders.

Eddie was deserving of the many honours he received in his lifetime, including the Order of the British Empire and an Order of Australia, as well as being named Local Hero for Queensland in the Australian of the Year awards.

His passing is a great loss to the Chinese community and the broader Queensland population. My thoughts are with his six children, and I offer them my condolences and the condolences of all members of this side of the House. Eddie Liu passed away on 25 June 2013, aged 91. He was a great man. He was a true gentleman and he will be sadly missed.

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (9.51 am): I wish to join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in saying a few short words in relation to the recent passing of Dr Eddie Liu. I first knew Dr Liu as a councillor in the Brisbane City Council. I received a phone call from him out of the blue one day saying, 'What are you going to do about the toilets at the "Joss House"?' I really was not too sure what he was talking about, but Eddie was ringing up to seek council funding to fix up the toilets at the Temple of the Holy Triad at Breakfast Creek.

For those of you who do not know the Breakfast Creek area, next to the hotel you will find a small Chinese-looking structure that has been around for over 80 years and which was used as a place of worship by people with a Chinese background over a long period of time. The lavatories there had deteriorated over that period of time. So Dr Eddie Liu said, 'Well, Tim, you and Hinchie'—I presume he meant Councillor David Hinchliffe—'should put some funds into looking after this historical area.' In a rare gesture of bipartisan support, we both did. From that time onwards I think Eddie Liu has been a firm friend of mine and my family.

He then subsequently invited us, as I am sure he did the Premier and others in the Brisbane City Council, to yum cha at the Aspley Hypermarket and to various functions to honour certain dignitaries, whether it was the retirement of Archbishop Bathersby, the retirement of the then Lord Mayor of Brisbane back in 2011 and many others. Eddie Liu was always extending the hand of friendship to many, many people and he did it without fear or favour, both political and business wise. I think that was one of the things that established him so firmly in the heart, of those people who got to know him.

It was always a time of anticipation around Chinese New Year when people would receive an invitation to attend the Chinese Club of Queensland's New Year celebrations and to see Eddie's son Frank, as the master of ceremonies, continually changing his jacket. He would have a different jacket for each stage of the seven-stage show. There were as many stages of the show as there were courses for dinner, and many people came from all over the country.

It would be a rare event indeed to go to a Chinese function in the Valley or around Chinese New Year and not see Eddie Liu in his distinctive white suit with a carnation in his lapel at all times. He was, as many have said, a true gentleman. I regret that because of other commitments I was unable to make the memorial service that was held for him at City Hall a month ago. But I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing on behalf of myself and my wife, Mary, our condolences to Eddie's family and his children.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Queensland Health Payroll System Commission of Inquiry, Report

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.54 am): I have received the report of the Queensland Health Payroll System Commission of Inquiry by the Hon. Richard Chesterman AO, QC. I now table the report for the benefit of members.

Tabled paper: Queensland Health Payroll System Commission of Inquiry Report, dated 31 July 2013 [2967].

From 1 February, the commission held 36 days of public hearings and examined 60 witnesses. One hundred and eighteen witnesses were interviewed and 119 summons or requests for information were issued. There were 44 submissions from parties with leave to appear and 20 submissions from the general public. The inquiry found—

The replacement of the QH payroll system must take a place in the front rank of failures in public administration in this country. It may be the worst.

They are the words of the commission of inquiry.

This payroll system was contracted from the international IT service provider IBM and was to cost Queensland taxpayers $6.194 million—$6.194 million. Instead it will have cost about $1.2 billion by 2017. Steps taken by this government have helped stabilise its operation, but today it still requires more than 800 employees to process pay for the Queensland Health staff each fortnight.

The inquiry found that the former Labor government entered into a settlement with IBM that is binding upon the state. It provides no means by which Queensland may seek damages from IBM for breach of contract. This is salt into the wounds of Queenslanders to the lasting shame of members opposite.

Four recommendations are provided that will inform our future behaviour in the delivery of contracts and administrative arrangements vital to the future of this state. The appalling failures and incompetency that hurt Queenslanders during the saga of the Health payroll fiasco must not be repeated. But Queenslanders are angry and they are entitled to know why it took a change of government and almost three years of waiting before these facts could be known.

In this forum and with this cautionary tale now firmly in hand, I put it to the opposition leader through you, Madam Speaker, what possible benefit did Labor hope to achieve for Queensland by delaying public access to the truth? Before she left, the last Labor Premier railed against the sick administrative culture of Queensland Health, but this report shows that the same lack of accountability, duckshoving and blame shifting was dangerously endemic at every level and across the full range of public administration under Labor. It paints a damning picture of a disconnected political leadership and blundering and incompetent directors-general, Michael Reid and Mal Grierson, who were hand-picked to be expert in scapegoating, not decision making.

The then director-general of Health, Michael Reid, was briefed about the payroll situation. The commissioner found that he took no responsibility and suffered no consequence. The report finds that the contract that made IBM the former government's prime contractor in the delivery of the ill-fated Shared Services Initiative should never have been signed. The government's program delivery director, Terry Burns, favoured IBM over other tendering companies. Public Service panels to rate the bids show signs of being tampered with. There was not even a probity adviser or a conflicts register. What is more, we cannot even locate the contact with lobbyist registers or access the diaries of former Labor ministers without paying huge sums in RTI fees to determine whether any Labor ministers had contact with IBM or other parties involved in this debacle.

Ms Palaszczuk: You don't even table your diaries in the House.

Mr NEWMAN: I urge the Leader of the Opposition to stop the interjections and listen because this is what this week is all about. Prices tendered were not properly analysed. IBM identified its price—$98 million—in a footnote and boasted, 'Our agency-centric strategy will help you cost-effectively achieve these goals through maximised uptake of the solution.' In fact, evidence shows theirs was an unviable bid, tailored to suit the reserve of remaining funds previously allocated by the Bligh government. IBM went so far as to provide misleading references about its proposed computing solutions, citing satisfaction from users including major retailers that was not substantiated.

When the deal inevitably exploded, the former Labor government did nothing to fully understand the circumstances or to properly learn from the experience. A technical expert, Dr David Manfield, told the commission, 'It was Plan A or die.' He described efforts to coordinate planning between the government and IBM as 'a death spiral'.

Interruption.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (10.00 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in the standing and sessional orders, the order of business be altered for this day's sitting so that ministerial statements can continue and question time commences at 10.30 am for one hour.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Resumed from p. 2261.

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (10.00 am), continuing: To recap the last section, a technical expert, Dr David Manfield, told the commission, 'It was Plan A or die.' He described efforts to coordinate planning between the government and IBM as 'a death spiral'. Commissioner Chesterman said this—

The State's response to the delivery of a malfunctioning payroll system was timid. Its attempts to recover any recompense for the delivery of a malfunctioning payroll system were ineffectual.

In submissions to the inquiry, former Premier Bligh claimed to have made the decision to settle with IBM rather than to seek damages because of 'public interest judgements at the highest level' and that these extended to include 'the political fortunes of the government'. In evidence, Ms Bligh and the former minister for public works, Robert Schwarten, claimed they acted against their political interests by deciding not to pursue IBM and to forego the public popularity such a move would generate. That is nonsense. The former Labor government including the Leader of the Opposition, the deputy leader and the shadow Treasurer dropped the case and went behind closed doors with IBM to create a new contract that would bind the behaviour of their contractual partner. Against the public interest former ministers like the Leader of the Opposition gave up the chance to claim damages of up to $88 million without even seeking the advice of the Solicitor-General or senior counsel. Labor opened the floodgates to even more public expense. This began the Labor cover-up that has constrained public debate and neutered community understanding of the full and shameful circumstances.

It was a cover-up, exhumed last year by the Leader of the Opposition that lasted right up until 14 December 2012 when notice of this inquiry was finally published in the *Government Gazette*. I would like to thank the Hon. Richard Chesterman QC for leading the commission of inquiry. I would also like to thank counsel appointed to assist the inquiry, Peter Flanagan QC, Jonathan Horton and Anastasia Nicholas, as well as David Mackie, the executive director of the commission.

Queensland Health Payroll System Commission of Inquiry, Report

Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (10.02 am): I welcome the Queensland Health Payroll System Commission of Inquiry, which recounts years of bureaucratic indecision by the former Labor government. On 14 March 2010 the 10th and final disastrous attempt to implement a new payroll system affecting more than 80,000 Queenslanders and their families was made. Few connected with the project had reason to doubt it was heading for disaster. This report documents the corrupt behaviour of the Labor government's key project director, Terry Burns, and the improper favours he granted his mates at IBM. But under the former Labor government a cast of hundreds played a part in this lemming like journey to oblivion and no-one intervened.

Among the lemmings were Labor politicians and unions, bureaucrats and dozens of IT experts and project managers. Collectively, they stood by while the most basic workplace entitlements of some of the state's hardest working and most valuable employees—nurses, doctors and health workers—were trashed. Commissioner Chesterman finds that the SAP/Workbrain creation of IBM was grossly deficient on the day it went live. As the Premier said, the contract should never have been granted at all. There was no reason to proceed on that day and every reason to continue with the legacy system known as Lattice. The Labor government was entrusted by Queenslanders to act in their best interests, but given a choice between certain disaster with IBM and a much smaller risk

with Lattice on 14 March 2010 Labor set this state on the path to certain disaster. That was the decision that unleashed the misery. It will cost a total of $1.25 billion and burden our hospitals for many years to come.

In his report Mr Chesterman recounts an early promise about the payroll project which was passed on to Queensland Health workers through their unions—

Queensland Health provides senior managers and unions with the assurance that the new systems will not be commissioned into production without testing assurance that the payment outcomes meet minimum integrity measures and that future payments will be produced and correct to a reasonable level similar to or improved on current outcomes of the legacy HR systems.

But it was a different picture by March 2010. At go-live, the report tells us a total of 2,422 defects had already been identified. In evidence a technology expert who reviewed the final stages of testing, Dr Manfield, said, 'I haven't seen such an unequivocal sign of distress in a project.' That was the system inflicted on Queensland nurses, doctors and health workers by the former Labor government. Unions, ever ready to condemn this government, were mute—even in March 2010 when out of the blue health workers were told of a new Labor rule, 'no roster, no pay'. This applied to people who had been on stable rosters for years and years with no negative effect. This edict forced many to fill in roster forms for the first time and totally clogged this deficient system within three pay periods.

For the benefit of members, I have found more records from Queensland Health which illustrate the sick culture so roundly condemned by Commissioner Chesterman. I table the minutes of the Agency Consultative Committee meeting between five departmental managers and six union representatives which was held in February 2010 to discuss go-live. Keep in mind this was only a month before the cataclysm was foisted on Queenslanders by the previous government.

Tabled paper: Minutes of Agency Consultative Committee, Queensland Health, Shared Service Partner, 11 February 2010, 3 pm [3143].

At that meeting on the eve of that disaster and when all of the major tests had already failed there were congratulations and talk of more meetings 'in collaboration with union colleagues'. Mr Chesterman's report reveals the culture of a Labor government in which union bosses sit down with bureaucrats for endless meetings while the most basic interests of health workers are wasted. Queensland has come a long way since the ill-fated go-live decision that so hurt this state and revealed to Queenslanders the indolence and recklessness of the former Labor government.

Today nurses in Queensland Health are paid on time and they receive more than six per cent more than those years under the previous Labor government. To the union bosses I say this: just as Terry Burns gave IBM a free ride at the heavy expense of taxpayers, you too indulged the Labor Party at the direct expense of your own members.

Overseas Trade Mission

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (10.09 am): Queensland is entering a new era of prosperity with regard to its relationship with Asia. I recently returned from a two-week trade and investment mission to some of our most important trading partners, and I was accompanied by a delegation of Queensland business leaders. During the trip I welcomed the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the Queensland Investment Corporation and the Korea Finance Corporation. That agreement will strengthen the bonds between Queensland and Korea. I also met with the Export-Import Bank of Korea and signed another agreement endorsing Queensland as a reliable business partner and an attractive destination. These agreements are a clear testimony to the confidence overseas investors now place in our state's economy.

As we work to repair Queensland's finances and restore our AAA credit rating, it is renewed international confidence in Queensland that will boost our economic credibility and create great opportunities in this great state. Our business relationships with China continue to grow strongly, with ABS data showing that the value of Queensland merchandise exports to China exceeded $8 billion in the first 11 months of the 2012-13 financial year. This data indicates that China is on track to become our largest trading partner in the very near future. Much like Queensland is the engine room of Australia, Guangzhou and the wider Guangdong province is China's economic powerhouse. So I took particular delight in being able to re-sign the Queensland-Guangdong Friendship State Agreement on behalf of the Queensland government. The renewal of this agreement underscores Queensland's commitment to further strengthening and broadening our bilateral trade and investment ties with this powerful economic region.

Whilst in China, I also took the opportunity to promote our state sponsored business migration program and, in particular, the significant investor visa. Queensland hosted 261,000 Chinese visitors last year, and that figure is only expected to increase, injecting hundreds of millions of dollars into the economy as more airlines establish and expand operations in Queensland. To that extent, I had further discussions with China Southern Airlines about increasing their flights into Queensland. While I am on the subject of flights, last week Garuda Airlines commenced daily flights between Denpasar and Brisbane in yet another sign of the strong relationship this state is building with our Asian partners. On Tuesday evening last week we received official approval from the Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to establish a Trade and Investment Queensland office in Jakarta. While in Jakarta, I took the time to visit, along with the delegates, the proposed site of the new office. The reopening of an office was one of the key recommendations of the review of Trade and Investment Queensland and reaffirms the Newman government's commitment to strengthening ties with Indonesia. The office will be led by a Trade and Investment Commissioner, who will also be responsible for the greater ASEAN countries, an increasingly powerful trading bloc and a source of great opportunities for Queensland's export orientated businesses. A permanent Queensland presence in Indonesia will play a crucial role in rebuilding the long-standing relationship that was so badly damaged by the federal Labor government's ban on live cattle exports.

As well as visiting some of our long-standing trading partners, I also met with representatives from Queensland's emerging export markets. Singapore's banking and finance industries heard firsthand about the wide range of partnership and infrastructure investment opportunities in Queensland. Like many of our Asian neighbours, Singapore is searching for new investments in the region, and Queensland's robust economic base, competitive business environment and stable government make it an ideal choice.

Queensland's relationships with its Asian trading partners are growing stronger. Trade and Investment Queensland continues to nurture these relationships so that all Queenslanders can enjoy the benefits. Queensland is a great state with great opportunities.

Child Protection Commission of Inquiry

Hon. TE DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (10.12 am): On 1 July the government received recommendations from the Child Protection Commission of Inquiry. Former federal Family Court judge Tim Carmody QC, who headed the inquiry, presented the 121 recommendations to the Attorney-General and me, delivering on the Newman government's six-month action plan. When coming into government, we knew the child protection system was overburdened and unsustainable. We knew the previous government undertook two inquiries and made countless promises, but failed to act and left a shameful legacy. Sadly, in his report, Commissioner Carmody confirmed these failures, finding a system desperately in need of structural reform.

The inquiry heard nearly 400 hours of evidence from across the state and found that reports of child abuse had tripled in the past decade. Detailed hearings were held over 12 months with a wide cross-section of professionals involved in child protection. More than 150 meetings were held with individuals and stakeholders with knowledge and expertise in the child protection system. Focus groups were held with children in the care system, and site visits were conducted to residential and therapeutic care facilities as well as non-government organisations that provide child protection services. An extensive academic literature review on child protection was also undertaken.

Commissioner Carmody found the cost of delivering child protection in Queensland had increased by more than 300 per cent and the 8,500 children under state care deserved something better. The final report, *Taking responsibility: a roadmap for Queensland's child protection*, recommended changes affecting multiple government agencies. Commissioner Carmody found the current system is more reactive than preventative and is too quick to shift responsibility. The report prioritises strengthening families, improving early intervention strategies and breaking intergenerational cycles of abuse. These themes have been applauded right across the sector, with some of the key recommendations including: a renewed focus on supporting families to keep children at home; an overhaul of the reporting system to divert cases to support services and reduce the number of investigations; the development of a new family and child council; and the Queensland Police Service to take over the processing of blue cards. Currently, the government is taking the time to carefully consider each and every one of the recommendations. The changes will chart a new road map for child protection for the next decade and beyond. Importantly, they will go some way towards making Queensland the safest place to raise a child. As such, it is important for this government to

make the right decisions about the recommendations so that the lives of Queensland's most vulnerable children can be protected. We will make sure that the new child protection system is one that encourages and enables everyone to take responsibility for protecting children.

Fire Ants

Hon. JJ McVEIGH (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (10.15 am): The LNP government has made significant changes to management and procedures to deliver a far more cost-effective fire ant program. The latest detections at Muirlea, Jimboomba, Yatala, Forest Hill and Glen Cairn showed that the program of remote sensing and public engagement has been working. In contrast, Labor continues to deny the past. Under their leadership, the fire ant program was beset by serious allegations of nepotism, cover-ups, misreporting and staff bludging, and the whole thing was run by PR staff for Labor ministers' own personal promotion on the 6 pm news.

When I took over as minister, the then federal minister, Joe Ludwig, and ministers in other states were quite critical of how the program here in Queensland had been managed under Labor and there was strong talk of the national program being disbanded and Queensland having to move to management of, and living with, fire ants. Since coming to office, I have received many emails, letters and calls about how poorly the program had been managed under the now deputy opposition leader, Mr Mulherin, and the Labor government, including the current opposition leader's father, Henry Palaszczuk. The LNP government has, therefore, made significant changes to management and procedures to deliver a far more cost-effective fire ant program.

We have embraced the latest infrared sensing technology to define the spread of the ants but we have also simplified reporting and classification of fire ants. While all nests must be reported to the department, we have changed the regulations to allow landholders to treat the nests if they choose. This is a significant change because previously only fire ant staff were permitted to treat nests. I will explain why this was typical of Labor's overly bureaucratic and archaic approach which resulted simply in a massive backlog.

Now, landholders can join in the fight. If they find nests, they must still report them to the Biosecurity Queensland Control Centre. They can treat them with readily available chemical products, if they wish, which contain the active ingredient hydramethylnon, which can be found in many local hardware stores and even at Bunnings, as has been the case for many years. If the landowners prefer, Biosecurity Queensland can still come out free of charge and treat those nests for them. This is a far simpler and more effective approach. Instead of reporting and then waiting for staff to come out and treat nests, which obviously runs the risk of colonies spreading, landholders can treat nests immediately if they wish.

Biosecurity Queensland is using leading-edge technology to identify fire ants from the air using a unique infrared and thermal camera system mounted on helicopters to pinpoint fire ant nests over large areas. This can be done quickly and far more efficiently than having teams of staff traipsing across farmland, housing and industrial estates, and parklands poking sticks into holes. We are now also covering more at less cost. In 2011-12, it cost $21.6 million to cover 89,500 hectares. In 2012-13, through operational efficiencies and increased use of remote sensing, $17.9 million has allowed 105,000 hectares to be covered. In short, 15,500 hectares more were covered in 2012-13 for $3.7 million less. Using the old Labor methods, conducting 100,000 hectares of ground surveillance would cost an estimated $32 million and require 480 staff.

Natural Disaster Events of 2013, Recovery Assistance

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (10.20 am): Queensland's resilience was tested in January, when 57 of the state's 73 local government areas were impacted by floods—in some regions, up to the fifth time in two years—but it will not be the damage which communities endured that will define this Queensland tragedy. The pace and success of the state's 2013 recovery, which was made possible by the determination of its people and the new approach of this government, will be the lasting legacy. The start of that journey was the Newman government's establishment of the state's first betterment fund. This fund will help us build better, stronger infrastructure, rather than simply replace the same structures in the same positions that would be swept away again in the next flood.

We asked the federal government for $100 million, and we matched dollar for dollar the $40 million that we received from them. We have since wrung every drop of value out of that $80 million to break the stupidity of rebuilding the same structure, knowing that it will be washed away again in the future. It is a scenario that has been repeated too many times throughout Queensland and it is a dumb cycle, but this government has broken it for the first time in any Australian state. We have turned the corner in this recovery—not by crying crocodile tears during the event and then disappearing, but by adopting the new approach of working with local governments. We have streamlined the heavy load of bureaucracy by putting people on the ground to address the different problems that diverse councils encounter in a state as big and diverse as Queensland.

No longer are regional communities dictated to from Brisbane; it is the long arm of Canberra that we have to worry about. The current Prime Minister says he is a Queenslander. It is time for him to put up or shut up. Queensland's flood recovery did not even rate a mention in his cabinet, and the position was taken from a minister and given to a secretary. The Prime Minister says he will look after us personally. If that is the case, where is the $725 million owed to Queensland, Mr Rudd? After flood repairs had already been undertaken several years ago and funds allocated in the federal budget, the Labor government changed the reporting requirements of Queensland councils. The state footed the bill for those repairs in good faith, and it would be wrong of me to condemn the former government, because it did the job according to those guidelines. But the federal government has refused to pay. It is time for this Queensland Prime Minister to settle his bill with this state.

This failure should not cloud this year's recovery effort. In 2011 it took the Bundaberg Regional Council 18 months to get $25 million worth of work out to market; this year we have seen $40 million in four months and an additional $30 million the following month. That is nearly three times the amount of recovery in less than a third of the time, and it has been repeated in towns across this state. The job is not finished, but we are building the foundations for a stronger, more resilient Queensland that will never be quite as vulnerable again.

Government Administrative Precinct, Redevelopment

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (10.23 am): Last year our government announced that we would begin the redevelopment of the government precinct here in Brisbane bounded by George, Alice and William streets, which had become tired and somewhat run-down over many years of Labor administration. The redevelopment of this part of Brisbane's CBD provides a once-in-a-generation opportunity to revitalise a significant part of the city, to instill new life into the area and to provide a signature development which will put Brisbane on the world stage. We made it clear that there would be a considerable period of time for us to consider what this development might look like and that the people of Brisbane would have a big say in the final outcome. Little can happen on the site until the 1 William Street building is completed.

Isn't it great to see progress on the 1 William Street site? Despite the cheap shots from the members of the opposition, it is great to see the first of the 1,000 jobs that will be created on that site. It is great to see those guys employed there. Every day when I walk from the Annexe up to the Executive Building on my way to and from work, those building workers know that it is the LNP government that has made that construction possible. They are very vocal and I have become good friends with some of them. The builders labourers and guys on the construction site know that this is the government that did that after so many years. Those 1,000 jobs will be there for the duration of that construction, and similar jobs will be created in the construction of the government precinct. I once again acknowledge the work that has been done by my parliamentary colleague the Treasurer and Projects Queensland. It has been enormously gratifying to work with Projects Queensland. The Treasurer and I are almost self-appointed project managers, because we keep a close eye on the construction, and it is gratifying to see that project proceed. It demonstrates what a responsible, grown-up government can do in terms of generating those types of jobs.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr SEENEY: The point that the Treasurer makes is right. It contrasts markedly with the absurd nonsense of the North Bank proposal that the former government entered into. We have a real project that is months ahead of schedule and is providing real jobs for builders labourers in Queensland, and so it will continue with the redevelopment of the government precinct.

Earlier this year we opened a consultation process with the people of Brisbane, the Brisbane City Council, the business community and a wide range of representative groups such as the Property Council of Australia, the Brisbane Development Association and the Natural Heritage Trust. That consultation process is ongoing, and it remains open to input from anybody for at least another month, until the first week in September. I want to inform the House today that this is a real consultation process. We want to hear what people think and we want to hear divergent views about how this precinct should look. We fully expect that there will be a wide divergence of views and that there will be a degree of controversy whilst those views are expressed and considered. That is the right and proper process, and the people of Brisbane and the wider Queensland community should engage in discussion in a mature, responsible way rather than the sort of cheap shots that we saw from the opposition in relation to the development of 1 William Street.

Of course there has been a high level of interest, and some very high-profile businesspeople have taken public positions on what they want or what they believe should happen to this government precinct. Much of that public discussion has been centred around the issue of whether or not a casino should be at the heart of the redevelopment. In the end that may very well be the case; but then again, it may very well not be the case. The government does not come to this process with a preconceived position about what the development should encompass. That is unlike the previous government, which made decisions first and entered into consultation later.

The precinct is a significant landholding in the CBD. It provides incredible scope for a landmark outcome which will benefit Queensland, benefit the people of Brisbane and attract visitors to our state for years and generations to come. At the same time, it is not an easy site to redevelop. There are already landmark buildings on the site: historic and heritage listed buildings from the earliest days of European settlement. We are very aware of their heritage value and significance on the site, and the redevelopment plan will determine how we maintain these buildings for future generations and open them up to greater usage. I look forward to the redevelopment of the government precinct and to continuing the consultation process with the people of Queensland so that we can develop something of which the people of Queensland and Brisbane can be proud.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (10.29 am): I wish to advise the House that the Minister for Energy and Water Supply will be absent from the House for both of the August sittings due to ill health. Minister Cripps will be acting minister for this portfolio during Minister McArdle's absence, and we wish him well for a speedy recovery.

AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Briefing

Mr RICKUSS (Lockyer—LNP) (10.29 am): I lay on the table of the House an outline of a special briefing on the impacts of CSG to be hosted by the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee tomorrow. The briefing will be held in the Dandiir Room between 1 pm and 2 pm and will be provided by Deputy Director of CSIRO, Dr Peter Stone. Dr Stone is also Director of the Gas Industry Social and Environmental Research Alliance. This is a partnership between the gas industry and CSIRO to promote the highest quality research of the industry's impacts. The briefing will be highly informative and I encourage all members to attend.

Tabled paper: Flyer regarding special briefing on CSG hosted by the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee on 7 August 2013 [3144].

NOTICE OF MOTION

Education, Better Schools Plan

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.30 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

- acknowledges the importance of education in providing equality of opportunity to all Queensland children;
- recognises that the federal government's Better Schools initiative will result in more funding for Queensland students;

- notes that the Liberal-led governments of New South Wales and Victoria have recognised the benefits of the Better Schools initiative and reached agreement with the federal government, as have the Catholic and independent education sectors.
- acknowledges that the Newman government has been more focused on closing schools and selling off land than securing a better outcome for our students.
- note that the government's failure to sign up to the Better Schools initiative will result in Queensland state school students being denied extra funding.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Public Service, Jobs

Ms PALASZCZUK (10.30 am): My question without notice is to the Premier. I note last night's television reports that his government had a 'good story to tell', and I ask: can the Premier now confirm that some 17,000 people have lost their jobs under his government?

Mr NEWMAN: I am delighted to answer the question from the Leader of the Opposition. In relation to the full-time equivalents that have left the Queensland Public Service, the latest information I have was provided only a couple of weeks ago, at the estimates committee hearing. I provided that with my officials present. So those are the latest figures and I recall the figure we provided of around 14,000 or so.

In relation to the comment on the news last night, I am delighted to talk about the difference between this government—which is upfront, honest and direct with Queenslanders about the financial mess that we were left by the Australian Labor Party—and federal Labor. Let us remember that the Labor Party in this state had a secret plan to sack 40,000 public servants. If I have to table the document again today, I will be delighted to. We have tabled it in the past. Those opposite were going to lose 40,000 people.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members! There are too many interjections on my left. I ask that they cease. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: To return to the context of what I was saying, as reported on the news last night, let us look at Kevin Rudd and the Labor Party. What did Kevin Rudd say? On 22 November 2007 an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* stated—

Kevin Rudd will take "a meat axe" to the bloated public service ...

I recall when he was Wayne Goss's chief of staff and the Goss government sacked thousands of people, shut down railway lines, shut down police stations, shut down schools, shut down stuff right across regional Queensland. What was Kevin Rudd called in those days? 'Dr Death'. He was not called 'Dr Death' because he was a doctor of surgery or something—we do not want to go there; he was called 'Dr Death' because of the joy he took in sacking people. This is the truth of the matter.

Kevin Rudd is a hypocrite. Kevin Rudd says one thing and does another. Kevin Rudd had early experience in setting up detention centres when he established the so-called gulag at Spring Hill. He would know all about breaching people's human rights in detention centres because that is what he did in terms of employment law at the Spring Hill gulag back in the 1990s. Labor is never upfront and never straight with Queenslanders; never upfront and never straight with Australians. That is why Kevin Rudd and Labor need to be booted out at the federal election.

Unions

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is great to hear the Premier talking about Kevin Rudd, a great Queenslander! My question is to the Premier. I refer to the government's actions late Friday afternoon to seek orders in the Industrial Relations Commission to prevent union officers from communicating with their own members, and I ask: is limiting communication between workers and their representatives, including the forced removal of information from their website, consistent with the LNP's promise for an open and transparent government?

Mr NEWMAN: Frankly, the premise of the question from the Leader of the Opposition is completely false. I say today: the only person standing in the way of 50,000 to 60,000 hardworking public servants in the core getting a pay rise is Alex Scott. Alex Scott needs to be upfront and honest. This government offered a pay rise. This government has been offering a pay rise since last year. This government wants to settle this as soon as possible. By the way, the only reason I am answering

this question today—I understand that the commission wants me to refrain from comment at this time, even this morning—is that I am trying to be upfront and fulfil my responsibilities in this House. I only say: we are ready to pay hardworking public servants in the core a pay rise. That is what we are prepared to do for them.

I will move on to other things. On a day when we have handed down a report from an independent, highly respected judge outlining arguably the worst failure of public administration in the nation's history, which has cost $1.2 billion, what do those opposite do? They completely ignore and try to obfuscate what has gone on and what they are responsible for. This was $1.2 billion that could have gone into education, $1.2 billion that could have gone into health, $1.2 billion that could have gone into helping people with disabilities, $1.2 billion that could have been building homes for people who are disadvantaged and getting people who are homeless off the streets. $1.2 billion is a huge drain on the public purse, and those opposite are responsible.

Those opposite have to answer some questions over the next three days. They have to tell us what they knew. They have to explain why they did not take on IBM. They have to explain to Queenslanders why they allowed this gross waste of money. We will be moving a motion of our own on Thursday, perhaps. We will be looking to see if they have the ticker to actually deal with companies like IBM, the ticker to deal with individuals who are still employed in the Queensland Public Service, the ticker to be part of an apology to Queenslanders and hardworking Health public servants who did not get paid and a general apology, that they should be involved in, that they diverted $1.2 billion of taxpayers' funds to prop up a failed payroll system. That is what we should be talking about today. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that that is what we will be speaking about all this week, because that is the only issue of import this week.

I close by saying: as it is with the Health payroll system, so it is with federal Labor—with their waste and inefficiency, with their complete blowing of the budget in the past few days. This federal government led by Kevin Rudd deserves to be kicked out in September.

Queensland Health, Payroll System

Mr WATTS: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the report of the commission of inquiry into the Queensland Health payroll system, and I ask: does the report contain any lessons about the previous Labor government's hands-free ministers being too scared to take on big business and putting the political fortunes of the government ahead of the interests of taxpayers?

Mr NEWMAN: As the commissioner states in his report, success has many fathers but failure is an orphan—and so it is with the Health payroll matter, for which the Labor Party and its people never wanted to take accountability. The replacement of the Queensland Health payroll system must take its place in the front ranks of failure in public administration in this country. It could be the absolute worst failure of public administration ever in this nation. The project was not just a massive failure but comes with a $1.2 billion cost to Queensland taxpayers, all because those opposite were too scared to take on IBM. They talked tough in the media, yet they did nothing. In a joint press statement issued in June 2010, the former Premier and the former health minister said—

> We have sought Crown law advice in relation to options for terminating the payroll contract with IBM and it is only fair that we seek to reserve our legal rights.

Minister Lucas went a step further and said in response to a question that the state might sue IBM. They took no responsibility, and nor did they even question the advice that was provided to them.

The report finds that Labor's hand-picked director-general, Mal Grierson, who was responsible for the project and negotiated with IBM, failed to bring to the project the skill and authority which his position demanded. I am disappointed to tell Queensland taxpayers that there are now no means by which the state may seek damages from IBM for breach of contract. The concession that a factor in the decision to settle was the political fortune of the government is contrary to the evidence given by the former Premier that the decision was made without reference to what might benefit the government at the time. There is an inconsistency between the written evidence of the former Premier and her verbal testimony. This is an insult to the hardworking doctors and nurses who did not get paid or were paid incorrectly. Perhaps we should expect this, knowing Labor's record of duplicity and deceit, failure and complete lack of accountability in government.

Kevin Rudd said he was a fiscal conservative and then Labor borrowed $100 million every day to reach a $254 billion debt and a budget blowing out by $3 billion a week. He then said he would take a meat axe to the Public Service and then criticised Queensland for the hard decisions we have

had to make on Public Service numbers. Kevin Rudd said in 2007 that government advertising is 'a cancer on democracy' but will blow $65 million on a three-month advertising blitz on asylum seekers and pre-election promises. In just the first day of the federal election campaign he is already promising child-care centres in schools—the same as he failed to deliver at his last election—and money for a car industry that he is killing with new taxes. Policy failure, deceit of Queenslanders and the Australian people are the hallmark of Labor governments. Perhaps we should not be surprised by the Health payroll disaster.

(Time expired)

Member for Redlands

Mr MULHERIN: My question is to the Deputy Premier—sorry, the Premier.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr MULHERIN: Jeff, we had a bit of fun during estimates! My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the House when he or his office were made aware of the allegations that the member for Redlands may have misused taxpayer funded travel entitlements and why these allegations have not been referred to the CMC or police?

Mr NEWMAN: I can advise the House that I was informed after around 5.30 pm yesterday and I made a statement in the House which outlines the correct way of dealing with this matter, and that is on the advice of the Clerk and the matter goes to the Clerk first. So I have fulfilled my responsibilities in that matter in accordance with that advice.

I again reflect that on a day when we have tabled a report about the biggest failure of public administration in this nation's history the Labor Party does not want to deal with it. It does not want to deal with it. It does not want to deal with it because it is inconvenient, because what this Health payroll debacle reveals is what is in the DNA of the Australian Labor Party. Its financial incompetence and its public administration failure is deceit and deficits.

These people have no idea how to run government. They are good at running elections. They are good at running smear campaigns. In fact, just to demonstrate to the House the close connections between the failed Bligh Labor government and the current Kevin Rudd failure government, who ran the Labor campaign? That is right: Bruce Hawker—that genius! Who worked for Anna Bligh? That is right: Eamonn Fitzpatrick, the chief spin doctor and dirt doctor. Who is now working for Kevin Rudd? That is right: Bruce Hawker and Eamonn Fitzpatrick. They work for Kevin Rudd. I just say to Queenslanders and to Australians: you just have to look. Kevin Rudd is trying desperately to disassociate himself from Julia Gillard. He cannot disassociate himself because they are all one big, happy family.

Mr Nicholls: Not happy!

Mr NEWMAN: Sorry, I correct myself; I do not want to mislead the House. They are, of course, the unhappy, dysfunctional family. The Labor Party is 'The Addams Family'. It has the skeletons in the closet. It has the mad uncle. It has the ghost who keeps coming back. It has got everything! It has got the executions. It has the ritual flambéing. That is what it is good at. The only thing it is good at is running elections, but it certainly cannot run government! Just think what $1.2 billion would have paid for in terms of schools, $1.2 billion would have paid for in terms of disability services, $1.2 billion would have paid for in terms of looking after people who are homeless or who need a hand up. That is what $1.2 billion means. Federal Labor needs to go, just like state Labor had to go!

(Time expired)

Queensland Health, Payroll System

Mr GRIMWADE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I refer to the report of the commission of inquiry into the Queensland Health payroll system, and I ask: can the minister outline what the bosses of the Queensland Nurses Union told him about the payroll fiasco in the first week he was the minister?

Mr Johnson: Put your seatbelt on, Annastacia!

Madam SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for Health.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order. The member did not use my correct title.

Madam SPEAKER: I will ask the Minister for Health to pause. I did not warn the member for Gregory, but I do remind the member for Gregory and other members to allow ministers and the questioners to be heard. I call the Minister for Health.

Mr SPRINGBORG: As we have seen today with the tabling of the Queensland Health payroll report, what we now have is the truth of what actually went wrong and the absolute failure of the former Labor government in Queensland to do anything about it to protect Queensland Health workers and their families and the ongoing cost to Queensland patients. Indeed, I thank the honourable member for Morayfield for that question because it is extremely important that the parliament understands the actions of the former Labor government and its hands-free administration in this state. Indeed, what we had was hands-free ministers and hand-picked directors-general absolutely too terrified to take on big business, and that is not the view and that is not the modus operandi of the LNP government.

I was most interested after we announced the Queensland Health payroll commission of inquiry last year to hear the luminary from the Queensland Nurses Union, Mr Des Elder, saying, 'You shouldn't have this inquiry. You should put it down to experience.' What a wonderful experience it has been for Queensland Health workers! Within a couple of hours of being sworn in and prior to formally meeting my director-general, I went and had a meeting with the Queensland Nurses Union and I said that I would not only fix the issue of the payroll in Queensland but also address the issue of the pay for nurses which had been lagging behind. It handed me this august publication, and in this publication it said under 'Payroll debacle'—

> Of course we know that the system implementation was a total disaster. However, the real question is how was it possible for such a disaster to occur in light of the supposed checks and balances that should have been in place. Despite the numerous inquiries and reports, the QNU does not believe that Queensland Health has answered the fundamental question to any satisfaction to date.

This helped the government formulate its desire to have a commission of inquiry to get to the bottom of this—that is, what went wrong that caused up to three-quarters of the nurses in Queensland to be underpaid, overpaid or not paid at all but certainly paid 6.2 per cent less than the Newman LNP government is paying them? Fast forward a couple of months to when Des Elder was running around flustering and carrying on and said that we did not need an inquiry but needed to put it down to experience after it had published this, which clearly called on the government to get to the bottom of it.

The government now has got to the bottom of it. We clearly know the maladministration. We now know the hands-free administration from the former Labor government in Queensland. We know the lack of probity. We know the dishonesty. We know the unconscionable conduct. We also know how to avoid it in the future and the pathway. That is because we took the advice of this document, not of Des Elder.

(Time expired)

Withers, Dr T

Mr PITT: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the government's decision to dismiss neurosurgeon Dr Teresa Withers, a Bali bombing surgical volunteer, from her position as director of surgery at the Gold Coast Hospital. I ask: was Dr Withers dismissed for telling the truth about the impact of the government's slash-and-burn policies?

Mr NEWMAN: I have no knowledge of the details of this matter. What I will talk about is something that I do have knowledge about and that is the Health payroll commission of inquiry, That is what we should be focusing on today. Let me give honourable members a bit more detail today since I have a bit of time now. I think it starts with—

Mr PITT: I rise to a point of order. The Premier has not even attempted to answer the question. If it is too difficult for him to answer and he is willing to take it on notice, we would accept that.

Madam SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I ask the Premier—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! I warn members on my left. I am speaking. There was not a proper point of order called, but I ask the Premier to address the question in his answer.

Mr NEWMAN: The question was about Health and there have been many changes in Health involving personnel. The former Premier said that Queensland Health was dysfunctional and we saw corruption there. I am really talking about some of the reasons for changes within Health. One of the biggest issues in Health is the Health payroll system and I want to talk about that, if I may.

I want to inform honourable members that, when you get into this report, it is a fascinating read. Some of the salient points are these: IBM should never have got the contract. That is very, very clear from what the commissioner says. In addition, the commissioner seems to have exposed that there was some sort of collusion going on between people within government and IBM. He points to clearly unethical behaviour by IBM employees, some of whom I understand are still employed by IBM. It begs the question: what should the government do on behalf of the people of Queensland in dealing with IBM in the future? That is a matter for debate later on this week, but I will state my position today: I do not for a moment want to continue to do business with a company that has so clearly been adversely named in all sorts of ways in this report. That is my position. Those opposite did not have the ticker to deal with IBM. I want this parliament to make a statement on it if it chooses to about how we deal with IBM in the future.

I turn now to the former director-general of the health department. That is Mr Michael Reid. Was he not the hand-picked Labor director-general? Was he not Nicola Roxon's former chief of staff? Was he not hand-picked by Labor and plonked from a chief of staff position to director-general of the health department?

Mr PITT: I rise to a point of order. Madam Speaker, I ask you to rule on standing order 118(b), relevance. This is a specific question about a specific matter, not about the Health payroll.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! In the first instance the Premier advised the House, I understand, that he had no recollection or understanding of the specific issue. I ask the Premier to address the question. That is the answer to the point of order.

Mr NEWMAN: I am talking about the administration—or the maladministration—of the health system under the Australian Labor Party. I will continue to talk about Mr Michael Reid, who, as I have said, was a chief of staff to Nicola Roxon—the Labor government—and who went on, hand-picked by Labor, by those opposite, to be the DG of Health, who clearly failed in his responsibilities as the director-general of Health and who is adversely named in this report. Now, apparently, I understand, he works for PricewaterhouseCoopers as the head of its national healthcare practice.

Again, I pose the question today: what will honourable members say about the use of PWC in healthcare matters knowing those facts? These are important issues that will be dealt with this week. This is the issue that we must talk as a parliament.

(Time expired)

Business Confidence

Mrs RICE: My question without notice is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade. Can the Treasurer update the House on any challenges to business confidence in Queensland and if there are any alternative views?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for her question. Of course, the member is vitally interested in what goes on in the small business sector and the business sector generally, having hosted a function with the Inner West Chamber of Commerce, at which I spoke in relation to the budget that was delivered by this government. It is also nice to get a question from the member, because those opposite continue to refuse to ask me questions in relation to the state of the economy. There is a dearth of intelligent questions from those on the other side. Perhaps it is because they do not like the answers they get. But I can tell members that that is not going to change, because they are not going to like the answer they are going to get today, either.

If there has been one thing that has been holding back confidence in the Australian economy, including here in Queensland, it has been the state of disarray by federal Labor in Canberra. This is reflected in the Westpac Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland Pulse Survey of Business Conditions released yesterday, which showed a weakening in business optimism right across the country, although I should point out that it is marginally stronger in Queensland than it is across the national economy.

What is one of the main factors identified in that survey as leading to a loss of business confidence? The changing policy landscape as a result of federal Labor's latest leadership changes. The report anticipates the election, but what is of greater concern—

... is the changing policy landscape and rapid pace of new policy as a result of the leadership change. Businesses need certainty to reduce the risk of planned investments underpinning growth opportunities, which is not being delivered by the Australian Government at present.

Who can blame businesses for their lack of confidence in this dysfunctional government? In just over three years Labor has given us two Prime Ministers, two Treasurers, five assistant Treasurers and six small business ministers—in just three years. It is obvious that Kevin Rudd and Labor are more concerned about internal party matters than they are about governing for Queensland and Australia.

I contrast the stability offered by Tony Abbott, with a stable and experienced frontbench, with a government that will see Australia follow the path of Labor in Queensland, with over $418 billion worth of debt—an addiction to debt and deficit. How many times has federal Labor promised a surplus in its budgets? How many times has it delivered it? It has been in office since 2007. Does anyone know how many surpluses it has delivered? None at all—none at all! So despite all the uncertainty—

(Time expired)

Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service

Mrs MILLER: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that the government will release the independent review ordered by the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service CEO, Ron Calvert, into the issues that Dr Withers has raised?

Mr NEWMAN: I again have to say that I do not know anything about the matters in question and that the members opposite would be well advised to ask the health minister a question. But I am happy to talk about what has been going on in the health system over the last few years and this government's program to create the best free public hospital system in the nation. That is what we are working to do. We are working to create the best free public hospital health system in the nation and our reforms are designed to deal with the problems that we have inherited from the Australian Labor Party.

There is, of course, the need to get the resourcing of hospitals right and the organisations set up appropriately. I point to the early success and I thank and applaud the health minister and his staff for one of their biggest achievements to date. In 18 months—just 18 months—what have they achieved? That is right. I know honourable members know this. They know what I am alluding to. We now have—and Queenslanders should know and Australians should know—the best performing emergency departments in the nation.

Mr Springborg: That is on the federal government's own assessment.

Mr NEWMAN: That is on the federal government's own assessment. What has happened? Ambulance ramping has been basically cut to nothing. On my phone I have an audio recording of former minister Robertson on radio station 4BC—I cannot remember the exact date, whether it was 2008, 2009 or 2010—seeking to explain the unexplainable. He would not take responsibility for ambulance ramping that was a problem then. He obfuscates and tries to sidestep. He says 'It's not me. I'm not responsible. You will have to ask another minister.' Michael Smith gets more and more frustrated. Why do I keep it? Because it reminds me day after day what government should be about and what bad government was. I have that and I am happy to play it to the Leader of the Opposition later on. Maybe she will remember then and come out of this fog of amnesia about what was going on in the health system.

We now have the best performing emergency departments in the nation. Minister Springborg and this government—this team on this side of the House—achieved that inside 18 months. Well done, Minister! The next step is to make sure that we make huge inroads into the elective surgery waiting lists.

Mr Springborg: We've improved five out of the six categories since we've been in government.

Mr NEWMAN: We have already improved there, as the health minister is saying. In contrast, those opposite—state Labor, federal Labor—talk and talk and talk and waste money and never deal with the issues. That is why Kevin Rudd and federal Labor should be tossed out.

(Time expired)

Infrastructure Funding

Mr SHUTTLEWORTH: My question without notice is to the Premier. When you met with Mr Rudd recently about key projects and issues for Queensland what was discussed and what commitments were given?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the opportunity to talk about the meeting that I had a few weeks ago with the Prime Minister. If memory serves me correct, it is probably four weeks to the day on Friday that I did see the Prime Minister.

Mr Rickuss: Which Prime Minister was that?

Mr NEWMAN: For the benefit of honourable members, that would have been Kevin Rudd, the current Prime Minister. The record would show that I came out and I was quite enthusiastic because the Prime Minister, unlike the previous Prime Minister, gave me an hour and a half and was prepared to sit down and talk about the issues of importance to Queenslanders. I just want to cover some of the things that we discussed. We talked about Cross River Rail. The Prime Minister said, 'You agree to a 75/25 deal.' He shoved some letters across the table, one from Anthony Albanese to Scott Emerson and one from Scott Emerson to Anthony Albanese, and he said, 'You've agreed,' and I said, 'Prime Minister, I am reading the letters. We haven't.' Kevin Rudd looked somewhat perplexed at this and he said, 'No, no, you've agreed.' I said, 'Prime Minister, that letter doesn't say that we've agreed.' In fact, for the benefit of honourable members I would be happy to table those documents within the next 24 hours. The Prime Minister had been told by some staffer—I was going to say something rude then—that we had agreed. But we had not. He clearly was not across the brief. I said, 'If you want to go fifty-fifty we'll do the deal right now,' and Kevin Rudd said, 'I'll look into it.'

We then talked about the wireless network, the digital radio network that is required for G20. I said that there had been a deal with the previous Prime Minister to go fifty-fifty. It is going to be quite expensive. It is their event ultimately. They have imposed it on us and they should go fifty-fifty. What did Kevin Rudd say? 'I'll look into it.'

We then talked about education and we put our position on the table. I said, 'We want you to look at the funding that we are providing already and what you are putting on the table. We need to see less red tape. We don't want bureaucracy being imposed on our schools. We want a better deal for Queensland kindergartens and don't cut funding for universities.' What did Kevin Rudd say? He'll look into it.

Then we talked about the Galilee Basin. This is the most important thing that Queenslanders need to know. Over 10,000 jobs could be created like that. Billions of dollars of investment are waiting to pour into this state at a time when we need it, when people are coming off the construction projects in Gladstone on the LNG terminals. It could happen right now. I said, 'Prime Minister, you and I could go out together and make the announcement that you have approved these projects. There is no reason to hold them up any longer. We can really deal with unemployment issues in Queensland just like that.' And Kevin Rudd said, 'I'll look into it.'

Four weeks on and this no-hoper is looking into it. This guy has no idea how to get the economy going. He has no idea how to generate health reforms. He has no idea how to run G20 and he has no idea how to lead this nation.

(Time expired)

Gladstone, Mammography Unit

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. The Gladstone mammography unit relies on radiology staff from the Rockhampton Hospital. Advice received last week is that our unit operates only one day a fortnight due to a lack of staff. Will the minister review this and ensure that the service the minister opened—a Monday-Friday service—is funded, staffed and reinstated?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Gladstone for her question and do acknowledge the commitment of the honourable member for Gladstone to make sure that the interests of women who require the services of this satellite outreach service for mammography in Gladstone is available to them. This certainly is a service that I opened I think in May or June of last year and I acknowledge that the honourable member was there to assist during the course of that day. There is no doubt about it, if you are able to have in an area a permanent facility, albeit a satellite service, rather than relying upon the mobile van then it provides a much greater degree of certainty and also utilisation of resources in those particular areas. Gladstone is one of those.

If I can indicate for the benefit of the honourable member for Gladstone and others, when it comes to breast screening in Queensland, and the commitment of the Newman LNP government, to understand how we have been increasing access to breast screening around this state since we came to power, indeed in the 2011-12 financial year some 228,733 breast screens were performed in Queensland. In 2012-13, 232,991 breast screens were performed. In 2013-14, 237,900 breast screens are funded to be delivered. That is a significant increase by the Newman LNP government. Not only that, there has also been a significant contribution from the proceeds of Labor's fake Tahitian prince which is directly going in to enhancing and providing more breast screening services to Queensland women as well, indeed some additional thousands, and I thank the Premier and I thank the Treasurer for their commitment to make sure that the sordidness of that particular tale actually had a silver lining, insofar as that cloud is concerned, to provide enhanced services to Queensland women.

Specifically, I understand that when the service was established in Gladstone last year there was a major backlog of women requiring breast screening. It is run out of Rockhampton. There were initially some recruitment issues. As I understand it much of that backlog has now been cleared. I will get updated figures for the member in regard to that. The average for that service to run over the two years from establishment I understand is around about three days a week. I understand that that will not only do a lot in reducing the backlog but also be ahead of the needs of the women of Gladstone and not having to rely on the mobile service which was there previously. I will get some more updates for the honourable member, but I can assure her we are committed to properly delivering the service.

Cross River Rail

Mrs MADDERN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Minister, what has been the federal government's response to the Prime Minister's promise to negotiate a deal on Cross River Rail?

Mr EMERSON: I thank the member for the question. Let me lead on from what the Premier said a bit earlier. The reality is that Kevin Rudd is someone who is all talk but no action. He makes promises but never fulfils them. Members will remember that shortly after becoming Prime Minister, the former, former Prime Minister walks out and says, 'I want to talk about Cross River Rail. I want to negotiate on Cross River Rail.' What do we do? We write to him and say we are happy to talk, let's start to talk. What do we hear? An eerie silence. The reality is that this project is a Labor project that they want to rip off Queensland.

Ms Palaszczuk: Oh.

Mr EMERSON: I hear the Leader of the Opposition say, 'Oh'. Let us go back to see what the Leader of the Opposition wanted to talk about in terms of Cross River Rail. When the Leader of the Opposition was transport minister, how much did she want Canberra to pay for Cross River Rail? She wanted Canberra to pay 75 per cent. She wrote to Michael Deegan, the head of Infrastructure Australia, and said, 'I want Canberra to pay 75 per cent'. I am very happy to table a letter on this 75 per cent.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 12 December 2011, from the then Minister for Transport and Multicultural Affairs to Infrastructure Australia regarding Cross River Rail's Infrastructure Australia submission [3145].

What we hear back from Canberra is that they want to pay just 25 per cent. They want to short-change Queensland. State Labor is now saying that we should just sign up to Canberra paying 25 per cent. In government, they want Canberra to pay 75 per cent; in opposition, they want Canberra to pay just 25 per cent.

We have said, 'Let's be fair with a genuine fifty-fifty agreement'. That is what we put to Canberra, that is what we put to Kevin Rudd and that is what we put to Anthony Albanese. Again, let's go back: Kevin Rudd wants to negotiate; Kevin Rudd wants to talk about it. So we write to Kevin Rudd. We receive a letter from his deputy prime minister, Anthony Albanese, who says, 'We're not going to budge; Canberra is not going to budge'. Kevin Rudd comes out and talks to the cameras. He says, 'We want to talk'. But behind the scenes, nothing is going to happen. They are all talk and no action. In fact, I was supposed to meet with Mr Albanese, first, on 26 July, and he cancels; 30 July, he cancels; 1 August, he cancels. They are not genuine, they do not want to do it and they cancel every meeting we have to talk about it.

The reality is that we have a genuine deal out there, we have a genuine offer out there, but Kevin Rudd is all talk and no action. State Labor should be ashamed of itself. In government they say they want 75 per cent from Canberra, but in opposition it is 25 per cent. That is the hypocrisy of Labor. They just want to look after their Labor mates in Canberra. That is all they are interested in.

Gregory Downs, School

Mr KATTER: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Last year the Gregory Downs school was shut down and the community is battling to keep in town the associated infrastructure that they themselves substantially contributed towards. Will the minister commit to working with the council and the community to ensure they have every opportunity to stop those buildings being relocated over 1,000 kilometres away in Townsville?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for the question. This is an issue that has arisen over the past year. For the information of honourable members, last year the Gregory Downs school had only four students and we had trouble finding a teacher who was able to go there. I am advised the school had only two enrolments for this year. Therefore, the decision was taken that we would have to provide alternative education.

I understand that there is a building on the site that is council property. Last week, there was a mistaken attempt to move the property which, of course, has now been stopped. The head of infrastructure within my department is meeting with the mayor tomorrow. I advise the honourable member that he is meeting with the mayor from that community tomorrow to resolve this issue. Of course, we want to ensure that we give acknowledgement for whatever money has been spent on that property by the local community and acknowledge the difficulty that we have finding teachers and teacher aides for some of our most isolated communities. However, the government has a strong commitment to providing the best education we can for all Queenslanders and all young Queenslanders, notwithstanding the challenges that we face.

In summary, I am happy to reassure the member that the head of infrastructure from within my department is meeting with the mayor—I am advised that that will happen tomorrow—so that they can resolve the issue about the fact that there has been a community contribution to the infrastructure there, plus the fact that it is leased land, which is why last week there was that attempt to move the infrastructure, which I understand was not supposed to have happened. I assure the member that I am happy to work with him and the local community to make sure that we resolve this issue to everyone's satisfaction.

Public Hospitals, Emergency Departments

Mr SORENSEN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. After more than a decade of Labor's mismanagement and squandering of precious Health dollars, does the minister have any details of how our hospital emergency departments have turned the corner after just one year of Campbell Newman's government?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the member for Hervey Bay for his question.

Mr PITT: I rise to a point of order. Madam Speaker, I would ask you to consider whether there was an imputation in the question asked by the member for Hervey Bay?

Madam SPEAKER: I am checking my notes and I am taking advice. I do not recall there being any personal imputation in the question. I call the Minister for Health.

Mr SPRINGBORG: There may have been a factual imputation and I think it may have related to years of Labor mismanagement. I do not think anyone could really argue against that. Indeed, what we have here today is a commission of inquiry report that probably validates the view of the hands-free approach of the former Labor government where we saw billions of dollars go up in smoke without any sort of ministerial oversight and, indeed, any sort of direction whatsoever when it came to the administration of the basics within Queensland Health. If we look at the legacy of the Labor government, we saw ambulance ramping and ambulance bypass. It was not uncommon for people to be bounced from one hospital to the next across South-East Queensland, like some sort of glorified ambulance version of pass the parcel. Patients could be in the back of ambulances for up to 10 hours, resulting in really adverse outcomes, including people dying.

We banned ambulance bypass. The other night a paramedic came up to me and said that at the hospital where he takes most of his patients, hardly any ambulances are ramped any more. We now have the best national emergency access targets of all the Australian jurisdictions. Over the past

12 months, on average we have gone from 64 per cent to 76 per cent of people going through our EDs in under four hours. That target was set initially by Kevin Rudd and then Julia Gillard in consultation with the Labor governments of Australia and others, but they had no idea how they were going to deliver it. The LNP government has an idea about how to deliver it. The great thing is that it is actually giving better patient outcomes. Bouncing people around from hospital to hospital results in adverse outcomes. Leaving people lying on trollies in aisles in EDs results in adverse outcomes. The important thing is to actually have the patients seen to, assessed and either discharged or sent through the next step of their hospital admission, and that is what we are doing.

In Queensland, the mortality figures for people in our hospitals are the lowest they have ever been. Not only have we improved the performance of our hospitals, particularly in the area of emergency departments, but also we have improved five out of six categories with regards to elective surgery.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: In addition, the hospital mortality rate has either remained stable or has actually decreased. That is the simple reality. There is no doubt about that. Some on the other side might have a problem with that, but the facts speak for themselves.

(Time expired)

Calvert, Mr R

Dr DOUGLAS: My question is to the Minister for Health. The Gold Coast Hospital CEO has just terminated the services of Queensland's highly trained and regarded director of surgery, neurosurgeon Dr Teresa Withers. She and many others have raised serious issues of safety concerns at the hospital. When is the minister going to take responsibility and stand down the hospital CEO, Mr Ron Calvert, for failing to provide a safe environment for patients and staff?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I remind the honourable member for Gaven that when he used to be a member of a certain other party in this place he applied a far more cautious approach to dealing with these issues than he does now. He also used to counsel a former colleague of his, who is now a candidate in the party that he represents, with regard to jumping to conclusions about these particular matters. The honourable member raised issues similar to this the other day in the parliamentary budget estimates process. I indicated to the honourable member that he should be prepared to come forward with specific allegations with regard to any such issues of concern around the matter that he has raised. Consequential to that invitation, I understand that some matters have been put forward by those who have raised these concerns and they have been internally investigated and nothing remarkable has been specifically found. Following on from that, the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service has contacted Queensland Health and asked us to use our reserve powers and authority to engage independent people to have a look at this matter. We are doing that. We will have people from interstate come in and look at this particular issue.

I say to the honourable member in relation to his assertion about the sacking of a person that that person continues to be employed by the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service as of this morning. That is the case unless there has been breaking news in the last five minutes. Indeed, we are talking about a managerial position that that person does not currently hold.

There certainly has been a restructure in the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service. There have been restructures in a lot of areas around Queensland which are generally giving us far better results with regard to service delivery. We will wait to see the results of that investigation. We are prepared to investigate those things—unlike the other side when they were in government.

Let us talk about some of the things going on on the Gold Coast. Wait times for crucial cancer diagnostic investigations have plummeted from over two years to six months. Eight out of 10 patients, or 78 per cent, are now seen and treated within four hours of arrival compared to five out of 10 patients in 2010. Some 90 per cent of patients now have their elective surgery within the time frames recommended by their doctors. I understand with regard to the standardised hospital based mortality index that at the Gold Coast Hospital there has been a decline.

If this review shows something else then that will probably be released and addressed. I caution the honourable member with regard to these issues until we can actually establish the facts as asserted.

(Time expired)

Smoke Alarms, Subsidy

Mrs FRANCE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. Can the minister please outline how the government, in partnership with Deaf Services Queensland, will deliver the smoke alarm subsidy scheme to ensure the safety of Queenslanders who are deaf or hard of hearing in the event of a fire?

Mr DEMPSEY: I thank the member for the question and for her particular interest in this community safety initiative. I note that this is something that she is passionate about, as are a number of other members in the House. Madam Speaker, I note how you have embraced the deaf and hearing impaired community when it comes to the operation of this parliament.

Smoke alarm laws require all homes throughout the state to be fitted with working smoke alarms—whether that home is one you rent or own or is even a caravan. I make no apologies for this because we all know that smoke alarms save lives. I ask everyone to remember that smoke alarm awareness day is 1 April—

Madam SPEAKER: I will ask the minister to pause. The minister is talking about an important issue and I ask that he be heard in silence. I call the minister.

Mr DEMPSEY: I ask everyone to remember that the state's smoke alarm awareness day is 1 April. We do not want people's lives taken foolishly through fire. That is the significance of that day.

Smoke alarms save the lives of Queenslanders, including those with special needs—such as those in our deaf community. Many people may not have stopped to think how those in the deaf community are alerted by smoke alarms in the event of a fire. I can inform the House that specialised smoke alarms are a key to fire safety for the deaf community. These alarms have a vibrating pad that is placed under a pillow and activates when an alarm sounds. Unfortunately, though, the additional cost of a specialised smoke alarm can be financially out of reach for many people with high needs. While standard smoke alarms cost up to $50, these specialised smoke alarms cost around $400.

I am pleased to be able to announce today that the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service and Deaf Services Queensland are now delivering the smoke alarm subsidy scheme. The Queensland Fire and Rescue Service will provide funding of up to $250,000 each year and Deaf Services Queensland will independently manage the smoke alarm subsidy scheme.

Deaf Services Queensland provides a huge range of services for the deaf community and its management of the scheme will result in a great initiative for those who require it. Deaf or hearing impaired people who are residents in Queensland and hold a current pensioner concession card can apply. Those who are eligible only need to pay $50, as opposed to $400, for the specialised alarm. This scheme will help ensure the safety of everyone in the community, not just those who can afford it.

Government Advertising

Ms TRAD: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the government's advertising campaign about health privatisation, and I ask: how much is being spent on this politically motivated advertising campaign and how many intensive-care nurses—

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Member, I ask you to take your seat. I warn the Treasurer under standing order 253A. I remind members that we want to hear the question being asked. The member answering the question can take issue with the question if they wish while answering. It should not be done in the middle of the question being asked. I call the member for South Brisbane and ask her to start the question again.

Ms TRAD: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the government's advertising campaign about health privatisation, and I ask: how much is being spent on this politically motivated advertising campaign and how many intensive-care-unit nurses could have been funded with this money?

Mr NEWMAN: I am delighted to talk about the fact that this government spends 60 per cent less on advertising than was spent in the last period of the previous Labor government—60 per cent less. I have to say that it does frustrate me a bit that we have had to do some advertising. But it is important at the current time to let Queenslanders know what we are trying to achieve—that is, a quiet revolution in health care in this state. As I said earlier, we want to create the best free public hospital system in the nation. Mr Alex Scott of the Together union and also the Queensland Nurses

Union are, I am afraid, putting out material that suggests that hospitals have been sold off or are going to be sold off. Can they name one? While the Australian Labor Party and their fellow travellers in the union movement put out falsehoods, we will have to actually tell Queenslanders what our objective is—that is, to create the best free public hospital system in the nation. That is what we are about.

If we are talking about government advertising, let us see what Kevin Rudd did. In 2007 Kevin Rudd said government advertising is 'a cancer on democracy. Governments are entrusted to spend taxpayers' money to provide essential services not to use them as a re-election war chest.' Guess what? I do not know that there is an election on in Queensland right now; we are simply informing the public. They can make a call on what they believe.

What is going on federally? There is an election campaign that started way back at the beginning of the year. All we have seen from the Australian Labor Party, those fraudsters opposite, is the spending of public money directly against what was said by the master hypocrite himself, Kevin Rudd. Federal government advertising has jumped by $22 million in June 2013—a 111 per cent increase compared to June 2012. There has been $65 million spent in a three-month advertising blitz on asylum seekers and pre-election promises.

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam SPEAKER: Premier, take your seat. I call the member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: I ask you to rule on relevance. I am not asking about the federal advertising budget but what this government is currently spending on the hospital ads.

Madam SPEAKER: Premier, I will ask you to address the issue of spending in the question. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: Indeed, I am. This government spends 60 per cent less and has saved millions and millions and millions of dollars. That is taking into account the fact that we are spending some money on this advertising campaign. But I have to make the contrast that federal Labor spent an extra 111 per cent or $22 million on advertising in June 2013 alone. The member for South Brisbane, who is always there with the bile at the back of her throat, venting her spleen in this place, just needs to accept that Labor are hypocrites, that Labor are financial incompetents and that Labor federally need to be kicked out of office.

(Time expired)

Right to Information

Dr DAVIS: My question without notice is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. What steps are being taken by the government to ensure that the people of Queensland are given an opportunity to contribute to improving the effectiveness of the Right to Information Act and the Information Privacy Act?

Madam SPEAKER: I am going to allow one minute given that we started one minute late. I call the Attorney-General. You have one minute on the clock.

Mr BLEIJIE: Madam Speaker, I do thank you for that gracious one minute. I table copies for all honourable members of the discussion paper about the Right to Information Act and also the Information Privacy Act 2009.

Tabled paper: Review of the Information Privacy Act 2009: Privacy Provisions—discussion paper, August 2013 [3146].

Tabled paper: Review of the Right to Information Act 2009 and Chapter 3 of the Information Privacy Act 2009—discussion paper, August 2013 [3147].

Despite what you read in the *Courier-Mail* from one Alison Sandy, this government is the most open and accountable government in Queensland's history. We have released diaries for the first time in Australia's history. We have changed legislation to say that when a journalist gets information through an RTI application so does the world. We have Minister Ian Walker, who directed his office to release information on the very same day and yet somehow gets accused by Alison Sandy in the *Courier-Mail*. Where is this not accountable and open? I encourage all Queenslanders in the spirit of openness and transparency, when the government holds an Open Government Forum next month, to have input, to have a say. We want the push model. We want to push as much government information as we can out in the public domain, as it should be.

Madam SPEAKER: The time for questions has expired.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before we start matters of public interest, I wish to acknowledge schools visiting this week: King's Christian College from the electorate of Mudgeeraba, St Mary's College from the electorate of Ipswich, school leaders from the electorate of Southport, the Glennie School and also Logan TAFE.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Newman Government, Performance

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.31 am): I understand that yesterday the Premier addressed his LNP caucus and talked about what a good story he had to tell, a good story on behalf of the Newman government. Well, I would like to politely disagree. The front page of today's *Courier-Mail* is not a good story to tell. I do want to put on record that the member for Redlands has done the right and honourable thing in standing down as chair of the Ethics Committee while this matter is under investigation. While we were on leave after the last session of parliament, we also had the revelations from the member for Moggill, known now as the 'Flegg tapes'. Let me make it very clear that that was not a good story to tell.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: I warn the member for Gregory and ask him to cease interjecting. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We have also seen from this government the resignation of Minister Bates, Minister Flegg and Minister Gibson—also not a good story to tell the people of Queensland. And who can forget the member for Redcliffe? That is also not a good story to tell. Let's talk about the Premier's hand-picked director-general, Michael Caltabiano. It was revealed during estimates that he was paid in excess of $650,000. I understand this matter is still under investigation, but that is not a good story to tell Queenslanders.

But there is something that stands out and that puts all of these other issues to the side, and that is the sacking of some 14,000 workers by this Newman government. Today I want to draw the attention of the House, and indeed the attention of all Queenslanders, to a shocking, startling exchange that is almost incomprehensible in the degree of callousness it exposes on behalf of the individual who purports to care for everyone who lives and works in this state—the Premier.

Everyone remembers the Premier sincerely promising public sector workers before the 2012 election that they had nothing to fear from an LNP government. They now see that sincerity for what it was—fraudulent—because, once he had his feet under the Premier's desk, the mass sackings started. Almost immediately upon taking office 16 months ago the Premier set about systematically destroying some 14,000 families by sacking the breadwinners who made their living as public servants.

What everyone always suspected is that nobody on that side, unlike those of us on this side, really cared about those who were being tossed on to the dole queue, that the people being sacked were just numbers to them. What can be revealed today is proof that this government's lack of care is systemic—and it starts at the top. As a demonstration of that uncaring, unfeeling, cold and heartless attitude, I want to read directly from an exchange between the Premier and a senior member of his staff which goes to the cold, black core of this cruel and self-centred government, led by Premier Newman.

On Friday, 29 July last year—which all of those who work in government will have etched in their memories as 'black Friday'—the Premier launched the first offensive in his determined war against public sector workers by starting his campaign of sackings. On that day 14,000 people were told to clear out their desks. On that day lives were ruined. On that day families were left bewildered about how they would pay the bills and how they would put food on the table. Nobody in Queensland, and nobody in this place, can deny the genuine concern felt throughout the community for the thousands of people who had been afforded no dignity, no respect and certainly no care from this government. It was no secret that there was a very real fear for the wellbeing of those thousands of workers—many of them left in a delicate state of mind at the shock and brutality of this Premier's mass sacking campaign.

Certainly that wide concern was widely reported in the media. But the Premier had only one thing on his mind, and that was how his crumbling image would emerge. In emails between the Premier and the head of his government media unit on that 'black Friday', obtained under right to information, there is an extremely telling exchange, and I will quote: 'Public service story was on three commercials …', Mr Lee Anderson wrote to the Premier at 6.22 pm after he had obviously viewed 6 pm broadcasts reporting the blood-letting on channels 10, 9 and 7. Mr Anderson continued, '… which is really starting to become tiresome.' Let me just repeat that line so everyone is very clear what Mr Anderson said: 'which is really starting to become tiresome.' That is how those at the highest level of this government feel about 14,000 people being distressed after losing their livelihoods—it becomes 'tiresome' when such facts are reported.

Mr Anderson went on to tell the Premier that Channel 9 news 'reported cases of self-harm as a result of job losses' before he added, 'I reckon the public perception of how many have been sacked far outweighs the reality.' And then—shockingly, appallingly, dreadfully—came the Premier's reply: 'How did I end up looking?' I will give everyone just a moment to take that in: 'How did I end up looking?' I ask members on that side of the House to take a moment and give that response very careful consideration. While thousands were in the midst of attempting to dust themselves off after they had been sacked, while families sat around their tables anguishing about how they would pay the bills, while thousands of people were stripped of their dignity, while people who had been in jobs for decades were suddenly shown the door and while genuine concerns were held for their state of mind and their wellbeing, what was the Premier thinking of? His one and only response was, 'How did I end up looking?' 'How did I end up looking on the news?'

The fact that this Premier with the stroke of a pen ruined 14,000 lives is appalling enough. The fact that one of the most senior members of his staff found the concerns of those 14,000 lives tiresome is scandalous. The fact that this Premier's first area of concern amidst the blood-letting was how he looked on the nightly news at six o'clock defies belief. It also shows Queenslanders what they could expect in the frightening scenario where Tony Abbott takes office: the Newman government is the entree and an Abbott government would clearly be the main course.

The self-interest of this Premier is without measure. The self-interest and twisted priorities of this Premier and his government know no bounds, but Queenslanders can see through this facade. They are right to imagine a Premier who leaves his office on level 15 of the Executive Building each day after watching the nightly news chanting, 'Mirror, mirror on the wall.' They see a government and a Premier which continue to sack workers and refuse to rule out sacking thousands more in the future only to try to sneak through grotesque pay hikes that as I speak see the Premier on a wage equivalent to the President of the United States. They see a government that sells off public housing and throws elderly retirement home residents onto the street. They see a government that closes down important schools and at the same time ploughs ahead with a new building for themselves and their ministers. They see a government that refuses ambulance officers a fair wage for a fair day's work. This is not a good record of government. Queenslanders will know better come the next election and send them a very clear message—

(Time expired)

Palliative Care

Mr DAVIES (Capalaba—LNP) (11.41 am): I rise today with a good-news story for the people of Queensland and ultimately for the people of my electorate of Capalaba. As a member of the Health and Community Services Committee, it has been a great privilege to be involved in a recent report that we as a committee put together on palliative care. The *Palliative and community care in Queensland: toward person-centred care* report made 63 recommendations. Of those recommendations the one that I found the most powerful and the one that I hope to see become a reality was recommendation 3. Recommendation 3 of the report concerns the provision of a children's hospice for children with life-threatening illnesses. The report recommended that the hospice should provide end-of-life care and respite care for children and adolescents with life-threatening illnesses.

During our public hearings we had a number of very powerful submissions, both in writing and in person, from people talking about the amazing need for a facility like this in Queensland. A number of us—and even a big burly guy like me—were brought to tears hearing some of the tragic stories of families who have had to take their child, often with a very grave illness, either to Bear Cottage in New South Wales or Very Special Kids in Victoria. One family talked about putting their child into the

back of their station wagon in a humidicrib with all the oxygen tanks and things they needed and taking that child to Bear Cottage just to give them a week's respite so they could just be mum and dad rather than having to be the doctor or nurse for their child.

I can only say that the need is very apparent. One of the groups that attended the hearings was Queensland Kids. Queensland Kids is headed up by a wonderful husband-and-wife team, Paul and Gabrielle Quilliam. They spoke about their dream and vision to start up a hospice for young children called Hummingbird House. They spoke about their vision in the committee hearing and talked about what they would like to see happen.

I am pleased to announce that as a result of our report the Queensland government made an announcement only last week of $5.5 million to fund this project, and if the LNP federal opposition wins government it will match that number with $5.5 million to make Hummingbird House a reality. This is a good-news story. As a government we have had to make tough decisions, but those tough decisions have real positive outcomes in that we can set up a hospice in Queensland so that families with some of the most needy kids in our state do not have to lug their kids in the back of a car, as they used to under Labor, and go all the way down to New South Wales or Victoria to provide not only what these young children deserve but also what their families need.

I think it is a wonderful initiative. I talked to the Quilliams last week and they have come up with a program with St Vincent's Hospital. St Vincent's have identified some space within their hospital where within six months they can set up a temporary hospice with eight beds on the hill at Kangaroo Point. By 2015 they will have a purpose-built facility. This is as a result of the Campbell Newman government responding to the report and seeing the need. We have made the hard decisions so we have the money in the bank. We have not had to borrow to do it.

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr DAVIES: This is important, Jo, and you know it. This is a very important issue. Where is Mr Rudd matching Tony Abbott's $5.5 million if he gets elected? It is not going to happen. It is here now, it is a great project and I commend it to the House.

(Time expired)

Member for Mudgeeraba, Qualifications

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.46 am): The Labor Party and its QNU mates have seen fit to dispute my qualifications to speak in this place on matters concerning the nursing profession. They were undoubtedly inspired by a desire to protect their Queensland Nurses Union colleagues from the damning speech I made in the House demonstrating their commitment to partisan politics above all and certainly above the welfare of their members—the hardworking nurses of Queensland who day after day commit themselves to the health and wellbeing of their patients.

The Labor Party asserts I was putting myself forward incorrectly as a currently registered nurse in an attempt to enhance my credentials to speak on issues affecting nurses. In response to that I state that my reference to registered nurse was referring to the fact that I had been a registered nurse for some 30 years prior and that I was currently eligible to be registered as same. It was in no way a representation of my registration or not. Regardless, this is a ludicrous claim. I do not need to fraudulently enhance my standing in this regard.

I have been a registered nurse, either as a state enrolled nurse or a registered general nurse, for some 30 years. Not only that, I am a decorated nurse in Australia and I have been awarded a few citations. Some of these awards include Queensland Telstra Business Woman of the Year (AusIndustry) as the General Manager of the Wesley Gold Coast Hospital; the Australian Council on Healthcare Standards Quality Award 2000; the Australian Private Hospitals Individual Achievers Award 2000; the Royal Australian College of Nursing Queensland Chapter Distinguished Service Award 2001; and the Prime Minister's Centenary of Federation Medal for services to the Australian community in health in 2003. The QNU's attempt to downgrade my experience and recognised professional history as a registered nurse is farcical. It is demeaning. It is disrespectful not only to me but also to all nurses, registered or otherwise, and shows the disregard the Labor Party holds for all nurses.

On each occasion I was referring to my extensive experience and the qualifications I have held from time to time. I was not referring to my state of registration at the relevant time regarding which an application for re-registration is currently being assessed by AHPRA. Speaking of AHPRA, I received a letter from them which I now table.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 July 2013, to Ms Bates from Matthew Hardy on behalf of the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency [3148].

AHPRA now consider this matter closed. In fact, let me read from the letter. It states—

I appreciate your responses to the matters raised ... I accept that you intended to make references to having been a registered nurse and to having had completed the required qualifications. I also acknowledge your statement that you have not provided nursing care ...

The final word is that as far as they are concerned this matter is now closed.

I am entitled to be a registered nurse, a general nurse, in the state of Queensland. I did not reapply for my certificate to practise as I did not, at the time, feel I had the ability to fulfil the continuing medical education program required to practise clinically. I have subsequently been advised by AHPRA that I am eligible to be registered and, furthermore, any irregularity with my registration at the relevant time does not give rise to a breach of any regulations. As I said, I deny that there was a breach as I had not practised any clinical nursing care, and that fact is accepted by AHPRA.

I have a diploma as a state enrolled nurse and a diploma as a general nurse which give rise to my capacity to be registered for which I have held registration and at no time was I referring to holding current registration. I respect the different skills and experience that the various members of parliament bring to their representation of their electorate and to the parliament. Together we contribute to the collective good. The way this matter has been prosecuted by the QNU and the Labor Party, devoid of any forensic analysis and with a small-minded pursuit based on unfounded allegations, is at the very least petty and displays a deplorable disregard for all nurses, registered or otherwise. It is important that people cannot simply claim to be a medical practitioner without adequate qualifications. These rules exist so that patients can be confident that if they are to be treated by a nurse or a doctor or a specialist, they are being treated by someone adequately trained to do so. It is about confidence and about maintaining the integrity of the aforementioned professions.

What it is not about is giving the Labor Party and the QNU an avenue for petty political point-scoring. These rules were not set up to ensure that I could not preface a statement I make in this place with 'as a registered nurse'. To say so, firstly, does not indicate my current registration but serves to give context to what I am about to say. It certainly does not put patients at risk, which is why the rules exist in the first place. As already stated clearly, the QNU was motivated not to protect the wellbeing of Queensland residents or maintain the integrity of Queensland Health professionals, but to score points as they continue to spread falsehoods regarding the future of our hospitals and the future of front-line staff in Queensland Health.

(Time expired)

Nyanda State High School

Mr JUDGE (Yeerongpilly—UAP) (11.52 am): I support my community against the proposed closure of Nyanda State High School for a range of legitimate reasons that I have put forward in a comprehensive submission. I table my submission to keep open Nyanda State High School, together with relevant attachments.

Tabled paper: Submission, dated 24 July 2013, to Keep Nyanda State High School open written by the member for Yeerongpilly, Mr Carl Judge MP [3149].

It is my intention to highlight some of the key points from the submission. The Brisbane City Council's draft new city plan is being advanced to guide how land in Brisbane can be used and developed. Significantly, the Newman government has endorsed the plan for public consultation. There is a clear need to ensure that high quality education is available in all communities that are projected to experience major residential growth and population growth. On this point, Nyanda State High School is located in the suburb of Salisbury, which is identified as a growth node under the Brisbane City Council's draft new city plan. In fact, Salisbury and many other suburbs in the catchment for Nyanda State High School are already visibly gentrifying with small lot subdivisions and residential development increasing. Demographic data for the catchment confirms a population base that will be able to sustain and increase enrolments in Nyanda State High School into the future, especially after factoring in the major residential development and population growth associated with Brisbane City Council's draft new city plan.

From this perspective, my primary concerns about the proposed closure of Nyanda State High School are as follows. The consultation process was insufficient and, therefore, flawed. It is highlighted that, in accordance with chapter 2, part 3, sections 18 to 20 of the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, the minister must carry out adequate consultation with school communities. The school viability assessment is similarly flawed and based on the department and responsible minister continuing to fail in the inherent obligation to address problems associated with the image of Nyanda State High School and/or developing a more targeted and specialised curriculum to intervene in the trend of decline in enrolments. Action of this nature is required to avoid negligent administration of a significant state asset reportedly valued at $27 million and to fulfil due diligence and accountability. There is evidently strong potential for long-term sustainability and projected increases in enrolment at Nyanda State High School, seemingly overlooked in the school viability assessment. Additionally, Nyanda State High School is somewhat uniquely located in a renewing suburb and beside a major industrial estate, presenting real opportunities to collaborate in public-private partnerships that will support key educational outcomes. This includes through important initiatives such as the Newman government's own Great Schools, Real Opportunities five-year action plan to revitalise Queensland's vocational training sector.

Overall, it is obvious that early action could have conceivably stopped or even reversed the trend in declining enrolments at Nyanda State High School. Recognising the public as shareholders in this $27 million state asset, there is an inherent obligation for the department and the Newman government to not only address problems associated with the image of Nyanda State High School and/or develop a more targeted and specialised curriculum, but also to ascertain from the 659—that is, 79.02 per cent—secondary students in the catchment who are currently not enrolled at the school why they choose to enrol elsewhere and what would influence them to enrol at Nyanda State High School before any final decision is made to close the school.

In conclusion, I wish to express genuine concern about the condensed time frame allocated to consider submissions. This is based on the final day for lodging submissions being 26 July 2013 and the independent consultants report apparently due to be provided to the Newman government by the end of July 2013. This essentially allocates just five days for the consultant to collate findings for the purpose of informing government in early August 2013. On this point, it is recognised that the decision is required in early August 2013 to enable the Newman government to meet legislative obligations under section 20 of the Education (General Provisions) Act for any school closures commencing in 2014. It is not about giving parents the opportunity to enrol their students in other schools; it is simply a legislative requirement and it is misleading for the government to say otherwise.

Mackay Sugar

Hon. JJ McVEIGH (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (11.56 am): I would like to pay tribute to a successful agribusiness company here in Queensland, Mackay Sugar. On 25 July this year Mackay Sugar was inducted into the prestigious Queensland Business Leaders Hall of Fame in recognition of their contribution to the state's reputation and economy. Mackay Sugar, Australia's second largest and Queensland's largest sugar producer, was formed through the merger of the Farleigh, Marian, North Eton, Cattle Creek and Racecourse cooperatives in 1988. They also acquired the Pleystowe mill in the same year. Over the ensuing two decades following the merger a number of other mills were closed and a major refinery now capable of refining some 450,000 tonnes was built at the Racecourse mill site in partnership with ED&F Man in 1993. Mackay Sugar is now a 25 per cent shareholder along with Wilmar International in both New Zealand Sugar Co. and Sugar Australia Pty Ltd, Australia's largest refiner, purchaser and exporter of raw sugar.

The merger and subsequent consolidation of the local industry into a successful, modern and progressive company owe much to the vision and leadership of Graham Davies AM, who became the company's founding chairman. He guided the grower owned companies for some 14 years. Leaders like Graham are important to the future success of agriculture. He and the inaugural board laid the foundations for future generations to succeed and control the sugar supply chain from paddock to plate—or sugar bowl in this case. Cane farmers in Mackay own the asset, with a turnover of nearly half a billion dollars—and they own that, too. Had they not merged in the late eighties they probably would not have what they have now. Mackay Sugar, which produces around 800,000 tonnes of raw sugar and 200,000 tonnes of molasses each year, now has the scale to be globally competitive and resilient. It has a turnover of approximately $400 million annually and employs over 600 people permanently and up to 1,000 seasonally, thus contributing significantly to the local economy. The

company has three operating milling sites in Mackay at Farleigh, Marian and Racecourse with another mill in Mossman, north of Cairns. The company has begun implementing a 20-year diversification plan which will enhance its business sustainability but also benefit the local community.

A clean, green renewable energy cogeneration plant has been completed at the Racecourse mill and will supply 30 per cent of Mackay's electricity consumption from processing sugarcane waste. Mackay Sugar is truly an agriculture success story and proves that grower owned and operated agribusinesses can still thrive in this state. I congratulate Mackay Sugar on being inducted into the Queensland Business Leaders Hall of Fame. Also inducted on the same evening were: Gold Coast fashion doyenne Paula Stafford, who obviously focuses on the use of textiles in that important industry including, no doubt, cotton and wool—as the Leader of the House has just outlined, she is the original designer of the bikini—the ground-breaking early Australian film maker Charles Chauvel, who hails from my region, the rural area of the Darling Downs; milk product manufacturer QUF; the vital rural organisation Queensland Country Women's Association; as well as the Brett family timber and hardware dynasty. On the same night the Queensland Business Leaders Hall of Fame also announced Brisbane Markets Ltd as the winner of the 2013 Queensland Business History Award.

Well may they say that agriculture is one of the four pillars of our economy. I was fortunate enough to be present on this evening, and it was most pleasing to see three out of the five inductees, plus the history award, from rural industries. This proves that agriculture is still very strong and successful in this great state with great opportunity.

Gold Coast Hospital

Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—UAP) (12.01 pm): On 24 July at the Health estimates I raised the serious issue of patient safety at the Gold Coast Hospital and sought a safety audit, only to be told by the health minister that I was going for cheap headlines and making outrageous claims. Since then medical specialists on the Gold Coast—many with long experience in the delivery of health care—have tried to have the issues investigated, but their requests have been ignored. They have spoken as one and given the evidence that the minister has repeatedly said was absent.

In February this year 90 of the affected senior medical specialists who represent patients resolved to confront both the CEO and the hospital board. Nothing was done by either the CEO or the hospital board. They ignored the 20 specialists who represented them and did nothing. Like all other Gold Coast state MPs—all of them—I have received a letter from paediatrician and clinical geneticist Dr Stephen Withers backing up my claims and seeking my support in asking the minister for an investigation—which, lamentably, I think he has announced this morning. The minister is saying nothing, but his CEO Mr Ron Calvert has gone public with misleading statements about a pseudoinquiry that he had done. Mr Ron Calvert actually asked the head of the unit requiring investigation to investigate himself. I table the letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 25 July 2013, to the member for Gaven, Dr Alex Douglas MP, from Dr Stephen Withers on behalf of Pindara Paediatrics [3150].

One of the most salient points made by Dr Withers is that doctors do have hard evidence to substantiate their claims, and they have attempted in what he calls 'every conceivable way' to have those concerns investigated, but without success. The local area health board apparently dismissed their written allegations without investigation. Many people have already lost their positions or been stood down regarding the matter, including the medical superintendent. No substantive evidence was found against him after outrageous claims by the CEO were made directly against him. That was an independent report.

This morning the minister said that with regard to medical matters I am naturally a very cautious person—and I am—but when there are serious matters of patient safety, I take them seriously. I expect him to do so as well. I think all members need to take this seriously. All Gold Coast members need to realise that this is serious stuff. This is about people's lives and the potential loss of life. Do not ignore these things. The director-general of health is aware of these concerns. There are no medical people left on the executive; Dr Teresa Withers has just been stood down. He says that doctors are gravely concerned that the current path will lead to more doctors being removed from their positions at the hospital. How many people does it take?

There are no medical, nursing or allied personnel now on the executive team of the hospital which is run by the CEO Mr Ron Calvert. Last week I again expressed my concerns to the minister in a formal letter and sought an investigation. I also asked him to facilitate what is needed to correct a potentially dangerous situation. As I said in that letter, during the last 40 years of public health care in

Queensland—I have worked for Queensland Health on and off for over 30 years—when such significant matters are raised, on further inquiry all were found to be substantial and there were major consequences.

With regard to the current matter, the number of specialists identified and the depth of presentation and concern alone is sufficient to warrant investigation. I predict there will be serious consequences—as there should be. That is why this morning there was all of this rubbish about payroll inquiries and our questions were stymied. The payroll inquiry is important, but this is more important because this is the immediate problem. In contrast to the statement of Mr Ron Calvert, safety issues have been raised by multiple doctors and in many instances—not just a few—there are longstanding and systemic problems. The medical assessment unit which he has mentioned is only one of many that have had problems, and we need to investigate all of these problems. We cannot have Caesar judging Caesar, for God sake. We are much better than that.

An indication of the current problems is reflected in the fact that both the AMA federal president, Steve Hambleton, and the state president, Dr Christian Rowan, attended a recent meeting of the hospital's local medical association because the CEO and the local board chair would not talk to anyone. They were unable to get Queensland Health to take urgent action. To give members an idea of what is going on here, there are patients who are going to this MAU unit for up to five days, they are going to be very ill and they may very well subsequently lose their lives. I am not going to go into the details. These will come out in an inquiry. This is serious stuff. As a general practitioner for more than 25 years, I appeal to the minister to investigate these matters openly and widely discuss them—no cheap headlines—but do what Dr Withers has said. It is imperative—

(Time expired)

Police Resources

Mr PUCCI (Logan—LNP) (12.06 pm): '...the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interest of the community welfare and existence.'

These are the iconic words of the former British Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel at the birth of the Metropolitan Police Force. With such diverse communities throughout Queensland, our police service is faced with a dynamic and challenging environment in which to discharge its duties. The dedication of the Queensland Police Service is unrivalled in our great state: from the Torres Strait to Currumbin and from Logan to Longreach, our men and women in blue are at the front lines serving our community with distinction; however, their efforts would be in vain if they were not adequately supported.

Our government is unashamedly tough on crime. Since being sworn in last year, we have undertaken the biggest reform of the police and community safety sectors that this great state has ever seen. Through tougher sentencing of offenders, youth justice intervention facilities and an ongoing commitment to increase the capabilities of the Queensland Police Service, we are ensuring that every community across our vast state remains a safe and prosperous community in which to live, work and raise a family. Those who now form the Labor opposition failed to act during the 20 years that they were in government; they failed to take the steps needed to protect Queenslanders; they failed time and time again to resource our police and equip our justice system to help our communities remain safe. The mentality of simply throwing inadequate amounts of money at the issue was not the solution. It will never be the solution. As long as the left think it is, they will never regain the honour and responsibility of governing our great state.

The solution is—and always will be—more boots on the ground whilst utilising the appropriate resources to engage the community; economy of management, using available resources to their full potential and producing maximum results. These are the leadership attributes missing from the opposition. The partnership between the Police Service and the community will always be instrumental in delivering a safer community. Our government has enthusiastically strengthened the relationship between the community and the Police Service through such initiatives as the myPolice blog. The Minister for Police and Community Safety, the Hon. Jack Dempsey, recently visited Logan and launched the myPolice Logan blog at the Browns Plains Police Station. With 14 localised myPolice blogs and more to come stretching from Far North Queensland to the south-east, this interactive and revolutionary policing method has the ability to engage tens of thousands of locals with one click of the button. The blog features crime prevention tips and allows our Police Service to

interact with people who are unable to attend Neighbourhood Watch meetings. The partnership with our communities is also enhanced with a new interactive online program that enables the community to have up-to-date, detailed statistics on crimes being committed throughout Queensland.

Both of these initiatives, I am proud to say, have been devised and implemented under our LNP government. Queenslanders have yearned for real action, and now it is happening. With real solutions, and not the smoke-and-mirrors show from the left, our communities will have a safer and brighter future. Maximising the right use of technology is only half the battle. The other half is on the street. More boots on the ground and at the coalface will make our communities safer places.

Our government has committed more resources to enhance our Police Service than any government in Queensland's history. The people of Queensland will be pleased to know that this government is doing its utmost to rectify the deficiencies in community safety left behind by the bad old days of Labor's inept Bligh-Beattie governments. Contained in the recent 2013 state budget, and reinforced during the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's estimates hearings, is a viable plan that will deliver real benefits for communities across Queensland.

Our policies and robust support for making Queensland a safer place can be seen in the deployment of 567 new police officers to our local stations. A further 57 officers have been moved to the front line from support roles within the Queensland Police Service. From school based police officers, which we have in Logan, and community police officers, to road safety and tolerance programs, and proactive and viable measures when it comes to police pursuits, this government is doing what is necessary to support our Police Service so that we can make a difference in making communities great places with great opportunities, free from danger of criminal activity.

Even with Neighbourhood Watch, PCYCs, the Safe City initiative and $1 million in 2013 to help revitalise Neighbourhood Watch and Crime Stoppers, we must remain vigilant and determined in our resolve that those who seek—

(Time expired)

Unemployment

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (12.11 pm): Queenslanders will have the opportunity to 'vote for Kevin on September 7'. They will have to chance to vote for Labor and jobs and growth—in stark contrast to what is being offered by the coalition. We are learning the hard way from the Newman government here in Queensland that when the LNP promise to support jobs, to grow the economy and to lower the cost of living, they in fact mean to do the exact opposite.

As recently as yesterday, the Premier said that nothing was more important to this government than jobs for Queenslanders. This is a little hard to believe when you look at the facts. Since the Newman government was elected in Queensland there has been a loss of 13,700 full-time jobs, with the unemployment rate rising to a decade high of 6.4 per cent. Under the first full financial year of the Newman government jobs growth in Queensland has been at its weakest in more than two decades. The last time jobs growth in Queensland was this bad in percentage terms was 1990-91, when the Australian economy was last in recession.

The Premier is attempting to blame everything except his government for what are shocking unemployment figures. The Premier blames the carbon tax and the mining tax while making out that his sacking of tens of thousands of people, his slashing of employment programs and his tax hikes have nothing to do with it. These excuses are just that—hollow and meaningless excuses.

While Queensland has lost 13,700 full-time jobs since March 2012, the nation has created 56,400 full-time jobs seasonally adjusted. In trend terms, Queensland has lost 14½ thousand full-time jobs, compared with growth of 75,500 full-time jobs across Australia, since March 2012. For the Premier's benefit, unemployment was rising under the LNP prior to the introduction of the carbon tax or the mining tax, and neither explains the significant rise in unemployment particular to Queensland under the Newman LNP government. Queensland now has the highest unemployment rate in mainland Australia. Only the Premier's home state of Tasmania has higher jobless figures.

Queensland's unemployment rate and loss of full-time jobs is pushing up the national unemployment rate. The same figures Joe Hockey attacks federally are in part the result of the actions of this Newman LNP government. On the Treasurer's now preferred trend measure, the unemployment rate of six per cent is above the peak during the global financial crisis and has been higher than at the 2012 election each and every month since April last year.

Queenslanders are starting to find out that an LNP promise to support jobs is code for the exact opposite, just like the LNP's promise to lower unemployment to four per cent in Queensland. Nobody voted for decade-high unemployment in Queensland of 6.4 per cent. Let us be clear about that.

The LNP's rhetoric about growing four pillars has also been shown to be nothing more than hollow words. After promising to grow the economy, the LNP has seen the economy slow since they took office. It is not forecast by Treasury to recover for another two years. The Treasurer is still insisting that growth of four per cent under Labor represented a basket-case economy. Somehow, an economy growing slower, at three per cent under the LNP, is better.

Queenslanders will also be wary of promises from the LNP and Tony Abbott to lower the cost of living. The Treasurer finally conceded at estimates last month that taxes per Queenslander have increased by $257 since the Newman government was elected. Mind you, this was after he initially described my suggestion, based on his own budget figures, as 'rubbish'. This represents a slug of more than a thousand dollars for the average household of four. Just last week we experienced another Newman government tax increase, with tax on insurance going up by $990 million, or by more than $110 per year for the average household, from 1 August.

At the election the Premier, in his so-called 'Contract with Queensland', promised to lower household bills by $250 to $330 a year—another broken promise. As part of the Premier's contract he pledged to lower electricity bills by $120 a year—another broken promise. The electricity price increase this financial year is the largest on average that Queensland has ever seen—at 22.6 per cent, or $268. Once again the Premier has attempted to sheet home blame for his government's failures to the carbon tax or any initiative that might help the environment. In reality, if there were no factors contributing to electricity price rises other than the green initiatives, the average increase would be just three per cent, not a record 22.6 per cent. That is hurting Queensland households right across-the-board.

From the performance of the LNP in Queensland it is clear that the only vote for jobs, growth and a positive future on 7 September will be a vote for Kevin Rudd and the Australian Labor Party.

Murray, Mr G

Mr SYMES (Lytton—LNP) (12.16 pm): I rise today to advise the House of the passing of a local Wynnum Manly identity who did a lot for the sport of rugby league in Queensland, New South Wales and the United Kingdom. I speak of Graham Murray, affectionately known by rugby league fanatics as 'Muzza'. Yesterday I had the honour to attend the funeral of Graham Murray on behalf of the Lytton community.

Graham Murray started his professional playing career at Parramatta before moving to Souths in the old NSWRL. He then entered coaching at the highest level. This is how Graham Murray was most widely known, as Graham coached numerous professional clubs including the Sydney Roosters, Illawarra and the mighty North Queensland Cowboys. Under Muzza's guidance, the Cowboys reached their first grand final. At times he was adored by Queenslanders, for his role in developing the game in Wynnum Manly, as both a former CEO of the club and coach. But he was also reviled as coach of the New South Wales Blues at Origin time.

It was fitting for a man who touched so many communities and people through his role in rugby league that over 600 people packed his funeral in Balmoral yesterday, with former greats such as Darryl Brohman, Royce Simmons and Chris McKenna in attendance, as was the former member for Chatsworth, Terry Mackenroth.

Outside of footy Graham was a gentleman and a loving family man to his wife, Amanda, and his daughter, Cara. Graham did not see his role as just a coach or a player but as a friend to his players. He saw that to have a strong rugby league side you need a strong community. Over his time as the Wynnum Manly CEO he saw the club increase its presence in the local area by being more community focused. This would have a knock-on effect, with the philosophy that if you get behind the community the community will get behind you. The Wynnum Manly and the Australian Rugby League community were made all the better for having Graham Murray working to promote the game. As Lance Campbell said in his eulogy yesterday, there's only one Graham Murray.

Health System

Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (12.18 pm): The release of the Health payroll inquiry report will no doubt attract significant attention in the media—and, yes, it was a debacle. But now we have a Gold Coast University Hospital debacle as described this morning by the member for Gaven, and his concerns are very real down on the Gold Coast. This morning we had the numbskull Premier in here who did not want to answer—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member will refer to members by their title and withdraw that statement.

Mrs MILLER: The Premier; I withdraw. We had the Premier in here who was asked question upon question in relation to the Gold Coast Hospital and he refused to answer any of them. That is because all he wants to do is play politics. He only wants to play politics with the Health payroll report. That is what this bloke is at. He just wants to do that. The Minister for Health has used this payroll system to divert attention from his own appalling performance, and we know why—because his performance has been singularly unimpressive. It has been cold and calculating, just like an accountant. The health minister is presiding over the erosion of Queensland's enviable public health system as he steps closer towards Americanisation, and just last week the Newman government attempted to fool Queenslanders with a deliberately misleading taxpayer funded advertising propaganda campaign. The health minister uses deceptive language when he says that no existing public hospital will be privatised, but clearly this language is being used specifically because privatisation is high on the agenda for three of the new hospitals—that is, the Queensland Children's Hospital, the Sunshine Coast Hospital and the new Gold Coast University Hospital.

The health minister could not have been clearer last month when he said the government has asked private providers for expressions of interest in the management of clinical and non-clinical services at the new Sunshine Coast Hospital. This means that anyone turning up for treatment when the doors open should be ready—they should be ready either to open their wallet or be ready when they could be asked about whether or not they have credit cards. Let us not forget the numerous non-clinical services in existing hospitals that are also under threat from privatisation, and we are looking at everything from catering and cleaning through to pharmacy and radiography. All of the staff currently performing these roles in Queensland public hospitals are nervous, and they are nervous because they know that the health minister will flog off their jobs to the private sector. Remember, this is a government that already has form in relation to these matters. It has been running around sacking doctors and nurses and cutting front-line health services despite its promises to the contrary to deny Queenslanders the basic right to free healthcare services in our community.

Queensland's performance in other areas is going backwards. It is going backwards on elective surgery. In the last performance figures, Queensland was the only state to fail to clear the longest waiting 10 per cent of overdue surgery patients for all categories of urgency. This is despite the extra funding provided to Queensland from our federal Labor government. We also have the situation where the state branch of the Royal Australasian College Surgeons has criticised the lack of intensive care beds. These are the doctors hitting out at this Campbell Newman LNP government. The doctors are up in arms over it. They come from senior medical practitioners working in the public health system—working in it and they see firsthand every day the impact of job cuts and funding cuts. The doctors have blamed not only the hospital and health services but they also know that this is because of funding cuts by this Newman LNP government. It is clearly a disgrace. I have a message for the minister today: health is about caring, not calculators.

Queensland Plan

Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (12.23 pm): I want to drag the House back to a sense of reality after the drivel that we just heard from the member for Bundamba.

Mrs MILLER: I rise to a point of order. I find the member for Burleigh's comments offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for Burleigh has been asked—

Mr HART: Mr Deputy Speaker, I withdraw. It might do well for the member for Bundamba to remember some of the facts that the Premier and the Minister for Health have presented in the House over the past months. The hopeless ALP federal government has in fact pulled over $100 million out of Queensland Health to the detriment of Queensland Health. There can be no doubt about that. The evidence is there. The Premier has produced it, as has the Minister for Health. But today I rise to

speak about a plan for Queensland. I rise to speak about the fact that this government has a long-term plan for Queensland. We are in fact working on a 30-year plan for Queensland, unlike the federal Labor Party, which has no plan for anything—no plan for the future. The federal coalition also has long-term plans for this state.

If people go to the Queensland Plan website—www.queenslandplan.qld.gov.au—they will see that there are still 24 days, 11 hours and 34 minutes for the public of Queensland to give their feedback on those important questions that were constructed in Mackay on 10 May. There is just over three weeks to go with that vision and I want to talk about the feedback that the people of Burleigh have been giving to me about those questions that we posed—questions like how do we move the focus from me to we, how do we teach skills and values to meet global challenges, how do we embrace responsibility for an active and healthy lifestyle, how do we achieve sustainable landscapes, and how do we attract and retain the brightest minds? I start by congratulating the representatives from Burleigh—Kelly Zirilli from the Gold Coast Central Chamber of Commerce, Salvador Cantellano from Rabbit+Cocoon arts precinct and Joel Ringland, the school captain at Miami State High School. I also congratulate the Premier for his involvement in getting schoolkids involved with these important questions to give us their feedback. The young people of this state are the future of this state and we want to hear from them exactly what they think about these important questions.

Over the last few months I have run a series of information booths and forums to engage the Burleigh community and to keep it informed about where we are going with the Queensland Plan. Every Friday morning from around 5.30 or six o'clock I go down to the Burleigh boardwalk and take my iPad to read the newspaper. I grab a cup of coffee from the local Nook coffee shop and I sit there and read the paper, but I never get past the front page of the paper because somebody always comes to sit down with me wanting to give feedback on the Queensland Plan. They want to give feedback on the wonderful things that this government is doing to promote Queensland and to promote business in Queensland in particular. It is a beautiful spot down there on the boardwalk. You can watch the surfers, and there are thousands of them every morning, and people walking down the boardwalk doing their morning exercise. I also go to the Burleigh farmers market once a week on a Saturday. That is the biggest farmers market on the Gold Coast and a lot of people stop to have a chat about the Queensland Plan when we give out forms. I also ran an information booth at Skilled Park on 2 June in conjunction with the member for Southport and the member for Broadwater. I digress for a second and congratulate the member for Broadwater on her birthday today.

Mr Young: Happy birthday!

Mr Costigan: Yes; hear, hear!

Mr HART: While the member for Whitsunday is talking, at that particular game the Titans played the Cowboys and we won 31-12. Not to rub your nose in it, but we did win 31-12. We also held a wonderful children's health and wellbeing expo on 21 July in conjunction with Jann Stuckey. We got some wonderful feedback from that when about 9,000 people attended. I congratulate the Premier on a wonderful Queensland Plan for the future.

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The time for matters of public interest has expired.

QUEENSLAND INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL BILL

Introduction

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (12.29 pm): I present a bill for an act to establish a tribunal to review and decide matters relating to remuneration in connection with members and former members of the Legislative Assembly, to amend this act, the Constitution of Queensland 2001, the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001, the Local Government Act 2009, the Local Government Regulation 2012, the Parliamentary Service Act 1988 and the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 for particular purposes and to repeal the Parliament of Queensland Regulation 2012. I table the bill and the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Bill 2013 [3151].

Tabled paper: Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Bill 2013, explanatory notes [3152].

I am pleased to introduce the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Bill 2013. The level of salaries and allowances for elected representatives has long been a vexed issue in Australia and, indeed, in most countries around the world. Queensland is certainly no different, and the actions of the former Labor government in this area and the situation we inherited has not made things any easier. It is clear that it is no longer tenable for the salaries of members of the Queensland Legislative Assembly to be legislatively linked to the salaries of members of the Commonwealth parliament. Indeed, it is no longer tenable, in my view, for members to set their own salaries, allowances and entitlements. That is why today I am acting to resolve this situation. That is why today I am putting a stop to the pay rises politicians were due under the Beattie-Bligh system.

This bill formally establishes the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal. The tribunal is being tasked with independently reviewing the remuneration of members and former members on an ongoing basis and make legally binding determinations about the level of salaries, allowances and entitlements that they deem should apply. Before I talk about the tribunal and the bill in more detail, I would like to correct one of the myths that has been perpetuated in certain quarters in recent weeks. The Bligh government did not freeze the salaries of members, as has been suggested. What actually occurred was that on one occasion the former Premier Anna Bligh delayed the full passing on of a Commonwealth increase by four months and on two occasions the salary increases that were due following increases received by Commonwealth members were reduced to a lower rate of 2.5 per cent. There was no freeze, but it was through these actions that the nexus with the salaries of Commonwealth members was broken.

When I became Premier last year, I was made aware of these salary matters by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Clerk of the Parliament. While I knew that the matters would eventually need to be dealt with, the salaries of members and how they are set was simply not a priority for this government. There were, and still are, many more pressing policy issues facing all Queenslanders. But our hand was forced following the crown law advice we received, detailing what a huge mess Labor had left us in this regard. And it was former Labor ministers who came out strongest, sticking their hands out, looking for what they believed they were owed.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: I refer particularly to the former member for Rockhampton—that is right; Robert Schwarten—who said, 'Because we're worth it.' That is what he said.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: And the interjections from the very aggressive and over-the-top member for South Brisbane simply reflect again that she is incapable of telling the truth at any time.

We have drawn a line in the sand. We are ensuring no Queensland politician, current or retired, will get a pay rise under the system distorted and manipulated by the former Labor government, and particularly that dear, dear friend of the member for South Brisbane, the former Premier, Anna Bligh. We are sorting this mess out once and for all in a totally independent, fair and transparent manner.

The bill implements my five-point plan to reform the Queensland parliament's entitlements system. The bill—

- breaks the legislative nexus between the salaries of Queensland and Commonwealth members;
- formally establishes the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal under legislation;
- provides that the determinations of the tribunal are independent, binding and are not subject to change by members;
- legislates to ensure that back pay for current and former members is only applicable from 1 July 2013; and
- provides that the tribunal must ensure that any allowances are to reflect the amount of reasonable expenses incurred by a member in servicing their electorate and that the allowances are not a substitute for other remuneration.

The tribunal has been tasked with undertaking its review and making its first determination by 15 October 2013. Subsequent determinations must be made within 12 months of the relevant previous determination.

To get the review underway as soon as possible and seek their views during the drafting of the bill, I administratively established the tribunal and appointed the tribunal members on 16 July 2013. The tribunal is being headed by Professor Tim Brailsford, together with fellow tribunal members

Mr David Harrison and Ms Joanne Jessop. Following the passage of the bill, I will formally recommend their appointments to the Governor in Council for a term to 15 July 2016. Professor Brailsford, Mr Harrison and Ms Jessop have experience in academia, business, industrial relations and non-government organisations and their breadth of experience will ensure that the tribunal is independent and reflects the profile of the community. On behalf of the House, I thank the tribunal members for agreeing to serve the Queensland community in this way. The job of determining members' salaries and allowances will be no easy task, but I have every confidence in the wisdom, experience and application that they will bring to the role.

Given the strict provisions in this bill, Queenslanders can have confidence that the tribunal will be totally independent in its actions. The tribunal will not be subject to any direction by me as Premier or, indeed, by any member of this House. While members and other Queenslanders will be able to have input into the tribunal's processes, the determinations they make will be legally binding and the determinations will not be subject to disallowance or amendment by the parliament. Indeed, the only way that a determination by the tribunal could be overturned would be through a retrospective act of parliament. I understand that the tribunal has already met on a number of occasions and is getting on with the task at hand.

The bill provides the tribunal with broad methods of inquiry, enabling them to inquire into and inform themselves in any way they consider appropriate when making a determination. However, in performing this task they must operate independently, impartially and fairly. The bill also requires that the tribunal must consult and consider the views of the Clerk of the Parliament in making a determination. There are also general principles in the bill that the tribunal may have regard to when making a determination. These principles include having regard to the value to the community of a member carrying out their role, functions and responsibilities and the importance of a member being appropriately remunerated for carrying out their role, functions and responsibilities. To ensure transparency, the chairman is required to give a copy of each determination and written notice of the reasons for the determination to the Clerk of the Parliament for immediate tabling in the Legislative Assembly. The chairman will also have to make these documents publicly available. Members of the public can view information about the tribunal by visiting a new website: www.remunerationtribunal.qld.gov.au.

As the accountable officer responsible for implementing a determination, the Clerk of the Parliament is able, under the bill, to ask the tribunal to give a ruling on the interpretation or application of a determination and the tribunal must do so as soon as practicable. The bill also requires the Clerk to publish a *Members' Remuneration Handbook* on the parliament's website. The handbook will reflect the determinations of the tribunal and will detail in an open and transparent way the remuneration that applies to members and former members. This is a similar arrangement to that which currently applies with the *Members' Entitlements Handbook* and the *Members' Office Support Handbook*. Queensland is one of the few parliamentary jurisdictions that has historically made this information publicly available. The tribunal is also required to prepare an annual report about the operations of the tribunal for tabling in parliament after the end of the relevant financial year. For maintaining the independence and impartiality of tribunal members, the bill provides strict eligibility requirements for their appointment and the Governor in Council will only be able to terminate an appointment in limited circumstances.

The bill transfers from the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001—the act—the entire part of provisions relating to the remuneration of members. The bill provides that the tribunal must determine the annual salary of a member, in effect a base salary, and determine any additional salary that may apply to office holders. The list of office holders outlined in the bill reflects those currently in the act, but it will be up to the tribunal to determine if any additional salary is to apply and what the amount of the additional salary will be.

The opportunity for members to enter into salary sacrifice arrangements was introduced in 2006. However, members are currently limited to being able to salary sacrifice for superannuation contributions only. The government is of the view that members should be able to salary sacrifice for other things if they wish in the same way that Public Service employees are permitted to.

The bill includes provision for this but it is important to note that members will have to follow the same salary sacrifice arrangements as public servants. The bill also allows the tribunal, should it wish, to vary its determinations in such a way that takes into consideration the different superannuation arrangements that apply to members and former members.

In breaking the nexus between the salaries of Commonwealth and Queensland members, it retrospectively confirms and validates the salaries that any member received from 1 September 2009 to 30 June 2013. The retrospective provisions aim at preventing any member or former member from pursuing any monies or superannuation benefits that they did not receive in accordance with the act between 1 September 2009 and 30 June 2013. Rob Schwarten, please take note.

The date of 1 September 2009 is the date from which the former Premier first decided not to follow the act with regard to members' salaries. The bill also rescinds the salary increase that was approved by the Governor in Council on 4 July 2013 with effect from 1 July 2013, and returns salaries to the levels which applied on 30 June 2013. The bill will take effect on 9 August 2013 and upon passage and assent, the Clerk will cease paying members at the current salary rates and will return salaries to the 30 June 2013 rates. Rob Schwarten, please take note.

Once the tribunal's determination is made with effect from 1 July 2013, the Clerk will assess if any overpayments have been made to members and, if so, will then begin to recover the money through their fortnightly salary. If a member stops being a member and the Clerk is unable to recover any overpayments through their fortnightly salary, the bill provides the Clerk with the power to recover the money through the courts if it has not been repaid within six months. This is a similar provision which currently applies with regard to allowances received in advance. The advance allowances provisions have been retained in the bill and have also been expanded to include a provision for the Clerk to recover from a member any amount of an allowance that they receive on condition that they are required to account for it. While the tribunal has not made a determination about allowances as yet, the government has acted upon the advice of the Clerk that such a provision should be included in the bill. The rescinding of the salary increase that was approved on 4 July 2013 has also been done in such a way to ensure that no superannuation benefit that would have resulted will flow through to members or former members. Rob Schwarten, please take note. The bill does not affect the provision of other entitlements.

Ms Trad: Jeff Seeney, please take note.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for South Brisbane will cease interjecting. The Premier has the call.

Mr NEWMAN: I might just recap. The bill does not affect the provision of other entitlements and members will continue to receive accommodation and services here at Parliament House and in electorate offices as provided by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly and the Clerk under the Parliamentary Service Act 1988.

While there historically has been a link between the salaries of Queensland and Commonwealth members, there has also been a link between the salaries of local government councillors and Queensland members. Therefore the salary increase approved by the Governor in Council on 4 July 2013 now being rescinded also had an effect on local governments. To ensure local governments in Queensland are able to adhere to their budgets recently adopted, it is imperative that the remuneration of councillors continues to remain at the same level as existed prior to 1 July 2013. The bill therefore removes the nexus which currently exists between councillor and state member salaries. However, the bill goes one step further and reforms the way in which councillor salaries will be determined moving forward. Instead of councillor salaries being set once every four years, the Local Government Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal will meet every year to set salary levels for each category of local government. Local governments will then either accept those salary levels or set new salary levels which are lower than those fixed by the Local Government Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal. This bill is yet another way in which this government is delivering more empowered and autonomous local governments in Queensland.

This bill will usher in a new era of accountability in Queensland. No longer will the salaries, allowances and entitlements of members and former members of this House be able to be set by a determination of a tribunal that resides in Canberra or by Queensland MPs.

First Reading

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (12.45 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Declared Urgent

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (12.45 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 137 the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Bill be declared an urgent bill to enable the bill to be passed through all remaining stages at this week's sitting.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT (SKILLS QUEENSLAND) AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (12.45 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000 for particular purposes, and to make consequential amendments of the Industrial Relations Act 1999 and other acts as stated in schedule 1 for purposes related to those particular purposes, and to amend the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Education and Innovation Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013 [3153].

Tabled paper: Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [3154].

The Newman government is committed to reforming and modernising the vocational education and training—the VET—sector in Queensland, and ensuring Queenslanders can access first class training that leads to real employment outcomes. Within months of coming into power, this government commissioned an industry led review of Queensland's VET sector. This was led by the Skills and Training Taskforce. The Skills and Training Taskforce Final Report outlined a range of recommendations to revitalise the provision of VET and the management of apprenticeships and traineeships.

The government has already implemented some of the key recommendations from the task force by reforming TAFE Queensland, and refocusing our investment on training for job outcomes. The government has also released Great Skills, Real Opportunities, a five-year plan to revitalise Queensland's VET sector. So far under this action plan the government has introduced the Certificate 3 Guarantee, which means that every Queenslander is able to access their first subsidised certificate III level qualification in priority courses. The government is also opening up the training market to full contestability. Under the Certificate 3 Guarantee, selected registered training organisations, RTOs, will compete for an additional $42 million in contestable funding this financial year. From 1 July 2014, all government subsidised training will be delivered contestably, giving students an even greater choice of training provider.

Another key action under Great Skills, Real Opportunities is to encourage government, industry and employers to partner effectively to meet the challenge of matching training to employment opportunities. The Skills and Training Taskforce found that Skills Queensland, established in 2010, had not been effective in addressing the fundamental strategic skills needs of industry. In this regard, the government is establishing an industry advisory body, the Ministerial Industry Commission. This body will be responsible for advising me on the state's skilling priorities and industry needs, and priorities for funding qualifications that will align training with job opportunities. The commission will enable a direct relationship between government, industry and employers that will give industry and employers genuine opportunity to input into how public training investment is made. Membership of the commission will include representatives from industry sectors and employer bodies with expertise in labour market economics and contemporary human resource management. The commission will consult with industry and employers to identify the state's skilling and funding priorities. This will directly influence the relative priority of every government subsidised qualification in Queensland.

The commission will also oversee the effectiveness of the contestable training market which delivers the skills needed by the economy; streamline existing industry consultation arrangements; give small, medium and large industry a voice on local, regional and state skilling requirements; and work with industry and employers to stimulate demand for accredited training. The commission will be an advisory body that will more effectively engage with industry and employers to ensure finite public funds are directed towards priority training. The commission will not be established in legislation.

To avoid wasteful duplication, legislative amendments through this bill will abolish Skills Queensland and give the Director-General of the Department of Education, Training and Employment responsibility for the functions regarding apprentices and trainees, vocational placements, group training organisations and principal employer organisations. Under current arrangements, Skills Queensland delegates most of its day-to-day regulatory functions to regional departmental officers. It is anticipated that once the bill is passed those functions will be delegated to regional departmental staff. As such, there will be no discernible change in the nature or type of service provided to industry employers and employees as a result of the abolition of Skills Queensland. Importantly, Skills Queensland staff will return to the department and will effectively contribute to the important reforms of the training system, including as secretariat support to the Ministerial Industry Commission.

The implementation of the bill will not result in any additional cost to government. It is anticipated that, with the establishment of the Ministerial Industry Commission and the abolition of Skills Queensland with certain functions being returned to the department, there will be a saving of approximately $1 million per annum. This government is committed to genuine sustainable reform for Queensland's VET sector. The abolition of Skills Queensland and the establishment of the Ministerial Industry Commission support effective partnering between the government, industry and employers to meet the challenge of aligning training and funding to job opportunities.

The bill also amends the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 to enable TAFE staff to continue to be employed on a temporary basis. TAFE Queensland was established under the TAFE Queensland Act 2013, which commenced on 1 July 2013. TAFE Queensland will be the public provider of vocational education and training in Queensland. By mid-2014, TAFE Queensland will take over the existing network of TAFE institutes currently run by my department. It is essential for its effective operation that TAFE Queensland has capacity to continue to employ staff under temporary employment arrangements. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (12.52 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Education and Innovation Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Education and Innovation Committee.

TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (PORT PILOTAGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. SA EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (12.52 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Maritime Safety Queensland Act 2002, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 and the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Port Pilotage) Amendment Bill 2013 [3155].

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Port Pilotage) Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [3156].

I am pleased to introduce the Transport Legislation (Port Pilotage) Amendment Bill 2013 to the parliament. The bill will amend existing Queensland legislation to devolve the provision and delivery of port pilotage services from Maritime Safety Queensland to the government owned port authorities located north of Brisbane. These changes will mean MSQ can concentrate on its core responsibilities, focusing on its role as a safety regulator.

The Newman government is committed to ensuring pilotage services across Queensland are safe, sustainable and accessible. The feedback we received from industry also reinforces that pilotage services must be reliable and responsive to supply chain pressures. Currently, we have a situation where operations can be delayed because local ports have to check in with MSQ in Brisbane before making any decisions. Changes to the bill will mean greater flexibility for local ports to make on-the-spot decisions that are safe for industry and the environment.

Devolving the responsibility to port authorities will also increase the opportunities for pilots and pilotage services to be better integrated into regional port management and operational arrangements. This will drive further efficiencies at a time when we are seeing an increase in shipping movements. Demands on the port network are increasing and it is important we balance commercial demands of commodity and trading interests while maintaining a high level of safety standards, managing any impact to the environment. Annually, there are around 10,000 piloted movements facilitating the import and export of 220 million tonnes of cargo in the ports located north of Brisbane. The Port of Brisbane alone has 6,000 piloted movements with 33 million tonnes of cargo.

Port pilotage is a compulsory service, applied to most ships 50 metres and longer that visit Queensland ports. A marine pilot is a qualified ships master who has a high level of skills in ship handling and a detailed knowledge of the port area in which they work. Marine pilots have the difficult task of manoeuvring very large vessels in what can sometimes be congested waterways with a number of environmental factors to consider. It is the responsibility of the pilot to assist the master of the ship to operate safely within the pilotage area. Due to their local knowledge, a pilot reduces the risks to port infrastructure and the marine environment associated with ship movements.

There are 69 marine pilots and 14 pilot vessel transfer crew members currently employed by MSQ and it is a legislative requirement that pilots may only carry out their duties if they are employed by or are acting under an agreement with MSQ. This service delivery is currently provided either under contract, as in the Port of Brisbane, or through pilots directly employed by MSQ. The bill will facilitate the transfer of the responsibility for the provision, or to arrange provision of, pilotage services along with employees, assets and liabilities necessary to undertake this function from MSQ to port authorities. This legislation provides the ability for port authorities to develop innovative business solutions around the delivery of service while maintaining the state's enviable safety record. The bill also places a general safety obligation on entities in the provision of pilotage services and ensures that this safety obligation is extended to parties who may be contracted to deliver this service.

As a government, we want to retain experienced and talented marine pilots in Queensland. In the current environment, once pilots are trained there is no guarantee that they will be retained within government as there is competition for their services interstate. Placing them with local port authorities will mean local decision making and lessen the likelihood of them leaving to take up positions interstate. Under the proposed legislation, all 69 pilots will remain in their current positions with no changes to their conditions. During the transition provision, the state government will retain responsibility for pricing, ensuring the same level of service delivery. Overall, this bill will reduce red tape, keep local talent in Queensland and help ports in Queensland to drive efficiencies to respond to the current industry demand. I commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. SA EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (12.58 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 pm to 2.30 pm.

FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (2.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Health and Community Services Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013 [3157].

Tabled paper: Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [3158].

I am pleased to introduce the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013 to ensure the operations of the Family Responsibilities Commission are extended by a further 12 months. The Family Responsibilities Commission, known as the FRC, is established under the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 and is the centrepiece of the Cape York Welfare Reform Trial. The trial, which commenced in 2008, operates in the four communities of Hope Vale, Aurukun, Coen and Mossman Gorge. The trial operates as a partnership between the Queensland and Australian governments and the Cape York Institute.

With the FRC as its driving force, the trial aims to rebuild social norms, re-establish Indigenous authority, increase engagement in the real economy, and move individuals and families from social housing to homeownership. The trial's aims are achieved by providing opportunities through enhanced services and a range of incentives and disincentives including income management of welfare payments. The FRC works with communities to reduce levels of dysfunction by focusing on individual responsibility to engage in socially responsible behaviours.

The FRC is constituted by a commissioner, deputy commissioner and currently 19 local commissioners. The local commissioners play a key role in the acceptance and success of the FRC and in restoring local authority in communities. The local commissioners are respected persons within their communities who have demonstrated leadership and conviction to the visions of the FRC. The FRC operates by holding conferences with people who live in the trial communities, receive a welfare payment and who have come to the attention of the FRC through a notification due to failing to enrol or send a child to school; conviction of an offence in the Magistrates Court; breach of a social housing tenancy agreement or using a premise for an illegal purpose; or a child safety notification.

Conferences involve the person sitting down with the FRC to discuss the matter which led to the notification and coming to an agreement on how to address the situation. This may involve referral to services. If the person does not comply with an order, the FRC can order that 60 or 75 per cent of that person's welfare support payment be income managed. Between 1 July 2011 and 30 June 2012, the FRC held 1,587 conferences, 67 of which were conducted independently by local commissioners. These conferences then resulted in 35 family responsibility agreements, 205 orders and 465 referrals to community support services.

Currently, the FRC Act, and consequently the FRC, will expire on 1 January 2014. This means the FRC cannot operate and its orders for income management would expire on that date. The challenges facing these communities are great and change will be gradual. However, the trial's independent evaluation, finally released in March 2013 after a lengthy delay, found that welfare reform had made progress. Subtle and fundamental behavioural changes in money management were detected and positive changes are happening around responsibility for children, school attendance, educational attainment and attitudes to work. The evaluation particularly noted the success of FRC local commissioners in the rebuilding of Indigenous authority to tackle antisocial behaviour.

In March 2013 the Newman government approved funding of $5.65 million to extend the trial for another 12 months to 31 December 2014. As a precursor to extending the trial, my department undertook stakeholder and community consultations in Mossman Gorge, Coen, Hope Vale and Aurukun. The results were positive. All communities have indicated their support for the trial to continue, including the Hope Vale Aboriginal Shire Council, which had previously opposed it. The trial was regarded by many as important in improving school attendance.

The local commissioners commented that since Cape York Welfare Reform and the FRC have been in Hope Vale 'there are more facilities, people feel better about themselves, and there are no drunks on the streets anymore'. They report that times have changed, and that the police have played a strong role. A lot of hard work remains to consolidate the trial's gains. The evaluation report noted that genuine economic opportunities need to be available, and further work is needed to remove barriers to homeownership. The 2013 extension saw improved governance arrangements that increase transparency and probity.

My department has made savings, and put in place more rigorous performance and accountability requirements. The Department of Education, Training and Employment has also focused effort on increasing higher school attendance and enrolment. The trial aims to move community residents from social housing to homeownership. Progress has been made in 2013 towards removing barriers to homeownership.

I am also pleased to report that the Newman government is making big inroads in removing barriers around land tenure and town planning. Amendments to the Land Act 1994 means that land can now be subdivided in Aurukun and Hope Vale. We are also working to maximise employment opportunities. Two promising enterprises are Rio Tinto Alcan's South of Embley Project, which may create up to 1,200 jobs, and the Aurukun bauxite project.

One of the great success stories for 2013 is the Hope Vale banana farm, established in 2012, with support funding from the trial and the Australian government. The farm's first crop, estimated to be worth approximately $1 million, was recently harvested. The trial will continue to work towards increasing economic development and participation and homeownership in the four communities during 2014.

The key objective of the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013 is to amend the provisions relating to the expiry of the act, the FRC and its orders by extending their operation to 1 January 2015. To ensure the continued operation of the FRC for a further 12 months, amendments to the FRC Act need to be passed and given assent or proclaimed prior to the expiry of the current act on 1 January 2014.

Appointments of the FRC commissioner, deputy commissioner and local commissioners must also be approved by Governor in Council before 1 January 2014 to ensure the FRC is able to function beyond its current expiry date. I look forward to continuing to work with the FRC, the four welfare reform communities and trial partners to improve social and economic outcomes, and to ensure Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have the opportunity to fulfil their aspirations and reach their full potential.

First Reading

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (2.37 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Health and Community Services Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Health and Community Services Committee.

BUILDING AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 16 April (see p. 949).

Second Reading

Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (2.38 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

In opening, I thank the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee for its prompt consideration of the Building and Other Legislation Bill 2013. In particular, I thank the committee members and chairman, the member for Warrego, for their deliberation and report on the bill. The committee tabled its report on 19 June 2013. I am now pleased to table the government's response to the committee's report.

I would also like to thank those who made submissions on the bill to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee. Submissions were received from the Queensland Master Builders Association, the Housing Industry Association Ltd and the Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority, trading as Seqwater. I greatly appreciate the time and effort taken to communicate their concerns and suggestions. The committee's report made only one recommendation—that the bill be passed. The government accepts that recommendation.

The main purpose of the bill is to cut red tape by streamlining the development application process in Queensland to building over or near sewers, water mains and stormwater drains. There is currently no state-wide standard governing building of this type and the approvals process is confusing, illogical and ad hoc. This is something I committed to addressing. In my address to the parliament when the bill was introduced, I explained the hoops that applicants for a building development approval have to jump through just to be able to build a house or shed on their own property. This kind of regulatory burden is unacceptable.

The Building Act currently does not allow a private building certifier to grant approval for building work over or adjacent to a sewer or water main without the consent of the relevant service provider under the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act. I will refer to this act as the water supply act from now on. The water supply act does not specify any criteria that an applicant must meet in order to obtain the required consent and nor does it detail the process to be followed when making an application. This has led to the development of inconsistent and ad hoc requirements by individual service providers. This lack of consistency is a source of confusion for applicants and building certifiers and can add significant cost and time to building projects. Also, the act does not provide any design standards that would inform potential applicants about the appropriateness of building over or near infrastructure in the first place.

The present requirement to obtain consent from a service provider can also trigger a need to lodge a planning development application with the relevant local government which then must be assessed under the local government's planning scheme or planning policies. Fees vary across different service providers and local governments, but planning approvals alone can cost up to $735, and a total cost for all approvals can reach $2,000 or more just to construct a small shed. This is outrageous and something that this bill intends to correct.

The proposed amendments will facilitate the introduction, under a regulation, of a new mandatory part in the Queensland Development Code, which I will refer to as QDC 1.4. QDC 1.4 has been developed in close consultation with the Department of Energy and Water Supply as well as with local governments, water service providers, building certifiers and the building industry.

In addition, the bill has also been closely scrutinised by the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee, which tabled its report on 19 June 2013. In undertaking its deliberations, the committee undertook public hearings and considered submissions from industry. I am pleased to report that this consultation confirmed overwhelming support for these common-sense reforms. For example, Seqwater stated that they welcomed 'the government's objective of reducing red tape through the assessment of impacts on water infrastructure'. The Queensland Master Builders Association submission to the committee concluded—

Overall the new process will deliver great certainty and consistency and these efficiency gains will reduce delays and costs for the building industry.

Likewise, the Housing Industry Association suggested—

Defining once and for all a clear consistent set of clearance requirements based on sound technical principles ... will streamline the design, pricing, approval and construction processes significantly, providing certainty for both the builder and the client.

The committee concluded that it was fully supportive of the new scheme on the basis that it 'will standardise the procedures for building applications thereby saving applicants, the building industry and service providers time and money, while at the same time continuing to ensure underground infrastructure is not damaged, or its maintenance hindered'.

It is worth noting that there was unanimous support from all members of the committee for this proposal. I wish to thank all of the relevant stakeholders once again for their extensive involvement through the consultation process. I understand that final consultation on technical aspects of the new part of the Queensland Development Code are well advanced. The government expects that the new process will be in place and will commence on 1 November 2013. This will provide ample time for industry and water service providers to undertake necessary preparation for the introduction of the code.

The bill continues the government's commitment to reduce red tape and will streamline the design, pricing, approval and construction processes, benefiting both builders and clients. It will be a boost for the construction industry—one of the four pillars of the economy. I table an erratum to the explanatory notes which corrects certain minor editorial errors. I commend the bill to the House.

Tabled paper: Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, erratum to explanatory notes [3159].

Mr BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (2.45 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution regarding the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. Despite rereading the minister's introductory speech, explanatory notes, the committee report and submissions to the committee, I can find nothing to seriously contest in this bill. That is a function of the good work of the committee and the sensible nature in which this piece of legislation has been framed.

The legislation changes the application and approval process for building over or adjacent to a sewer, water main or stormwater main. I understand that the existing process for applying to build over or adjacent to a sewer, water main or stormwater main requires a private building certifier to obtain consent under the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008 before granting a building development approval. Consent must also be obtained from a local government, a South-East Queensland distributor-retailer or other service provider registered under the water supply act. Additionally, section 192 of the water supply act makes it an offence to interfere with a water or sewerage service provider's infrastructure without obtaining written consent. If a person does not obtain consent, a penalty can be applied. However, the act does not provide for review or appeal in circumstances where written approval is not provided to the applicant.

This bill has several objectives in response to the situation outlined above. This bill will amend the Building Act 1975 to remove the requirement for a private building certifier to ensure the consent from a service provider has been obtained prior to approving building work that is over or adjacent to relevant infrastructure. It will also amend the water supply act to remove the requirement to obtain the service provider's written consent where building work is to be carried out on a lot containing relevant infrastructure owned by the service provider and to remove the related offences under section 192(1) and 192(2) of the act. The bill will also amend the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 to allow delegation of concurrence agency functions from the distributor-retailer to the local government.

Finally, the bill will amend the Building Act 1975 and the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002 to add appropriate references to the City of Brisbane Act 2010 where there are existing references to the Local Government Act 2009. The removal of the mandatory requirement to apply for consent from a water service provider will allow for the introduction of a simpler building approval process, which provides for assessment against a single state-wide standard. Under the new scheme, building certifiers will be able to grant building development approvals where the proposed building work complies with the new mandatory part of the Queensland Development Code.

Under the proposed new scheme, building work over or near relevant infrastructure will be assessed as part of the building assessment provisions under the Building Act 1975 and under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009. As a consequence, the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee will be able to hear appeals about the decision of a certifier or concurrence agency. Appeals to these committees will be heard by referees with appropriate expertise. I note that currently

the water supply act does not provide design standards to inform the applicant about the appropriateness of building over or near relevant infrastructure. Also, it does not set out specific criteria to be addressed by the applicant in order to obtain consent or detail a process to be followed when making an application.

Local governments and other water service providers have responded to this situation by developing their own individual standards for assessment of applications via guidelines or in local government planning schemes which has led to some inconsistency. A consent application through the local government planning scheme may also trigger the need for an additional development application to be lodged and assessed. The explanatory notes to the bill point out that this can have an effect on the timely approval of that type of building work and can attract fees that range between $95 and $735. Now that consent is no longer required from local governments or other entities, an issue may arise with the use of private certifiers to assess applications against the new state-wide code. Proper training and oversight will be required to ensure that the process is transparent and accountable.

This legislation is relatively straightforward, with the amendments providing a remedy to industry concerns. An indication of the relatively benign nature of these amendments is the report from the portfolio committee which examined this bill, the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee. I thank the committee and its chair for that work. The challenge of this legislation is not so much in the drafting as it is in the implementation, and I would like to hear the minister's comments on some of the matters that I have raised.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego—LNP) (2.51 pm): It is with pleasure that I rise to speak to the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill is small in volume but it is big in changes to the building laws of this state. There is a big reduction in red tape, and I want to thank the minister for his support and interest in improving the building codes in Queensland. The amendments proposed in the bill have been developed in response to concerns raised by the building industry. They will save building applicants time and money by streamlining the approval process for building development approvals for work that is over or adjacent to a sewer, a water main or stormwater main. The amendments will also provide for a timely and cost-effective appeals process.

The bill amends legislation to simplify the process of making an application to build over or near a sewer, water main or stormwater drain. It removes the mandatory requirement to obtain consent from a service provider and the need to lodge a development application under the local government planning scheme. A new process will be put in place which significantly reduces costs and delays for applicants and offers greater certainty and consistency by providing for assessment against a single state-wide standard.

Through associated regulatory amendments, the proposed legislative scheme will facilitate, one, the introduction of a new mandatory part 1.4 of the Queensland Development Code which will provide performance criteria and acceptable solutions to all building work over or near relevant infrastructure and, two, the ability to appeal decisions of the assessment manager and concurrence agency advice to the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee.

The existing process for applying to build over or adjacent to a sewer, water main or stormwater main requires a private building certifier to obtain consent under the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act. For the granting of a building development approval, consent must be obtained from the relevant service provider—a local government, South-East Queensland distributor or retailer or other service provider registered under the water supply act. There was a lack of consistent design standards and criteria for assessing applications. The water supply act did not provide design standards to inform the applicant about the appropriateness of building over or near the relevant infrastructure, nor did it set out the specific criteria to be addressed by the applicant in order to obtain consent or detail the processes to be followed when making an application.

Local government and other water service providers had developed their own individual standards for the assessment of applications via guidelines or local planning schemes. There were over 80 water service providers across the state which the department recognises. It is very confusing for the building industry because it was left in a situation where it might have a hundred different sets of rules about how to build next to this infrastructure. The industry was bogged down under the previous act.

There were a lot of concerns within the industry. Concerns with existing processes were raised by the Master Builders in 2009. The department has advised that at the time Master Builders Queensland pointed to the need for a single consistent standard of this type of building work that could be assessed against the Building Act 1975. It also expressed a concern that there were no appeal rights regarding consistent decisions made by service providers.

The Housing Industry Association provided a submission to the committee that detailed the needs for legislative reform. It stated—

The increasing complexity of legislation with the inherit costs in both time and money associated with the construction of a dwelling is a significant contributor to the rising cost of building a new home.

HIA members have been expressing their frustration for many years at legislation that results in an automatic requirement to lodge a town planning application with all the associated costs … and delays just simply because a piece of infrastructure was also located on the site regardless of the actual risk to the infrastructure.

…

HIA is aware of examples in South East Queensland where builders have turned down work involving building on sites where infrastructure exists because the associated approval process is so complex. In the current economic climate this speaks volumes as far as the need to implement change.

This bill does exactly that. It further states—

HIA has long argued that the legislation surrounding building near infrastructure needed to be outcome focused based on clearly explained technical requirements rather than focusing on establishing a convoluted process that provided little if an certainty for the builder in relation to assessment timeframes or the likely outcome.

The committee made one recommendation, which was that the bill be passed. It is as clear as that. The committee noted the building industry's concerns about the lack of clear and consistent criteria for obtaining consent to build over or near sewers, water mains and stormwater drains and the associated necessary delays and expense. The committee also noted industry concerns about the current appeal process. The committee therefore strongly supports the objectives of the bill, which are to streamline the approval process for applicants to build over or near sewers, water mains or stormwater drains and provide a timely and cost-effective appeals process.

The committee looked at this in great detail. On behalf of the committee, I thank those individuals and organisations that lodged written submissions to the bill and others that informed the committee in deliberations, the committee secretariat, officials from the Department of Housing and Public Works, and the technical scrutiny of legislation secretariat. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr GRANT (Springwood—LNP) (2.58 pm): I rise to speak to the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I would like to say how delighted I am personally to see these changes coming through and thank the minister for such a practical, down-to-earth solution to these challenges. I hold in my hand just 11 pages that detail the acceptable solutions. I say today that such a simple solution to such a wasteful array of practices over many years is something that I think should have been done long ago. In fact, I question why it was not done long ago.

I am delighted for the thousands of people who will save thousands of dollars and months of waiting for approvals. This bill is about far more than just red-tape reduction because of the amount of money and time that it will save people. I am happy for the people in my electorate: the people of Rochedale South, Springwood, Daisy Hill, Shailer Park, Loganholme and Cornubia. Once this legislation is in force residents right across Queensland will be able to save time and money in obtaining approvals for building construction close to services which are below the ground. I hold the previous state government responsible for failing to find those just 11 pages of details to save these tens of thousands of dollars and, when extended right across the state, hundreds of thousands of dollars for many thousands of people.

Which services am I talking about? I refer to situations where people wish to build on private land close to a sewer line, close to a stormwater pipe or close to a water supply pipe where there is no easement in place. Not only does it apply to houses and garages; it applies to all classes of buildings where they can comply with the acceptable solutions that are put forward in the development code of Australia part 1.4. I want to give an example of what a typical resident faces currently in order to get a simple carport approved. Because one post of a carport might be too close to a sewer line, he or she must then obtain a building approval—that is reasonable—must obtain approval from the owner of the asset, be it a sewer, a stormwater pipe, or a water supply pipe; and is often forced to apply for a development approval, which is the same type of application that people have to pay for and wait for in order to undertake major subdivisional developments involving roads, lots and bridges. That is an absurd situation. There is also the example of where the only thing that is

required is a couple of hundred dollars worth of concrete to get the foundations below the level of a sewer, and yet such a person would have to spend thousands of dollars and have to wait many months to get his or her approval.

I thank the minister for coming up with such a straightforward solution in a short space of time to help save so many people so much hassle. This legislation removes the need for approval from the owner of the asset or the service provider where the construction complies with the simple acceptable solutions provided. It will introduce standards which are not difficult to comply with and will be a single standard right across Queensland.

I am concerned that where councils across Queensland—and, of course, there are as many town plans as there are major city councils and even small city councils—put into their town plans a requirement for a development approval if something is to be built close to a sewer, we are going to have to wait for them to amend their town plans. We should write to councils across Queensland about this to expedite that process, depending on how widespread we find the need.

Even those classes of building that might be major industrial buildings, commercial buildings, large accommodation buildings, hospitals et cetera, can be approved via a very simple process if they comply with the acceptable solutions, which is a very good thing. Where, however, they cannot and they feel offended by the type of approval issued under a development approval, they have one simple appeal process to the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee.

I am delighted with this bill. It is high time for this to arrive. It is so good to see it happening. I support the bill wholeheartedly. I thank the minister and all the committee members and staff who have worked on it. I commend the bill to the House.


Mr GRIMWADE (Morayfield—LNP) (3.03 pm): Today I offer my support for the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. This bill seems to streamline the current development application process for buildings over or near relevant infrastructure. This includes sewers, water mains and stormwater drains. While there are only a small number of legislative changes being made, the impact of these reforms will be significant.

The present system requires multiple approvals and results in far too much red tape. Currently, if an applicant sought to construct a deck on their property, three approvals may potentially be required. A building development approval will be required for the work. This may be in the order of $700. Presently, the Building Act prevents a private building certifier from approving the work where it is over or adjacent to a sewer or water mains unless consent is obtained from the relevant sewer or water service provider under the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act. Service providers may charge in the order of $700. So that is $1,400 so far for the approval in this case. The work may also trigger a planning development application requiring assessment against the local government's planning scheme. These approvals can cost in excess of $700 in themselves. If you go through some simple maths in this scenario, that is more than $2,000 purely for the approval process on that claim. That is not even factoring in the deck materials and the labour that the person would be required to spend. Considering the approval cost, I am sure many people would simply choose to not build the deck at all. This is a prime example of why the construction industry is facing such difficult times.

Those applicants who do persevere are faced with a lack of consistent standards across the state. The water supply act is silent on any criteria to assess an application for consent. It does not provide any guidance on what is considered an acceptable building practice. Requirements in local government planning schemes also differ throughout the state. This results in a multitude of requirements that could apply depending on where the applicant lives. Building certifiers who operate across local government areas are also expected to be familiar with these varying standards. This can be confusing and time consuming for all involved.

The lack of consistency in assessment and approval processes is a great concern to the government. What also concerns me personally is that the water supply act does not include any avenue to appeal a service provider's decision or conditions in relation to building work. I applaud this government's commitment to rectify this current failing in the system.

On reviewing the bill, I note that there are three key changes necessary to improve the process. First of all, the requirement for consent from a service provider when undertaking building work will be removed; second, a new consistent building standard will be adopted by a regulation for the state in the form of the Queensland Development Code Mandatory Part 1.4, that is, the building over or near relevant infrastructure—and I will refer to this code from now on as QDC 1.4—and, finally, applicants will be provided an avenue to appeal a development application decision via the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee.

Although only a small number of amendments are required, they greatly improve the present system. Under the new regime, building work over or near relevant infrastructure will be solely assessed under the building framework against QDC 1.4. The QDC 1.4 will provide standardised solutions throughout the state. Broad performance criteria relate to the structural stability of the building and prevent damage to the relevant infrastructure. The criteria will also require suitable access to the relevant infrastructure for ongoing inspections, maintenance and replacement. Acceptable solutions will provide a simple and clear pathway to achieve compliance with the performance criteria throughout Queensland.

Those building development applications that do not meet the acceptable solutions will simply be referred to a concurrence agency for a response. Concurrence agencies may direct a building certifier to accept the application with or without conditions or just refuse it. These concurrence agencies include service providers, South-East Queensland distributor-retailers and local governments. These applications will typically cover commercial developments, that is class 2 to 9 buildings, and some more complex house and garage scenarios, class 1 to 10 buildings and structures.

I also stress that this government has not forgotten about the water service providers as the owners and operators of the infrastructure in this process. It is important that service providers are fully aware of the building work in the vicinity of their infrastructure. For this reason this government will be ensuring that, where building work has occurred, the service provider also be notified and provided with this information. This demonstrates the commitment of this government to provide a workable and equitable solution for all. As honourable members can see, the new system will result in a clear, consistent, simpler and cheaper process for all involved, and building structures and relevant infrastructure will continue to be protected under the new regime. Instead, all that will be removed is the unnecessary red tape in this regard. It is with that in mind, and for the benefit of those people who are looking to build infrastructure around my local electorate, that I commend the bill to the House.

Mr SHORTEN (Algester—LNP) (3.10 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I commend the minister for introducing this bill to the House. It seeks to streamline the current development application process for building over or near relevant infrastructure. On a review of the bill, I was pleased to see that the new regime under which this type of building work will be assessed is a single standard. The new standard will be adopted by a regulation in the form of Queensland Development Code Mandatory Part 1.4, building over or near relevant infrastructure. In this speech I will refer to this code as QDC 1.4.

I would like to take the opportunity to applaud this government's commitment to striking a fair balance between the competing interests of applicants seeking to undertake building work freely on their lot, and the critical need of service providers to protect and access their infrastructure. QDC 1.4 has been developed through an extensive consultation process with the building industry, service providers, local government and the Department of Energy and Water Supply. As a result of this cooperative approach, the proposed QDC 1.4 has been developed with a key focus on ensuring the protection of a service provider's infrastructure. In addition, QDC 1.4 provides sufficient access for a service provider to undertake inspections, maintenance and repair work. I would like to talk about how the proposed changes, including the application of the proposed QDC 1.4, will help protect a service provider's infrastructure.

The new system will require a building certifier to be satisfied of the location of any service provider owned or operated infrastructure on any lot and on any adjacent lot. This means that under the new legislative scheme building certifiers will be obliged to confirm the presence and integrity of infrastructure and the type of pipes—for example, if they are gravity or pressure pipes—and to take this into account when approving building work. Building certifiers will therefore require reasonable checks to be performed prior to approving building work. This step is necessary because QDC 1.4 acceptable solutions do not apply to pipes under pressure, large pipes or deep pipes. QDC 1.4 recognises that these pipes pose a greater risk if they are damaged. For this reason it was decided not to include these pipes under the acceptable solutions of QDC 1.4. Instead, applications involving these pipes will automatically be referred to the service provider for a concurrence agency response against the performance criteria of QDC 1.4.

Concurrence agencies, which include South-East Queensland distributor-retailers and local governments, may direct a building certifier to accept the application with or without conditions or to refuse it. This approach will better ensure the safety of building work and protection of the infrastructure. It will also give service providers and local government an opportunity to comment on any potential risks of the proposed building design. The QDC 1.4 also proposes acceptable solutions

to enable access for a service provider, local government or other responsible entity to undertake inspections, maintenance and replacement. Specifically, QDC 1.4 specifies clear zones in which any building work completed must not impede access by a person or machine to undertake any necessary work on the infrastructure.

The development of QDC 1.4 has been an extensive collaborative process. Over the last two years, service providers and the building sector stakeholders have generously provided their expertise in the development of the application and technical solutions code. Not only has this extensive development process resulted in a sensible, proposed approach to approvals, but also a practical code. Service providers have also had this time to prepare for the removal of the approval process under the water supply act and to develop new administrative processes for their future role as a concurrence agency.

It is also intended that the Department of Housing and Public Works provide ongoing support for the implementation of the new QDC 1.4 in the form of fact sheets; for example, fact sheets and guidance will provide information on a service provider's concurrence role for QDC 1.4 and information for building certifiers about the application of the code. Importantly, the adoption of QDC 1.4 will provide one building standard to be applied across the state and will help achieve greater consistency in the assessment and approval processes for this type of building work.

The new QDC 1.4 has been developed in consultation with service providers, local governments and the building sector and will result in a more efficient system. I particularly note a service provider's infrastructure will continue will be protected under the new regime. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WOODFORTH (Nudgee—LNP) (3.15 pm): Today I rise to make a brief contribution in support of the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I commend the minister for the introduction of this bill to the House. The measures outlined within this bill aim to significantly reduce the legislative burden and costs through changes to the approval process and through updating the current development application process. Through these reforms the Queensland government seeks to reduce both the cumbersome approval process and red tape created by unnecessary legislation. This bill will streamline the act by removing the prohibition on private certifiers to grant building development approvals if building work is over or adjacent to a sewer or water main. This is a clear example of how straightforward changes in legislation can reduce red tape's restrictive effect on growth.

Queensland's approval system is currently based on a prescriptive approach to building approvals. This limits the capacity for applicants to develop solutions which are amenable to service providers and local government bodies. This process increases construction costs, restricts building design and location and effectively constrains the potential for growth in Queensland's business building sector. Through this amendment the government seeks to implement a new performance based approach that will allow increased flexibility for building solutions. This will improve design options to achieve compliance and maintain adequate protection for service provider's infrastructure. The positive effects these changes have will be felt by those who wish to move forward with building approvals in my electorate of Nudgee, and ultimately it is efficiency measures like this which resonate throughout the community and the local economy.

The implementation of this new process will result in cost efficiencies for applicants and service providers, as they will only have to approve the more complex applications. Improvements made to the development application process for buildings over or near relevant infrastructure such as sewers, water mains and stormwater drains are a great example of how relatively minor changes to legislation can have a significant impact. It is these changes which seek to cut red tape and make life easier for Queenslanders in the construction industry in my electorate of Nudgee. Relatively straightforward construction on an individual's property can require them to apply for one to three approvals to begin and would cost up to $700 each. If construction is over or adjacent to sewer or water mains, consent is required from the relevant sewer or water service provider. This can cost an individual up to $700. Then a planning and development application, which is required for assessment alongside the local government's planning scheme, could also be required. This too could cost up to $700. As can be seen by these examples of red tape, it has the potential to place a price tag of more than $2,000 on a basic construction project.

As far as we in the government are concerned, it is our responsibility to allow Queenslanders the freedom to undertake simple construction tasks without being hampered by restraining legislative requirements. I am certain that the changes which this bill seeks to implement will go a long way

towards assisting the construction industry, including those businesses in Nudgee that are facing such difficult times. I congratulate the minister and his department for this bill. It will go a long way in the task of cutting red tape and will benefit applicants for building approvals, the construction industry and infrastructure service providers in our local communities. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (3.19 pm): I rise to support the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which seeks to make an application process easier for building over new sewers, water mains and stormwater drains. With a background in the building industry, I thoroughly understand the frustrations and difficulties that landowners and other builders have faced in the past with the red tape involved in these circumstances.

The existing process can be confusing and often quite illogical. First the building certifier must seek permission from a service provider who owns the water infrastructure; however, there is no consistent process across different service providers describing how this should be done.

Seeking consent from the service provider who owns the infrastructure may also trigger a requirement to lodge a planning development application with the local government, meaning more paperwork and more fees. Finally, there is not even a consistent design standard for building over or near water infrastructure.

The lack of uniform processes and standards means that building costs and time frames often blow out beyond what is reasonable and what should be a straightforward job often becomes a bureaucratic mess. It is no surprise that, in their submissions to the committee, groups such as Master Builders and the Housing Industry Association strongly supported the changes proposed in this bill. When legislation such as the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is presented to this parliament, I welcome the opportunity to slash red tape and to make processes easier. This is as it should be.

This bill will eliminate the need for building certifiers to seek permission from water service providers and local governments to build over or near relevant infrastructure. One of the key service providers, Seqwater, indicated in their submission to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee that they would support this amendment on the basis that the bill also provides specific safeguards to protect their infrastructure. These safeguards are indeed covered in the form of the new mandatory part of the Queensland Development Code.

This amendment to the code will mean that work involving class 1 structures, such as houses, and class 10 structures, such as backyard sheds, can now be assessed directly by the building certifier against consistent, state-wide standards rather than against individual local government schemes and the requirements of individual service providers. Class 2-9 buildings or applications for class 1-10 buildings that do not fall in line with the new uniform standards will be referred to a concurrence agency for a suitable response. In the event that the applicant does not agree with the decision made by the concurrence agency, they will have a fast and affordable appeal mechanism at their disposal through the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee.

This legislation provides outcomes for all parties concerned. Landowners who wish to develop their land can do so sooner and be less out of pocket due to application fees. For the owners of water infrastructure, consistent design standards ensure their assets are protected, and more streamlined processes will potentially save them thousands of man-hours previously spent considering applications for permission to build over or near the infrastructure. Finally, builders, on whom our economy relies so much, can get on with what they do best, rather than getting buried in dreaded red tape. In their submission to the committee the HIA indicated that they were aware of builders who had turned down work on sites where water infrastructure exists because the associated approvals were so complex and complicated. We do not need that; we need people working in this great state of Queensland.

It is expected that thousands of people will move into the region of my electorate over the next 10 to 20 years. Naturally, we will need new homes for many of these people to live in. We need our building industry working as effectively as possible, and legislation like this will allow this to happen. In closing, having witnessed firsthand on many occasions how bureaucracy and red tape hinder the building industry, I thank the minister and his department for their foresight in bringing this bill to the parliament. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr RUTHENBERG (Kallangur—LNP) (3.22 pm): The measures outlined in this bill aim to significantly reduce the legislative burden and costs associated with the current approval procedures for building works over or near a sewer, water main or stormwater drain. There is an expectation of

about 150,000 people moving into the three electorates of Kallangur, Morayfield and Murrumba over the next 20 years. Any cuts to red tape that will help facilitate the infrastructure requirements and the building of residences and residential units will be greatly appreciated.

The proposed amendments will remove the requirement for a service provider's consent when building on a lot that contains or is adjacent to a lot that contains infrastructure of this type, which I will call relevant infrastructure. The amendments will facilitate the adoption in a regulation of new mandatory part 1.4 of the Queensland Development Code, or QDC as it is known.

The present system applies a prescriptive approach to building approvals. This means that applicants are limited in terms of the solutions that service providers and local governments may accept. This approach can add significantly to construction costs and can limit building design and location. In contrast, the new QDC part will apply a performance based approach. It will provide flexible building solutions that can be used to achieve compliance with broad performance criteria. This will allow more design options to achieve compliance while maintaining adequate protection for service providers' infrastructure.

For more complex buildings, such as multiunit residential or commercial buildings, or those buildings that do not comply with the QDC, the building application will be referred to a concurrence agency for response. Concurrence agencies have the role of reviewing and setting conditions for development approvals for their specialist jurisdictions. A concurrence agency can direct that the application be refused, approved or approved with conditions. The concurrence agencies will be the relevant local government, South-East Queensland distributor-retailer or other service provider. The new process will result in cost efficiencies for applicants and for service providers as they will only have to approve the more complex applications.

Another feature of the new arrangement proposed in this bill is that applicants for building works over or near relevant infrastructure will now have a right of appeal if they receive an adverse decision. This will be a vast improvement on the current situation. Decisions made under the present consent process may result in significant cost to an applicant; for example, having to relocate building works or pipes on a lot. Despite this, an applicant does not have satisfactory appeal rights to an external body under the current legislation. At present, the main avenue for external review of a service provider's decision is a costly and time-consuming process under the Judicial Review Act. Review under this act is generally limited to administrative matters and does not extend to the appropriateness of consent conditions. Under this bill, an appeal will be available to the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee under the Sustainable Planning Act. The committee will provide a quick and cost-effective dispute resolution service for applicants dissatisfied with the decision made by a service provider, local government or building certifier. Appeals to the committee do not require legal representation and are generally decided within three to five weeks by referees with appropriate experience.

The new QDC part will provide performance criteria and acceptable solutions for residential buildings such as housing—class 1 buildings—and structures such as sheds—class 10 buildings. In the case of class 2-9 buildings—multiunit residential and commercial buildings—only the performance criteria will apply. Because of the relative complexity of class 2-9 buildings, they cannot be easily assessed against acceptable solutions under the QDC. These applications therefore need to be assessed by a concurrence agency against the broad performance criteria of the QDC. Applications involving class 1 and 10 buildings that do not comply with the acceptable solutions must also follow this process.

In the absence of a suitable easement, there is currently no law requiring a proposed building or structure over or near a stormwater drain to meet any particular standard or be approved by the relevant owner of the drain. The proposed amendment will rectify this unsatisfactory situation. Under the proposed process, a building certifier considering a building development application for building works over or near a stormwater drain will need to apply the acceptable solutions under the proposed new QDC part. Where this is not possible, the application will be referred to the relevant owner of the stormwater drain for a concurrence agency response. Capturing this infrastructure under the QDC will provide a clearer assessment process for applicants throughout Queensland and so promote consistency and efficiency across the state.

I congratulate the minister and his department for the development of this bill, which will cut red tape and benefit applicants for building approvals as well as the construction industry and infrastructure service providers alike. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr BERRY (Ipswich—LNP) (3.28 pm): It is certainly a pleasure for me to rise to speak to the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I have listened to a good deal of this debate and can see that it has made sense to Queenslanders in general but more specifically to South-East Queenslanders. I wish to raise only one point in particular. In relation to the comments made by the member for Kallangur, I was quite assured that Ipswich was the fastest growing area. I am more than happy to argue the point with him at any time. Not only are we the fastest growing area; we also have a lot of young people.

With those young people comes a lot of construction and with construction—well, once—there was red tape. It is pleasing—in fact, gratifying—to see that with the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 some common sense has been brought back into this place. It is the case that you do not make legislation for the sake of legislation itself. There has to be a reason as to why you introduce legislation, and quite clearly I have heard from many speakers today those reasons such as the 80-odd pieces of legislation throughout Queensland that conflict with each other and the fact that building a simple deck could cost an extra $2,000 more than it ought to. It is difficult enough for our building industry to be able to survive in the present climate with all these impositions imposed on it. It is gratifying to see that this government—the Newman government—is making a difference in terms of reducing red tape. Removing $2,000 from the cost of a simple construction has got to be of benefit to the consumer and of course a major benefit to the building industry, which is doing it tough right this moment. Hopefully after September, things will improve.

There are three matters that are important to comment upon in this legislation which I want to highlight for my constituents in Ipswich. The consent from the service provider will be removed. How sensible is that? It is not a matter where you need the service provider to give its consent. However, we must ensure that the service provider knows what is going on—and there is provision made for that—so there ought to be no reason why the service provider is in any way affected by these legislative changes. The second matter which needs to be brought before this House is the consistent but new building code—and my learned colleagues have said this on many occasions—in the Queensland Development Code Mandatory Part 1.4 for building over or near relevant structures. What a common-sense approach to have something which is consistent and understandable. I give credit to not only the minister and member for Everton but also Treasury. There has been collaboration with this process, and that is one thing about this government. It is great to be a part of this government because of the amount of collaboration not only amongst members but also amongst departments to ensure that Queensland has a reduction in red and green tape.

The part of this bill that I really find particularly beneficial is the avenue of appeal where the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee takes over the role of review by a Supreme Court judge—a very expensive review and one which really ought not take up the time of judges whose work is valued in other cases. As my friend and my colleague from Kallangur indicated, this process will actually simplify the procedure, will not require a lawyer unnecessarily and will involve a streamlined process. This is something which I believe will certainly have a positive effect on not only consumers but also the building industry. It is the case that this bill brings about a sense of consistency and clarity, both in the assessment and the approval processes. It is something that is gratifying to see and I think of those young people in Ipswich who will benefit from this process. At the end of the day the status quo will be moved to where consumers will benefit, and I believe that this is just another part of the process in reducing red tape in Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (3.33 pm), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate today. As I noted in my earlier remarks, the main purpose of the Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 is to cut red tape by streamlining the development application process in Queensland for building over or near sewers, water mains and stormwater drains. The Building Act presently provides that a private building certifier cannot grant a building development approval for building work that is over or adjacent to a sewer or water main until consent under the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008 has been obtained. The consent must be obtained from a local government, South-East Queensland distributor-retailer or other service provider.

Currently, there are no clear or consistent criteria for obtaining consent. A consent application may cost several hundred dollars. An application to build over infrastructure may also require assessment against the local planning scheme, which increases costs and approval times. Planning approvals may cost up to $735 and the total cost of all required approvals may exceed $2,000. These amendments respond to concerns from the building industry and the general public by removing the consent requirement for this work. The amendments will cut red tape and save applicants and the

building industry time and money by streamlining the approval process for building development applications. The amendments will also provide a timely and cost-effective appeals process. Protection of a service provider's infrastructure remains a key priority. These amendments will continue to protect the infrastructure to a high standard.

I will now address some of the comments made by members in relation to the bill. The member for Warrego is correct that the current process is overly complex and costly, and I thank him for his stewardship of the committee as it worked through the issues of the relevant stakeholders. I thank the member for Springwood for mentioning the fact that this is a simple and elegant solution. I thank him for saying that in a simple and elegant fashion. I also thank him for the role he plays as part of the committee and note his dedication to the government's agenda of reducing red tape. The member raised the issue of inconsistency with the planning scheme. Because of section 78A of the Sustainable Planning Act, the provisions of the QDC will prevail over any inconsistent planning provision. This is regardless of whether the provisions are in the planning scheme for the next few years.

I thank the member for Algester for his support of the bill and note his particular emphasis on ensuring the protection of a service provider's infrastructure. The proposed new Queensland Development Code part provides acceptable solutions to enable access for a service provider, local government or other responsible entity to undertake inspections, maintenance and replacement. Specifically, the QDC specifies clear zones where any building work must not impede access by a person or machine to undertake any necessary work on the infrastructure. The QDC strikes a fair balance between the competing interests of applicants seeking to undertake building work freely on their lot and service providers wishing to protect and access their infrastructure. The proposed QDC part has been developed through an extensive consultation process with the building industry, service providers, local government and the Department of Energy and Water Supply.

I thank the member for Morayfield for raising the issue of appeals. At present, the only avenue for review of the service provider's decision by an applicant is a costly and lengthy process that could take six to 12 months under the Judicial Review Act. Review under this act is limited to administrative matters rather than the appropriateness of consent conditions. The Local Government Act also provides low-level administrative review. Under the proposal, the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee will be able to hear appeals for this work in the first instance. The committee will provide a quick and cost-effective dispute resolution service for applicants dissatisfied with decisions made by a service provider, local government or building certifier. Appeals to the committee do not require legal representation and they are generally decided within three to five weeks by referees with appropriate expertise. Decisions made under the present consent process may result in significant costs to an applicant—for example, having to relocate building work or pipes on a lot.

Despite that an applicant does not have appeal or review rights under the current legislation. I thank the member for Kallangur for his support and recognition of the efficiencies and the flexibility that will flow from adopting a performance based approach to approvals and his comments about the QDC offering flexible design options. The proposed new part of the Queensland Development Code strikes a fair balance between the competing interests of applicants and being able to provide building work freely on a lot and service providers in protecting the infrastructure of service providers. Under the current process, local governments and distributor-retailers often have their own standards for building work over or near infrastructure, including sewers, water mains and stormwater mains. The proposed QDC will instead bring a single state-wide standard for the assessment of this kind of work.

I thank the member for Nudgee for recognising that the QDC will now regulate stormwater. There is currently no law requiring a proposed building or infrastructure over or near a stormwater drain to meet any particular standard or be approved by the relevant owner of the drain. However, when there is an easement in place, certain requirements may apply to protect the infrastructure. The proposed amendments will rectify this unsatisfactory situation. Under the proposed process, a building certifier considering a building development application for building work over or near a stormwater drain will need to apply the acceptable solutions under the proposed new Queensland Development Code part. Where this is not possible, the application will be referred to the relevant owner of the stormwater drain for a concurrence agency response. Capturing this infrastructure under the QDC will provide a clearer assessment process for applicants throughout Queensland and so provide consistency and efficiency across the state. It will also provide protection to this valuable infrastructure, which was not always protected previously.

I thank the member for Burnett for his recognition of the quality of consultation with Seqwater and industry. There has also been significant collaboration between Building Codes Queensland in the Department of Housing and Public Works and the Department of Energy and Water Supply in all aspects of the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments and the proposed new QDC part were developed in close consultation with service providers, local governments and building industry representatives. These stakeholders have provided ongoing technical expertise to ensure that infrastructure is protected and access for future maintenance remains available while simplifying the process for gaining building approval. Consultation has included bodies such as the Local Government Association of Queensland, the Queensland Water Directorate, the Australian Institute of Building Surveyors, the Housing Industry Association, the Queensland Master Builders Association and various service providers such as Unitywater and Queensland Urban Utilities. All stakeholders support the proposed streamlined approach for a single technical standard for assessing building work over or adjacent to sewers and water infrastructure.

I thank the member for Rockhampton for his strong support and recognition that this is a common-sense way to reduce red tape. With regard to his concerns about implementation, I simply say again that there has been extensive consultation with the industry about these amendments. The industry was given a tentative commencement date for the legislative provisions and the QDC some time ago. This prior notice was provided to allow industry sufficient time to adjust existing systems to the new model. Consultation has included bodies such as the Local Government Association of Queensland, the Queensland Water Directorate, the Australian Institute of Building Surveyors, the Housing Industry Association, the Queensland Master Builders Association and various service providers such as Unitywater and Queensland Urban Utilities.

A communications plan has been implemented to ensure that industry stakeholders are kept up to date with progress and informed in advance of the commencement of the amendments. Building Codes Queensland news flashes and other department communications will keep building certifiers, local governments, service providers and other stakeholders advised of the implementation dates, and fact sheets will be provided to assist in a smooth transition.

I thank the member for Ipswich as well for raising the cost of building and red tape. The new process will reduce the cost associated with the current overly complex approval process. The new legislation will save applicants time and money by removing unnecessary delays for building approvals that exist under the current process. In fact, under the new process applicants will potentially save on the cost of a planning development application and/or service provider consent application. Planning approvals cost up to $735 and consent applications are also known to cost several hundred dollars. The adoption of a new mandatory part of the QDC as part of the legislative package for the bill regulating this type of building work under the building assessment provisions of the Building Act will provide a single, consistent state-wide building development approval process and standard.

Once again, I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate today. I thank the committee for their work and the industry for their contributions.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mander, adjourned.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012, Same Question Rule

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, standing order 87 provides the general rule of Westminster parliamentary practice that, once the House has resolved a matter in the affirmative or negative, the same question shall not again be proposed in the same session. Similarly, standing order 150 provides for the application of the same question rule in relation to amendments, new clauses or schedules of a bill. It states—

No amendment, new clause or schedule to a Bill shall be at any time moved which is substantially the same as one already negatived by the House, or which is inconsistent with one that has already been agreed to by the House, unless there has been an order of the House to reconsider the Bill.

As previous Speakers and I have noted, the matters do not have to be identical, merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form.

On 5 June 2013, the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2013 was passed by the House. The bill was significantly amended during consideration in detail. A number of the amendments dealt with matters contained in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012, which is currently on the *Notice Paper* awaiting its second reading debate. As a result, issues in relation to the same question rule arise.

In this case, a large proportion of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 does not deal with matters already resolved in the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2013. Therefore, the same question rule will not be enlivened at the second reading of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. However, the same question rule will be enlivened during the consideration in detail. In short, clauses 10, 14, 17 and 64, along with the entirety of part 5, clauses 18 to 36, part 7, clauses 39 to 40, and part 10, clauses 70 to 71, are identical to or substantially the same as provisions of the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2013 as amended and agreed to by the House. Therefore, I rule the relevant clauses and parts of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 out of order.

BUILDING AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from p. 2310.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (3.50 pm): 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. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (3.50 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.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

Resumed from 29 November 2012 (see p. 2969)

Second Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.50 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Prior to speaking can I thank you, Madam Speaker, for your ruling. For honourable members, essentially what the Speaker has ruled on is the Drug Court provisions contained in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill that were debated last sitting. We had to bring forward those particular amendments. We debated those in a previous bill. The House cannot debate them twice. Honourable members, do not talk about the Drug Court because it was legislatively abolished in the last sitting of parliament and will not be in this bill.

I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its timely consideration of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. I note the committee tabled its report on the bill on 8 April 2013 recommending that the bill be passed. The committee made no other recommendation. The government, of course, accepts that recommendation. Can I briefly address the statement of reservation of the honourable member for Rockhampton as it relates to the creation of a mandatory minimum non-parole period regime for drug traffickers. Believe it or not, honourable colleagues, the member for Rockhampton, the opposition shadow police spokesman, has put in a statement of reservation in relation to this bill dealing with a mandatory minimum non-parole period for drug traffickers—drug traffickers who kill children in Queensland, drug traffickers who are the scourge of our community. The opposition puts in a statement of reservation to this House through this bill on that particular mandatory sentence. I think that is absolutely shameful and a testament to laws that we have had—soft laws—on drug traffickers under the Labor Party in the last 10 years.

The member for Rockhampton and the opposition are opposed to the mandatory nature of the new regime and advocate for the retention of judicial discretion in the sentencing process for drug trafficking. This government is taking a hard-line approach against drug traffickers and we are unapologetic in relation to that hard-line approach. This is consistent with the commitment we made during the election campaign. Our resolve to ensure drug traffickers serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence before parole eligibility was further reiterated in our six-month action plan for July to December 2012. While the amendment narrows judicial discretion, the new regime is confined to convicted drug traffickers who are sentenced to an immediate period of full-time imprisonment. This bill does not alter the sentencing judge's discretion to impose a range of other sentencing orders where the circumstances are appropriate. So the judge has the discretion to have a range of sentencing options, but when one drug trafficker is sentenced to a term of imprisonment what we are saying is they should mandatorily serve 80 per cent of their sentence before being eligible for parole. The opposition do not believe that. It believes drug traffickers should be out roaming our streets and not in jail.

While the amendment, as I said, did narrow the judicial discretion, it does not alter the fact that judges can still decide, in terms of sentencing options, what they want to do and, of course, if the circumstances are appropriate. The impact of the amendment, including its impact on judicial discretion, must be balanced against the need for community protection and the need to denounce those who traffic in dangerous drugs. This bill recognises the far reaching and often devastating consequences of drug use. I am satisfied an amendment to the bill is not required in this regard.

The second issue raised by the member for Rockhampton concerns the decision to end the Drug Court. These reforms were debated and passed as part of the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Act 2013. It has been and gone so we are not, in fact, debating it now. To that end, in the consideration in detail I was going to propose certain amendments. That is not necessary now that we have had the Speaker's ruling on that issue, therefore no debate ensues.

I will also be proposing amendments to the Workers' Compensation Rehabilitation Act 2003 to implement recommendation 30 of the Finance and Administration Committee's report of the inquiry into the operation of Queensland's workers' compensation scheme, namely that the act be amended to give the minister flexibility to grant an extension of self-insurance arrangements for a further period of existing self-insurance. It is proposed to adopt the committee's recommendation and extend it to provide the workers' compensation regulatory authority, Q-Comp, with the discretion to issue or renew a self-insurance licence in circumstances where an employer does not meet one or more of the strict criteria for self-insurance if Q-Comp is satisfied that special circumstances exist that warrant the employer being issued a licence or warrant the renewal of a licence.

Essentially, there has been no consultation on that particular amendment other than through the workers' compensation review that went for 12 months. However, we do have businesses in Queensland, large businesses that are under the self-insurance scheme, that have renewals coming up that have now fallen below the required number of employees. They are good corporate citizens. There is no legislative scope, that we are aware of, to allow renewals to take place. It is a mandatory cessation of their renewal process for self-insurance. I think it is good that we have people on self-insurance. If we do not they would be back into the WorkCover scheme. This amendment gives Q-Comp the ability to have that discretion. The reason we need to have an urgent amendment through the passage of this legislation is because some of the businesses' renewals are this year, particularly in September, so it is important that we get the amendment through as soon as possible.

Further, members will be interested to learn that I am going to be proposing amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill to the Industrial Relations Act 1999, firstly, to ensure industrial organisations cannot avoid their obligations in regard to the requirements for spending for political purposes and, secondly, to make consequential and technical amendments. The requirements to ballot for authorisation to spend industrial organisation funds for political purposes were, as members know, introduced in the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Act 2013. The requirements were introduced to ensure that members of industrial organisations had the opportunity to be heard on how their funds were being spent and for what purposes their funds—their union member funds, their industrial organisation funds—were spent. Organisations must report the outcomes of the ballot. There has been an attempt by some to bypass these lawful requirements.

The Together union, a major union representing public sector employees, has established, believe it or not, a stand-alone corporation, a union established corporation—I know it is hard to believe, but they have—a stand-alone company not registered under the state industrial relations system to undertake their spending for political purposes. This measure has been taken with the clear intention of avoiding having to ballot union members to gauge their support for spending or not spending on particular political purposes. The industrial relations laws apply to organisations registered in the state industrial relations system. To ensure the integrity of the laws around political purpose spending, the government will introduce anti-avoidance provisions to cover entities associated with an industrial organisation. An associated entity is a related body corporate entity of an industrial organisation. The relationship may exist because of the control or influence the entity has over the principal or as a result of assets or other material interest shared between the two organisations. These changes will ensure that industrial organisations cannot avoid being accountable to their members about how their members' vital funds are spent. The measures will stop an industrial organisation from bypassing its obligation to give its members a direct say in the purpose to which their funds are being put. The change demonstrates that this government is determined to ensure transparency and accountability of industrial organisations. This amendment that I will be moving in consideration in detail is to ensure that the union heavyweight thugs are spending the union fees of hardworking men and women—who have every right to be a member of the Together union—as the members see fit. Mr Alex Scott and the Together union have set up a corporation to bypass their members. This parliament passed laws to ensure that their members had a direct say where they spent their money. The union said, 'We still don't want our members to know where we spend our money so we are going to set up a company and syphon the members' money to the company.' They did that so they would not be accountable under the Queensland legislation.

Ms Trad: That is such rubbish. That is rubbish.

Mr BLEIJIE: I hear the member for South Brisbane squawking away. I look forward to her contribution to this important debate. Because we know of the heavy union background that the member for South Brisbane has, I look forward to her standing up here and speaking for and on behalf of all the hardworking Queensland men and women who are members of the union, who ought to know where their hard earned money is spent, rather than the top 10 officials of the union movement deciding when, where and how their union money will be spent without a direct say from the people who are paying the money.

These anti-avoidance laws will ensure transparency and accountability. They will ensure that grassroots union members finally have their say, because for 12 years in this state under the Labor Party they were denied their say. They were denied by members such as the member for South Brisbane and the Leader of the Opposition. This government has given them the opportunity to have a direct say in where they pay their oversubscribed union membership fees and dues. I look forward to their contributions and to their support for making sure that, when it comes to union dues paid by hardworking Queenslanders, those Queenslanders know where their money is being spent. Given her heavy union militant involvement, I can understand the member for South Brisbane not wanting members to know where their money is spent. The member for South Brisbane is from the Old Guard that says, 'Trust the union officials; we'll spend your money wisely'. No more! We are amending this legislation to make sure that we have anti-avoidance legislation in place this week.

For the benefit of all honourable members, I note that the remaining amendments are technical in nature and either correct minor drafting errors and unintentional omissions or provide clarification on sections of the Industrial Relations Act 1999 that were recently amended by the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Act 2013. These include: an amendment to allow the Governor in Council, by gazette notice, to

appoint a person to act as vice-president; an amendment to section 341(1) to clarify that a determination means a determination under section 149 of the act; an amendment that makes clear that an inspector can require the production of any document when investigating suspected breaches of chapter 12 matters; an amendment to the right of entry provisions to clarify the employer may use the employer's notice to respond to entry notices by union officials and direct the union official to go to a certain room for discussions or to take a certain route; a provision to clarify that the term 'spouse' for the purposes of the statement of interest made by an officer of an industrial organisation does not include a former spouse; a provision that the statement of interest of officers holding management positions is only available for inspection by the registrar or another person permitted by law, that is, an inspector; an amendment to section 570 of the act to include a reference to a management committee meeting; an amendment to make it clear that an associate may be appointed to the president; and consequential amendments to the dictionary. These amendments have been circulated in my name, accompanied by the explanatory notes.

In closing, I note that the bill fulfils the government's clear commitment and pledge leading into the election to take a hard-line approach against drug offenders and drug traffickers. I note that again the opposition seems to have a reservation about cracking down on such offenders. We are also cracking down on graffiti crime and I will be interested to see if the opposition supports that. We are forcing people to clean up their graffiti mess. The bill will ensure that victim impact statements can be read out in court if the victim wishes. For a long time now, previous Labor governments denied victims the right to have their victim impact statements read out in court. I will be interested to see if the member for South Brisbane speaks up for the victims of Queensland and speaks to that particular provision, or whether she will contain her entire contribution to unions and political-purpose campaigning. We will see.

This bill is about victim impact statements. It is about ensuring that we crack down on graffiti crime by making offenders accountable because right around Queensland offenders as young as 12 will have to clean up their mess. Of course, the bill will crack down on drug traffickers. I note that the opposition has already put in a statement of reservation about the government cracking down on drug traffickers. That will be a very interesting contribution and I look forward to hearing it. As I said, the debate deals with many issues of importance to Queenslanders. I look forward to the debate. In particular, I look forward to summing up at the end of the contributions from all honourable members.

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (4.04 pm): Once again, the government introduces some last-minute amendments in relation to its favourite topic, industrial relations and bashing unions. From the outset, my question to the Attorney-General is: will the opposition be provided with a briefing in relation to the amendments that he is putting forward?

Mr Bleijie: I just gave you a briefing in parliament as to what it's all about.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, Attorney-General, it is not about being smart. It is about giving the opposition consideration—

Mr Bleijie: Are you going to support it? Are you going to support the amendments?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Obviously not. I am not going to support it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Leader of the Opposition, please address your remarks through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Honestly, Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr Bleijie: Why do you want a briefing if you're not going to support them?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Fine, do not give us a briefing, but let it be noted that this Attorney-General is refusing—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, refer to the Attorney-General by his parliamentary title and refer—

Ms PALASZCZUK:—the opposition a briefing on these pages of amendments—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, please refer to members by their parliamentary titles and address your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am talking to the Attorney-General.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please address your comments through the chair, Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am talking about the Attorney-General. It is his bill and I am addressing the issues at hand.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carry on.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much.

Mr Bleijie: I just said why do you want a briefing if you're not supporting it?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No. This afternoon, at about a quarter past five, people from the union movement will come to Parliament House. I put a challenge to the Attorney-General: go and meet the people coming here and tell them why you sacked 14,000 people, or up to 17,000 if we take in the government owned corporations? Why don't you go down and talk to them about why once again you are rushing into this Queensland parliament last-minute late-night amendments? We know that this government hates unions and we know that this government hates the workers in this state. If they did not hate workers, they would not have sacked 14,000 people. They would not have taken away their dignity and they would have treated people with respect.

In this legislation we are once again seeing discrimination applied. Once again the amendments that the Attorney-General wants to introduce are being applied just to the union movement. They are not being applied to other entities; it is just to the union movement. Queenslanders are absolutely sick of your constant bashing of unions. Every time the Attorney-General appears on television, people realise that we do not have the first law officer of the state that Queenslanders deserve. It has always been someone—

Mr Bleijie: We've got someone sticking up for victims in this state. Someone is finally sticking up for the victims in this state.

Ms PALASZCZUK: During the week the Attorney-General came out and made an announcement, but he did not even take it to cabinet. How irresponsible is that? He cannot even talk to the cabinet, he cannot even talk to the Chief Justice, he cannot even talk to the Law Society, he cannot even talk to the Bar Association.

Mr Bleijie: Did they talk to you about asset sales?

Ms PALASZCZUK: You can't talk to them. Oh no, you just come out with an idea, but you would not talk about—

Mr Bleijie: Come on, if you give it out you have to take it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am addressing the bill, Mr Deputy Speaker. You admitted that you did not even take it to cabinet. It was your idea, your flight of fancy, flying by the seat of your pants.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, please address your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Once again the Attorney-General is flying by the seat of his pants. He comes out with these grand ideas, but there is no consultation with the Chief Justice, there is no consultation with the Law Society and there is no consultation with the Bar Association. He says, 'No, no. I have this bright idea and I will just put it out there. I won't even talk to my cabinet colleagues, because I know more than them. I'm the smartest person in the room, aren't I?' It is an absolute embarrassment and what do we see?

Mr Bleijie: You don't stick up for the victims of crime; we do. We stick up for the victims of crime in this state.

Ms Trad: I think you hit a raw nerve there.

Mr Bleijie: You always stick up for the offenders and never the victims in this state.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Rubbish!

Ms Trad: I don't think he's the smartest person in the room!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will now move on to the substantive elements of the bill. We look forward to the debate on the new amendments that the Attorney wants to introduce. As I said, we note that the opposition has been refused a briefing by the Attorney-General.

I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. From the outset, let me advise that the opposition will not be opposing the bill, but we are opposed to certain aspects of the bill and have some concerns and would like some clarification about other aspects of the bill.

The purpose of this bill is fivefold: to provide that the Magistrates Court may impose as a condition of bail that the defendant participate in a rehabilitation, treatment or other intervention program; to create a graffiti removal regime for graffiti offences; to abolish the Drug Court and to establish transitional arrangements for orders still in place after the 30 June finishing date; to impose a mandatory minimum non-parole period for certain drug-trafficking offences; and to require victim impact statements to be read out in court if the victim so desires.

Let me indicate from the outset that the opposition will not be opposing this bill. However, there are a number of matters upon which I will seek the clarification of the Attorney-General. If he could address those matters during his speech in reply it would be appreciated.

Firstly, I will address the amendments relating to victim impact statements. In 1992 the Labor government introduced the Penalties and Sentences Act which imposed on a court the obligation, when imposing a sentence on an offender, to have regard to the nature of the offence and how serious the offence was, including any physical or emotional harm done to a victim. Then in 1995 the Criminal Offence Victims Act provided that prosecutors should inform the sentencing court of appropriate details of the harm caused to a victim by the crime.

The then Labor government recognised the important role that the victim impact statements could play in the criminal justice system in Queensland. As was stated in Hooper v The Queen, they 'ensure that judges know of actual, rather than the assumed, consequences of the crimes which come before them.' Another significant benefit is in cases where an offender pleads guilty and a court is unlikely to have had evidence of the personal circumstances of the victim or the extent of the injury, loss or damage upon the victim placed before it.

As a result of those amendments, courts in Queensland have recognised that information provided in a victim impact statement can assist the court to impose a proper sentence. That is why Labor introduced a system whereby victims could outline to the court the impact that an offender and an offence has had on them and their family. These amendments extend those provisions to provide that, where a victim so requests, the court must allow either them or the prosecutor to read their victim impact statement aloud to the court unless the court considers it is inappropriate to do so.

The bill also provides special arrangements to be in place when a victim of crime reads their statement to the court. This includes being able to have a support person with them, the offender being obscured from view, all unnecessary people being excluded from the court or the statement being delivered by way of audiovisual link. These arrangements are similar to the special arrangements that Labor introduced for victims when giving evidence to a court in criminal proceedings. I commend the LNP government for adopting our special arrangements for this purpose. I also commend the inclusion of a discretion on the part of the judge in determining whether it is appropriate for a victim impact statement to be read aloud.

The next set of amendments that I will address are those allowing a Magistrates Court to impose as a condition of bail that the defendant participate in a rehabilitation, treatment or other intervention program. This proposal was not opposed in any of the submissions made to the committee in respect of the bill, and the opposition will not be opposing those amendments. However, there was some concern expressed by the Queensland Law Society in its submission about the offence provision in relation to a breach of such a bail condition. Bail, by its very nature, means that a person has not yet been convicted of an offence. The society's concern is that the inclusion of a breach of bail provision could tend to criminalise people who have not yet been found guilty of an offence. This may result in an increase in the number of people who are on remand awaiting their trial.

Concern about the breach provision is also shared by Legal Aid Queensland. In its submission, Legal Aid has recommended that consideration should be given to not making a breach of bail condition to participate in a program an offence. Because programs would no longer be required to be prescribed by regulation, Legal Aid is concerned that there is a risk that some program operators may require some participants to do something unreasonable or inappropriate or impose some requirement with which participants cannot comply.

There could also be confusion as to what could constitute participation in a program. Would 100 per cent participation be required in every session of every program and would allowances be made for sickness or inability to attend because of family responsibilities? I think these issues need to be clarified by the Attorney. I would ask if he could address these issues during his speech in reply.

The concern of the opposition is that bail is a system for determining whether a person should be free in the community, whether or not on conditions or remanded in custody pending the hearing of criminal charges against them. If a person is in breach of their bail they can be brought back before the court and it will be determined based on the nature of the breach whether they should continue to be free in the community with additional conditions or whether the breach is such that bail should be revoked and they be remanded in custody. The court is well versed in making those types of decisions. The creation of a new offence is not necessary. For the reasons I have outlined and for the reasons expressed by many of the stakeholders, the opposition will be opposing that aspect of the amendments.

This bill increases the maximum penalty for graffiti offences from five years to seven years. Under section 469 of the Criminal Code, the maximum penalty for wilful damage is five years. This increases to seven years where the offence involves obscene or indecent representations. This bill makes the maximum penalty for all graffiti offences seven years.

Effectively, this will make the state's punishment the toughest in Australia. The maximum penalty for the same offence in New South Wales is five years, while in Victoria and Western Australia vandalism carries a maximum jail sentence of two years. In South Australia offenders face up to six months jail time, while in Tasmania perpetrators may face a fine or a community service order.

Legal Aid Queensland and Protect All Children Today were among the organisations which filed submissions against the changes. The Youth Advocacy Centre also voiced concern, writing—

It is inconceivable that any court would punish anyone by imprisonment for seven years for an offence which does not present any serious risk to life or significant threat to any person. The offence of "assault occasioning bodily harm" has a maximum penalty of seven years—the same as proposed in this situation. It sends an odd message to the community—that putting (some) paint on a wall is considered as serious as actually inflicting injury on another person.

There has been much criticism of the increased penalty and, as the Youth Advocacy Centre points out, the penalty is disproportionate when compared with offences of violence. The opposition therefore opposes this increased penalty.

The previous Labor government opposed a private member's bill in 2008 which purported to make it mandatory for graffiti offenders to complete some graffiti clean-up as part of their sentence. The 2008 bill was flawed because it required the mandatory clean-up order or a compensation order. This was not the only aspect of the drafting of the bill that was defective. Because in spite of the rhetoric espoused by the then opposition, the bill required a court, when sentencing an offender for a graffiti offence, to perform community service under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, including, for example, removing graffiti from property. It allowed the court to make an order which was already open to it, namely a community service order. The order could include removing graffiti from property, but did not require it to.

The bill provides that a court must make a graffiti removal order for the offender, whether or not it records a conviction, unless the court is satisfied that because of any physical, intellectual or psychiatric disability of the offender, the offender is not capable of complying with that order. The effect of the order is that the offender is required to perform unpaid graffiti removal service for the number of hours stated in the order. It does not require the offender to clean up the graffiti they performed nor does the complainant have to allow an offender to go onto their property to remove graffiti. The offender is also not obliged to have such an order if they are not suitable, so most of the objections that the then government had to the 2008 bill have been removed.

It is pleasing to see that before drafting this bill the Attorney has clearly taken on board the objections of the previous government to the previous policy initiative of the then opposition and has addressed most of the flaws and concerns that we highlighted in their failed bill.

This bill also makes provision for a court to order confiscation of property used in connection with a graffiti offence. This is provided that the person was an adult when the offence was committed and the thing was owned by or in the possession of the person and it was used to record, store or

transmit an image of, or related to, the commission of the offence. Such a provision might be justifiable where the person who commits the offence is the owner of the property. As the department briefed the committee—

> The new graffiti forfeiture provision which applies to adult offenders is justified to stop the dissemination of images of graffiti between offenders. The sharing of acts of graffiti is an important part of the graffiti culture and drives the graffiti-gang mentality.

That might be the case in those circumstances, but the property does not have to be owned by the offender. It can merely be in their possession. It need not even be lawfully in their possession or the owner need not have any knowledge or even a suspicion that it will be used to record, store or transmit an image. There should be some protection for owners of property who have acted in a perfectly honest manner. That is a concern with the bill.

There is, of course, a discretion in the court as to whether a confiscation order is made. As the clause provides, when the court is imposing a sentence on the person for the offence, the court may order the thing to be forfeited to the state. Whilst the court should be expected to consider who the owner of the property is and whether permission was given to use the thing or whether the owner had knowledge or reasonable suspicion that the thing was used in connection with a graffiti offence, this should probably be contained in the bill. I would therefore ask the Attorney-General to explain in his reply whether or how an innocent owner of property will be compensated for the loss of such property through a confiscation order.

In conclusion, this bill has some worthwhile features. The victim impact statement provisions and some of the Bail Act amendments have considerable merit, and the opposition will be supporting those amendments. We opposed the abolition of the Drug Court when it was considered earlier this year. This is a program that should have been continued by this government. It is negligent in the extreme to abolish the court without even proposing an alternative way of dealing with the vexed issue of criminal offending as a result of drug addiction. We will also be opposing the creation of the bail offence of failing to complete a program. We will be opposing the increase in the penalty for graffiti offences. This penalty increase is totally out of proportion with the penalty for offences of violence and with the penalty for similar offences throughout Australia. In conclusion, I ask the Attorney in his reply to please address the questions and issues that I have raised.

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (4.22 pm): Whilst I wish to start by saying I offer my wholehearted support to this bill in its entirety, I intend to focus my comments around the graffiti issue—the one that the Leader of the Opposition has spoken about. It would be wrong of me not to start by saying how bizarre it seems that people would rise in this place and almost seek to condemn a government for wanting to have the toughest laws in the nation. That is something that a government should wear with pride because we have seen the results of what happens when you do the opposite. We have seen the results of what happens when you allow criminals to be treated softly, when you continue to allow the judicial system to become a revolving door.

For the opposition to stand up in this place and say that they believe that the penalty for graffiti is too harsh shows that they missed the message that came out of the last election. In my electorate of Mundingburra, that was one of the key issues and it remains one of the key issues. When I have my fortnightly debate with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on ABC Radio, I see him doing his best to put forward the view of his colleagues who obviously have more sway than him in saying that somehow our communities in regional Queensland feel the same way as the Leader of the Opposition just spoke now. But they are angry and they want tougher sentences, and that is a message I am receiving time and time again as I go around the state.

Unfortunately there are a handful who sit opposite who hold more sway than others. For those who believe that somehow graffiti is the work of poor, banished, unfortunate souls, that is not the case. Mr Deputy Speaker, do not allow yourself to buy this rubbish about confusing legal street art with graffiti. There is legal art where people provide a wall and endorse it. Then there is graffiti—the work of grubs, the sort of stuff that tears communities apart, and it does. It makes people feel unsafe. It makes communities feel less proud. And we should fight it. When we have an Attorney-General who has the ticker to stand up and do it, despite the criticism that will always come from those more aligned with the bleeding hearts than the realities that face us in our day-to-day challenges, I say more credit to him.

In my short contribution let me talk briefly about what graffiti means to the people in my electorate of Mundingburra. I do so with some knowledge about what this means to local government, indeed to councils. In my city of Townsville, last year ratepayers spent over $100,000 on cleaning up

graffiti, and that number is growing. That number is replicated right around the state. When I speak with councils—and I speak with people like Paul Pisasale in Ipswich, Graham Quirk in Brisbane, Pam Parker in Logan, and indeed even mayors in regional areas like the city that I represent and Cairns and Mackay and even other smaller regional councils—I know that it has become a real issue that they want to deal with.

Earlier this year we found out the cost of vandalism to state schools in Townsville. That amounted to about $230,000 in less than three years. This figure does include things like repairs to property et cetera, but it still shows what happens when you are weak and allow people to continue to reoffend. What this amendment does is turns the table on graffiti vandals and makes them think twice before they deface public property. It is always the law-abiding citizens—the mums and dads with mortgages and families, the pensioners and those who can least afford it—who are forced to foot the bill.

Not only do these amendments increase the maximum sentence from five to seven years, despite the opposition from the Labor Party; they also include a new mandatory community based sentencing order which will ensure that graffiti offenders, whether adult or juvenile, remove graffiti or undertake related work that contributes to its removal. There is nothing like getting somebody out in the hot sun to clean up their work, particularly these nocturnal creatures who normally seek to do their work at a time when the rest of us are sleeping before getting up and having to go to work and earn a living. It is wonderful to get them up and working around midday. And may I suggest North Queensland as a great location for some of these clean-ups, around midday in about January or February!

Before I conclude I want to briefly talk about GraffitiSTOP, an initiative which I am very proud of. We made a commitment that we would spend $2 million tackling graffiti and assisting councils. When I see those opposite make out as though somehow graffiti is not a big issue, I will give them a little fact. We put up an initiative for councils to be involved with cleaning up graffiti. It is the first time in the time that I have been looking at local government that every single council accepted to be part of a program. It does not matter if it is graffiti on a prominent pedestrian footpath in Brisbane or if it is a bit of Nikko pen on a picnic table in Longreach, that hurts the community. We should be proud of wanting—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I understand the apologist from South Brisbane. I understand how this offends you. I get it. I understand that your group of people, your network, think that it is these poor, misunderstood youth—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Minister, I ask you to refer your comments through the chair.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I understand that it offends the member for South Brisbane, but perhaps I have a different view on the world which has been formed by seeing what occurs when we have a government that is weak. It is strange that the member for South Brisbane comes into this place as a new member and yet brings the same baggage as those who went before her. I will continue to support any move that gets tough on criminals and I will support any move that swings the pendulum back in favour of the mums and dads who go to work and pay their taxes. I will always put them ahead of the grubs who do this to our community.

Miss BARTON (Broadwater—LNP) (4.30 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2). I start by thanking my colleagues on the committee. We continue to do great work and to work very hard. I thank in particular my government colleagues because I know we spent a lot of time looking at this bill to ensure we achieve the right outcome for everyone. I would also like to thank the committee secretariat and those who took the time to make submissions.

Mr Johnson: You look older and wiser today, Verity.

Miss BARTON: I will not take the interjection from the member for Gregory because I do not think I want the word 'old' in *Hansard* referencing me. I would highlight that this bill is implementing our pre-election commitment. We made a commitment to the people of Queensland that we would be tougher on crime, that we would take—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Attorney-General and Leader of the Opposition, please cease your conversation across the chamber. I cannot hear the member for Broadwater. The member for Broadwater has the call.

Miss BARTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, it would, indeed, be a great shame if you were not able to hear the great contribution that I am about to make. We said to the people of Queensland that we would be tough on crime. We said that because the people in our community want it. The people in our community contact us regularly—day in, day out—complaining that sentences are not tough, that criminals are out on the streets sooner than previously and sooner than they should be, that they are not being rehabilitated and that they are reoffending. It is frustrating not only for members of the government but particularly for members in our community. We have an obligation to make sure that we stand up and represent them.

The Attorney has given a great précis of this bill so I will not indulge the House further and go into that extra detail. There are a couple of things I want to touch on, the first of which is the graffiti removal order. I see so much graffiti around the place that it just makes me angry. There are people who take such pride in their homes and they wake up in the morning only to find that someone has tagged their fence. There are also people who take pride in their business and when they arrive at work the next day they find that someone has, for no apparent reason other than they think it seems like a really fun thing to do—I have to admit that I can think of much better things to be doing with my time than graffitiing a wall—done all of this damage, and it is absolutely disgraceful. People in our community are really frustrated by graffiti artists and the vandalising of our community and they want us to take a tougher stand. People have contacted my office about graffiti saying, 'What can we do to make it stop?' I have been able to contact those people and say, 'We're taking a tougher stand. We're getting out there and we are saying to the perpetrators of these crimes that it is not okay, that the community does not accept it.' We will make sure that if people do the crime, they do the time.

In March I had the great pleasure of joining Mayor Tom Tate of the Gold Coast in announcing how the Gold Coast City Council will be able to work with the government on graffiti removal orders. At that same time I had the opportunity to talk to some of the hardworking council workers who are increasingly frustrated about having to go out, particularly to council buildings, and clean up after these delinquents. It is absolutely disgraceful that in the case of the Gold Coast City Council its workers spend good time and a good deal of ratepayers' money, which should be used to invest in services for the people of the Gold Coast, to clean up after these delinquents. At that same time I had the opportunity to really understand what kind of work goes into cleaning up graffiti. I had the opportunity with Mayor Tate to actually paint over some graffiti on a wall, and it is not as simple as getting some paint and slapping it on. The council invests a lot of money in the facilities they provide for our community and we cannot simply do a slapdash job in cleaning things up. It takes a lot of effort and a lot of money.

That was not the first time I have had the opportunity to clean up graffiti. In 2009, ahead of the state election I joined the now member for Mudgeeraba and others in the community who had decided that we were unhappy with some graffiti in Mudgeeraba. Nothing had been done. So the then candidate decided that she was going to get out there and clean up a skate park. It was not as simple as painting over it; we had to get down on our hands and knees and scrub. It is not easy work and that is why the graffiti removal order will be a fantastic thing, because those people who are committing graffiti crimes will have the opportunity to realise the effect of their crime on the community. Hopefully, the severity of the punishment will be enough to deter them from continuing down that path. You never know; we might be stopping someone from going down the path of serious crime. As I say, you never know what might be happening to these people.

The other thing that I want to address briefly is the change to sentences for those who commit drug trafficking offences. Drugs are the scourge of our society and I will not apologise for being part of a government and proudly supporting a government and its initiatives to see tougher sentences and longer sentences for those who sell drugs to people in our community, particularly those who sell drugs to our children. It is absolutely disgraceful to see that people are committing serious drug trafficking crimes but they serve only very short sentences because of the parole system in place. It is great to see that we have an Attorney-General who is prepared to stand up and say, 'That is not okay. We need to make sure that people serve at least 80 per cent of these sentences.'

The Attorney said in his second reading speech that we are not seeking to remove the discretionary nature of judicial sentencing. However, we are saying that once a sentence is set, people have to serve a minimum of 80 per cent of that sentence. I think that is incredibly fair. I hope that the House would support that because it sends a message to our community that if people are going to commit such a serious crime, if they are going to trade in drugs, they will be severely punished.

A number of people who contact my office are increasingly frustrated when they see that people are given sentences that they feel are fair but then they find out there is a certain non-parole period, which they think is extremely unfair or is far too short. Those offenders are then released on parole. The people who contact me are getting increasingly frustrated because they think that our judicial system should be setting sentences that are a deterrent to people in our community so that people considering going down that path do not continue.

One of the things this initiative will do, I believe, is increase the deterrent factor. It will also give us the greatest opportunity to help those people who have committed those crimes so they can turn their lives around. It gives us an opportunity not only to help the drug traffickers, who obviously need help if they think that is the right path to take, but also, importantly, to save future children. Anything that we can do to make our state safer for children is a good thing.

Of course, the Attorney-General has said many, many times, as have other government ministers and members, that we want Queensland to be the safest state in Australia in which to raise a child. If that means that we have really tough sentencing laws across a whole range of offences then, quite frankly, that is a fantastic thing because it means we are responding to the wants and needs of our community and we are looking at the best way we can help people in our community who are struggling and who need our support.

Sentencing is not just about locking people up; it is about making sure that we can help victims, offenders and particularly the community by restricting drug traffickers. This is a fantastic piece of legislation, and I very much look forward to supporting it when we go through the consideration in detail.

Just briefly touching on the amendments the Attorney has already mentioned, I think it is fantastic that we actually have a government that is standing up for the rights of workers in this state and is saying to union members, 'It does not matter what the union executive think and what they want; what we care about is what you want and what you need.' This LNP government is committed to making sure that union members have a voice in this state, particularly within their union. People have a right to join unions, but they should be able to have their say. Unions must represent their members in the way that they want to be represented, not the way that the apparatchiks and hacks want to represent their workers. I commend the bill to the House and I look forward to supporting it.

Mr CHOAT (Ipswich West—LNP) (4.41 pm): I also rise to speak on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. As a member of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, I am very pleased to speak in support of this important bill for which there was just one recommendation: that it be passed. The passage of this legislation will deliver on our promise to Queenslanders that we would get tough on crime, and indeed it will continue the government's positive and pro-active reform agenda in an area which is of great interest and concern to the wider community in Queensland.

This bill represents the implementation of a core LNP election platform, which committed this government to ensuring that victim impact statements are read out in the courtroom should this be the victim's wish, toughening the sentencing laws for drug traffickers who deliberately target children, and ensuring that drug traffickers serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence before they are eligible for parole. Let us keep them off of our streets and away from our children. It also requires all graffiti offenders to remove their destructive mess and will strengthen the maximum penalty for graffiti crime in our community.

I must just relay a little story. My wife and I took our two year old to an appointment recently. In the waiting room they had a nice little table with crayons and colouring-in books. She was in the habit of using textas and crayons on things other than paper, and to our absolute horror she graffitied the wall. If you listened to the member for South Brisbane, she would be staring down the barrel at seven years in jail. Eloise, you are two; you might get out when you are nine. What a lot of nonsense. Judges and magistrates will have the discretion to pass realistic sentences, but the ones who want to spread their muck all over the place will get what is coming to them. I certainly hope that we see maximum sentences handed down to those who deserve it, because I am totally sick of it. In our situation she got a smack on the bum, and I am happy to say that she has finally learned.

Ms Trad: So you are a smacker!

Mr CHOAT: I am a smacker; you bet I am. She no longer draws on anything but paper, so there you go. If a two-year-old can get it, why can't the member for South Brisbane?

These measures will make the world of difference right across the community, and of course not just in the area of graffiti. People in my electorate are sick and tired of the scourge of drugs on so many young lives. They want to see these drug-trafficking predators punished appropriately. Together with other bills passed by this government, this legislation will go a long way to shutting down drug criminals who seek to ruin our community and its assets.

I can say very confidently that this bill is welcomed by the vast majority of Queenslanders and certainly by my people in Ipswich West. Just last year we saw graffiti criminals from interstate cause tens of thousands of dollars worth of damage to rolling stock and property of Queensland Rail in Ipswich. People told me that it was obviously the case that these scumbags thought they would come to Queensland and leave their mark. I say to them and those with similar ideas: 'Look out, we are waiting for you! You will be sorry if you have plans that involve marking your visit by defacing our property.'

In my maiden speech I spoke about a local small business owner named Hong Falkenhagen. In 2011 she was viciously bashed and robbed in her small Tivoli shop. Following this her shopfront was graffitied by associates of the piece of filth who was charged with the bashing. I can remember going to Hong's shop with paint and getting rid of the spray-paint which was all over the front of the shop and all over the doors. It was absolutely disgraceful, and I felt so sorry for this lady when I just happened to stop in. I went back with equipment to clean up the mess and a local gentleman, Mr Les Retschlag, came along and helped me paint the front of the shop. We did it very quickly in one afternoon. I can remember saying to him at the time that I would really love to see those culprits there cleaning up their own mess. Well, Les, that will soon be the reality in Queensland, and I cannot wait to see it enforced.

Last year the local government minister, the member for Mundingburra who spoke so eloquently this afternoon, came to Ipswich. He, Major Paul Pisasale and I painted out a lot of graffiti that was on the Trumpy Bridge, and the government announced that it would provide financial support to councils to help them deal with the scourge of graffiti. Hopefully, as time goes by and these laws come into play and make their mark—sorry about the pun—we will see less need for that sort of money, and it can go into positive programs for young people who want to do the right thing. In this state we spend far too much money on the bad kids; I want to see us spending more on the good ones.

In relation to the forfeiture of devices used to record, distribute and promote graffiti, I believe that it is a worthwhile measure and it will certainly become an effective aspect of this bill. In the view of many people I have spoken with it is an offence to use social media and other means to record and promote criminal acts, so the legislation will really sort that out.

The committee received seven submissions on this bill, and not all of them were positive in their views. We saw typical responses from certain left-leaning self-interest groups crying 'victimisation' and wanting instead a go-soft-on-crime approach which, I have to say, is what has led to our society having to pass such tough laws in the first place. The era of the excuse, the period of things being someone else's fault and responsibility, as well as the age of getting off lightly, are now coming to an end in Queensland. Thank you, Mr Attorney-General.

We are a reasonable government, and as such we have ensured that the bill has sufficient regard for the rights and liberties of individuals, but we will not shy away from the responsibilities of punishing the guilty and protecting law-abiding Queenslanders and their property. I am satisfied that our courts will apply the law fairly and that the individuals who come before those courts will be dealt with appropriately and justly.

Too often crime is all about the criminals and their punishment, and, sadly, victims of crime can feel overlooked. I know that because I have spoken to many of them. It is important that these people are given a chance to publicly express their feelings and their loss and that this can be done in the court where the decisions about the crimes are made and that perpetrators are confronted by the ramifications of their actions on others. Where the opportunity for making a victim impact statement is taken, our community is more able to take stock of the impacts of crime, and in time I believe our community will be better for it. It is potentially confronting and will take much courage on the part of those who do speak up, but it is worth it for all concerned and I am sure it will assist in the healing process.

I do want to reflect on some of the words of the Leader of the Opposition earlier, because in the last couple of weeks I have met and had a number of discussions with a person who has a long history of working in a union. This person has relayed to me countless stories and instances of very serious bullying that happens in the union movement. These people that the Leader of the Opposition was referring to are not innocent little angels. Certainly there are a lot of good people in the union movement, and I have met many of them over the years, particularly in the Rail Tram & Bus Union—there were some great people there. Can I say that those people take advantage of their positions, and there has been nothing to stand in their way. This government is serious about giving everyone a fair go, particularly our workers. I have spoken at length with this lady, and what prompted her to come to me was the bill that we introduced last sitting. She explained to me that she felt this was going to be effective in giving those people a voice to shut down the bullies and those who want to run their own agendas in the union movement.

I look forward to seeing the benefits that this bill will provide in my community and across Queensland, including provisions that will protect my people, as well as the opportunity for victims to be heard. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DILLAWAY (Bulimba—LNP) (4.48 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. I congratulate the Attorney-General on his efforts in introducing another bill that delivers on the Newman government's pre-election commitment to get tough on crime. I acknowledge the extensive work of my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and the research team in reporting on this bill.

The Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 amends several current acts with a range of amendments that each focus on a specific area of offence. As outlined by the Attorney-General in his second reading speech, amendments are also proposed to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 and the Industrial Relations Act 1999 as part of this bill.

The amendments to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act are proposed as a result of the recommendations of the Finance and Administration Committee's report on the inquiry into the operation of Queensland's workers compensation scheme. The changes will give the minister flexibility to grant an extension of self-insurance arrangements for a further period for existing self-insurers. The act currently requires an employer to meet a number of criteria in order to obtain a self-insurer's licence or have an existing one renewed. This includes financial requirements and to have at least 2,000 full-time workers employed in Queensland. In adopting the committee's recommendation, Q-Comp will be provided with the discretion to issue or renew a self-insurance licence in circumstances where an employer does not meet one or more of the strict criteria if Q-Comp is satisfied that special circumstances exist that warrant the employer being issued a licence or warrant the renewal of a licence. For example, an existing self-insurer may have a solid performance history as a self-insurer or may hold a licence in two or more jurisdictions but may not have the required 2,000 full-time workers.

I also strongly support the proposed amendments to the Industrial Relations Act 1999. A major aspect of the IR amendment act earlier this year involved changes to accountability of industrial organisations, with particular focus on their financial accountability and transparency and their office holders. Unfortunately, there have been organisations pursuing action to avoid these new requirements. As a response, this amendment will require that if an entity meets certain criteria with respect to its relationship with an industrial organisation then the associated entity will be subject to the same expenditure balloting requirements as the industrial organisation.

I now move on to the amendments contained in this bill relating to the justice system. I echo the concerns of the citizens of the Bulimba electorate when I say that I am tired of the slap-on-the-wrist approach that sees offenders back on our streets, up to their old tricks, again and again. Second chances have become an expectation, and a dangerous perception has emerged amongst offenders that they have a right to a second chance.

The bill amends the Corrective Services Act 2006 and the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to introduce a more punitive sentencing regime for drug traffickers. These amendments will see offenders sentenced to immediate full-time imprisonment, and they must serve a minimum of 80 per cent of their sentence before becoming eligible for parole. This will be irrespective of the length of the immediate full-time imprisonment imposed. Drug trafficking is a very serious offence, and the punishment should be reflective of the gravity of the crime. The Newman government is committed to its stance that this illicit activity will not be tolerated and that offenders will not be profiting from a life of crime in our state of Queensland.

The bill also provides for the amendment of the Drugs Misuse Act 1986 to increase the maximum penalty for aggravated supply of dangerous drugs. Aggravated supply is the offence where an adult supplies a dangerous drug to a child under 16. Currently, this offence carries a maximum penalty of 20 or 25 years imprisonment, depending on the type of drug, compared to non-aggravated supply, the maximum penalty for which is 15 or 20 years imprisonment. The amendments to the current legislation will see life imprisonment as the maximum penalty if the offender provides a minor with a schedule 1 drug, such as amphetamine or heroin, and 25 years imprisonment for a schedule 2 drug, such as cannabis. Some may argue that these are harsh penalties, but I dare them to argue that these are not harsh offences.

Mr Johnson: If they had kids they would not be hard enough.

Mr DILLAWAY: I take that interjection. These offences have such broad ramifications for individuals, families and society that often we cannot comprehend the extent of damage a single offence may do to affected parties. I could not more strongly support this if I tried. An adult providing drugs to a minor is deplorable. Children under the age of 16 are still developing. Their brains have not yet fully developed and will not until their mid-20s. They are impressionable, with limited life experience compared to adults. They are curious and vulnerable. Having been supplied drugs, they are introduced to an illegal and addictive drug culture. Those members who attended the launch this afternoon on the Speaker's Green for Lives Lived Well would have heard and would understand that we as a government must address the issue of addiction and that an array of measures will be needed to put the complex puzzle together.

Traffickers rely on drug addicts, who need to feed their addiction, to feed their illicit business. Minors exposed to drugs at a young age forfeit their youth. It can be the beginning of a spiralling downfall where all life goals and ambitions fly out the door. As the father of three young children and as the member for Bulimba, which has a growing population of young families, it pains me to think that even one of these young children could be subject to this predatory method of illicit business. I cannot imagine a more tragic sight than that of a minor being consumed by the tragic effects of drugs, and it sickens me that there are adults who are the reason for this exposure. As an adult providing drugs to a child steals their youth, so they should very well forfeit theirs with life imprisonment as a consequence. These tougher penalties are a pre-election commitment which we have met—once again.

The bill also amends the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to insert a new mandatory community based sentencing order that will be referred to as a graffiti removal order, GRO. This delivers on another pre-election commitment. I notice quite a distinctive pattern emerging in my speeches as we tick one box after another. The GRO will apply to all offenders who are convicted of a prescribed graffiti offence and it will require them to undertake unpaid graffiti removal service for up to 40 hours under supervision. The removal and clean-up of graffiti is costly and draining on the public pocket. Having been subject to past graffiti attacks in both my personal and business life, I strongly support the idea that, if you make a mess, you clean it up. The majority of Queenslanders agree. Amendments contained in this bill will also increase the maximum penalty for the basic graffiti offence from five to seven years imprisonment and will eliminate the penalty distinction between a basic graffiti offence and graffiti that involves obscene or indecent representations.

Another aspect of the bill amends the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 to provide that a sentencing court must allow a victim to read aloud before the court all or part of their victim impact statement if they wish to do so. A victim impact statement is a written document that sets out the details of the harm caused to a victim by an offence and may include supporting documents. This bill also provides that the court must support the victim in reading aloud their victim impact statement, such as by providing measures that may protect their identity from the perpetrator or by allowing them to give their statement remotely from the courtroom. It is unfortunate that currently a victim impact statement may be submitted to a court but there are no requirements for it to be read. These amendments recognise that a victim impact statement is an important mechanism by which the victim can actively participate in the sentencing process and can be of therapeutic benefit to the person who prepared it. It will remain the decision of the victim whether or not they wish to read it. It is long overdue to have the victims of crime having more of a say, as opposed to the protectionist nature with which we treat the criminals.

The Newman government is sending a message to the rest of Australia and the world: Queensland has no tolerance for crime. I once again commend the Attorney-General for his unwavering dedication to the government's commitment to get tough on crime through the many initiatives he has undertaken in his role. I look forward to more initiatives from the Attorney-General in getting tough on crime, as per the community's clear expectations. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (4.58 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. This bill fulfils the Queensland government's pre-election pledge to ensure that drug traffickers serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence before being eligible for parole; to toughen sentencing laws for drug traffickers who target children; to ensure that victim impact statements may be read out in a court if the victim wishes to do so; and to ensure that all graffiti offenders remove graffiti to strengthen the maximum penalties for graffiti crime. I will talk to each one of these areas individually.

First I mention an amendment to the Bail Act. Clause 4 of the bill amends section 11(9) of the Bail Act 1980 in order to provide magistrates with greater flexibility to refer a defendant to suitable rehabilitative treatment or to other intervention programs without the current red tape involved to prescribe the program.

Clause 5 of the bill creates the offence of noncompliance with a condition of bail, providing for the penalty of two years imprisonment or 40 penalty units. Explaining the introduction of a penalty, the department advised the committee—

> The proposed reform is intended to send a clear message to defendants that all conditions of a bail undertaking, including educational, therapeutic and rehabilitative conditions, must be complied with.

It is very important to understand for a moment that we seem to have had a situation up until now that when a bail condition is put on it has been seen as optional by the offender in terms of their compliance with that bail and there has not been clear guidance as to what should happen. I commend the Attorney-General for bringing this issue forward to ensure that there is compliance with bail going forward. Before I continue I thank the committee and the secretariat of the committee for all of the work that was done and note that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee only had one recommendation in relation to this bill—that is, that it be passed in its entirety.

I now turn briefly to tougher sentencing for drug traffickers. The bill increases the sentences for drug traffickers who target children and requires convicted drug traffickers to serve 80 per cent of their sentence before eligibility for parole, and we need to think about that for a moment. There are several communities in Toowoomba North where there is a fair amount of family dysfunction and a fair number of people who are truant from school and generally causing some problems in the community.

It has been noted by some of the community groups that are working to try to help these kids stay in school and to see if they can build some resilience and some self-reliance that there are people arriving into those communities driving flash cars and big-noting themselves and splashing some money around and the sole reason they are arriving in the community is to find people who will distribute their drugs. Unfortunately, quite often the people they are finding are young—certainly below the age of 16—and they are misleading them. They are sending them down a path of drug distribution and drug use. The methodology to find someone who will run their drugs for them in that local community is in fact to create an addict first by providing samples for them to get addicted and then when they cannot afford to feed their addiction to send them out in the community to traffic these drugs on their behalf.

I see the harm that this is causing in my electorate of Toowoomba North and I certainly support the Attorney-General in dealing with these drug traffickers, particularly the ones who are preying on children, in a harsh and firm way. It is important to note the submission from the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian. It stated that bringing these penalties in was an important factor in recognising the significant and often long-term harm caused to children by the supply of an expanding variety of dangerous drugs. It is important to understand that everybody working in this space can see the harm. Certainly the Attorney-General has seen the harm and has moved to ensure that Queensland is tough on drugs and as harsh as we can be on the people who would prey on children by distributing these drugs. The committee considered it very important that a strong deterrent message is sent to persons who are trafficking drugs and the committee supported the penalties as outlined in the bill, and so do I.

As I have said, as these people travel into my community from further afield they are doing it for profit. I note that we have already passed legislation that addresses some of those areas of unexplained wealth and other things, but what they are really doing when they arrive in societies such as Toowoomba North is tearing at the fabric of that society. Introducing these poisons into our society starts to cause families to be dysfunctional and starts to cause people to become dysfunctional and it certainly has far-reaching and devastating effects on a community. I certainly endorse the increased punishments that are provided for in the bill for people who would traffic drugs and supply drugs to minors and those under 16.

I turn now to graffiti, increasing the penalty for graffiti offenders, introducing the forfeiture provisions and having graffiti removal orders. It is important to note that the forfeiture provisions are important, because often these offenders would very much like to spread their work on the internet and other means. The fact that they can have various devices that they have used to promote their work taken off them is a good and sensible punishment. I also believe that removal orders are particularly important.

As members would be aware, I have been involved in the hospitality industry and let me assure you that pubs and nightclubs suffer plenty of graffiti, plenty of tagging and plenty of marking. I have spent thousands and thousands of dollars over my time in the industry cleaning up these tags and marks all over businesses. They lower the tone of the business, scare away good customers and in fact encourage other customers to come in and tag along with the other person's tag. Removal orders are a great opportunity to punish offenders appropriately who may see this as a bit of fun or something where they like to make sure everybody can see their tag in the community. I would like to see everybody watching these offenders wear a hi-viz shirt and scrubbing tags off on a regular basis.

I should also compliment the local government minister for his GraffitiSTOP program. The Toowoomba council has grabbed with both hands the opportunity to implement GraffitiSTOP. It has a trailer that is fully loaded with the various cleaning devices and chemicals that are required to get these tags and marks off. Certainly, Mr Geoff Holmes, someone in our community who does a lot of volunteering and is involved in a lot of community groups, has worked very hard to make sure that the community of Toowoomba does not have to put up with this scourge of tagging and graffiti and the costs that are involved with that.

In a community like mine, the Carnival of Flowers is a great opportunity for people to come and visit Toowoomba and see the beautiful parks and gardens we have and for people to come up with their children, take them into the parks and play and be involved in those parks. The very last thing they want to see is offensive tagging and offensive graffiti all over a children's playground, a children's park or the public amenities that people will use when they come to visit our great town of Toowoomba.

I certainly agree very much with the increase in the maximum penalties, but there are those who have said that these penalties are very severe and obviously that is at the judiciary's discretion. I have actually met someone who was a prolific graffiti offender in and around the south-east corner. He had an absolutely marked talent and was a brilliant artist, but he had caused hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage to other people's property. Sofles is his name. He had also put his own life in danger on many occasions to provide his art.

What was interesting was that, upon being caught and upon being appropriately punished, he now has a career pretty much travelling the world decorating and providing street art in a legal way. So it was a good outcome from a bad situation for him. I paid him several thousand dollars to decorate a nightclub that I was running and he did a fantastic job. So once caught and punished, he realised that there was an opportunity for him to express himself in a legal way. It is important to note that wilful damage and the unwanted marking of businesses and premises will not be tolerated and will be punished. The graffiti removal orders will send a clear message to young offenders. The severe punishments will send a clear message to those repeat offenders who have no respect for other people's property.

I will now turn briefly to victim impact statements. I think it is very important that, when sentencing is taking place, the victim has a voice in the process, particularly if there has been a guilty plea. The victim may often feel that their opportunity for expressing the impact that that offence has had on them has been taken away. The Attorney-General is to be commended for giving victims a voice in the justice process if they choose to take it. It is important that a victim be able to set out the

details of harm that had been caused to them by the offence and able to provide the various documentation, medical reports and photographs that might go along with that so that a judge can fully understand the consequences of someone's actions in regard to how it has affected them.

I will talk very briefly to the amendment that relates to ultimately enforcing accountability and transparency. It is very important for people to understand that in this House are the people who were duly elected democratically by the people of Queensland. When they pass a piece of legislation, it should not be the case that organisations will then look for loopholes or play clever tricks to try to avoid the will of the people of Queensland. This House expresses the will of the people of Queensland and accountability and transparency is very important to the people of Queensland. I certainly congratulate the Attorney-General on bringing forward a mechanism that will ensure that accountability and transparency.

What is it that the union movement is afraid of? Is it afraid of asking its members whether they agree with the decisions it is making? Or is it afraid of telling its members how much money it plans to spend on things that they may or may not support? If the union movement is not afraid of those things, why would it try to circumnavigate the will of this House, which represents the people of Queensland? I certainly commend the Attorney-General for bringing forward that amendment. I would be interested to hear from those opposite, who think that people should be allowed to circumnavigate legislation that is passed in this House by representatives of the people of Queensland. With that, I commend the bill to the House. I thank the Attorney-General for bringing it forward.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (5.13 pm): Firstly, I will direct my comments in relation to this amendment bill to the abolition of the drug courts. I know that this was an issue that was addressed in previous legislation, but this amendment bill further erases the drug courts from various other sections of Queensland legislature and I want to address that in my opening statement. The opposition did not and does not support the abolition of drug courts. In fact, the opposition does not support the abolition of any of the diversionary courts, including the Murri Court and the Special Circumstances Court.

The Attorney-General's performance at last year's estimates was a remarkable exemplar of the typical unthinking and arrogant way of this government. At the estimates committee hearing, when the Attorney-General was questioned about whether he had ever visited the Special Circumstances Court, with a dismissive wave of his hand he said—

Highly unlikely now because I have abolished it.

In fact, at the end of the year the Attorney-General was given the least flippant comment by a minister award in Daniel Hurst's Queensland political quotes of the year for 2012. This comment was incredibly outrageous in that the Attorney-General made it on the very day that the Special Circumstances Court was sitting in the Magistrates Court building doing what it did best and dispensing justice with compassion and the ability to tailor appropriate sentences and treatment options for those who need that type of intervention.

Diversionary courts played an important role in sentencing offenders in Queensland. The Drug Court is no exception. As the Queensland Health website still proudly explains, despite the court having been abolished since 1 July—

The Drug Court Program is a whole-of-Government initiative funded by the Queensland Government.

Drug Courts are Magistrates Courts which deal specifically with the sentencing of people who are drug dependent and can demonstrate that their offence was committed to support their illicit drug use.

An offender who meets certain eligibility criteria may have the sentence suspended and be provided with the opportunity to undertake a rehabilitation program under an Intensive Drug Rehabilitation Order (IDRO) as an alternative to prison.

…

Drug Courts aim to help offenders overcome their drug dependence and associated criminal behaviour through court enforced and supervised rehabilitation programs. On referral to the Drug Court Program, the offender must be willing to undergo assessments by staff from Queensland Health and Queensland Corrective Services (QCS) to determine their suitability for rehabilitation. Once on an IDRO, a person must abide by the strict terms and conditions set by the Court including participation in treatment and QCS Probation and Parole directed rehabilitation programs.

That quote is on the Queensland Health website today, even though those opposite have abolished the Drug Court. The Drug Court has the support of stakeholders and has had considerable success in rehabilitating offenders and diverting them from prison. According to the *Magistrates Court of Queensland annual report 2010–2011*, in the court's 11-year history the community has been saved the cost of resources equivalent to 588 years of actual imprisonment time. In dollar terms, based on a conservative estimate of the cost of imprisonment of $200 per day per person, the money saved for taxpayers and the government is in excess of $31 million.

The Queensland Law Society in its submission to this bill had this to say—

The Society supports the Drug Court as an effective rehabilitative mechanism to address underlying causes for offending behaviour. We are therefore disappointed to see the abolishment of this court and urge the government to retain this significant aspect of the criminal justice system.

Ever since the government announced its intention to abolish the diversionary courts, including the Drug Court, concern has been expressed by many members of the community. University of Queensland researcher Dr Genevieve Dingle from the School of Psychology called for the government to reconsider. She stated—

The rehabilitation services are doing a fantastic job, however these budget cuts will drastically affect the way that residential rehabilitation services can operate.

Local and international reports show that Drug Courts work; and save tax payers money because it costs more to keep these clients in prison than it does to rehabilitate them.

Dr Dingle's comments build upon the findings of a 2009 Queensland Alcohol and Drug Research and Education Centre report that measured the impact upon individuals undergoing diversion. It indicated that participants had shown significant reductions in their drug consumption, patterns, risk behaviours, domestic conflict and psychological distress. The report's author, Professor Najman, estimated that the cost of one year's imprisonment is between $50,000 and $100,000, whereas it is considerably cheaper to achieve similar outcomes through the Drug Court.

Last year at the estimates hearing the Attorney advised—

The government had to make tough decisions. We had to reprioritise the services offered in all of our courts. One service that I have ceased funding is the Drug Court.

This is another example of this government knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General advised in—

November 2012 amendments were made to the Drug Court Regulation 2006 to reduce the maximum number of active intensive drug rehabilitation orders, which in effect meant no new offenders could participate in the Drug Court program, or be placed on an intensive drug rehabilitation order. Again, this was aimed at facilitating the Drug Court in its case management of offenders and to reinforce that the Drug Court would end on 30 June 2013.

The Attorney advised that a 'gradual approach to the termination of the Drug Court has been adopted to allow offenders, currently subject to an intensive drug rehabilitation order under the Drug Court Act, time to sufficiently complete their order so that a fair, final sentence can be imposed on them'.

But as the Attorney advised at estimates last year—

We will have programs in place in our courts. We will want to try to divert people as much as we can from living a life of crime and drugs.

I invite the Attorney to outline in the consideration in detail what specifically are these programs that have replaced the justice that was administered by the Drug Court? What alternatives are in place in our courts to divert these people from a life of crime and drugs?

As has become the way of the Attorney-General of Queensland, he cannot help but slip another little amendment in without consultation, without discussing it, without giving the opposition a brief on it. This is the issue of amending the Industrial Relations Act. Again this arrogant and extreme Attorney-General has introduced legislation to attack workers and their representative organisations. That is all it is. It is old ideology at play here in Queensland.

I note in the explanatory notes that this issue, the requirements for balloting, have previously been raised as an issue of whether the legislation has sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals and whether there is a breach of the implied doctrine of freedom of political communication and association. This government is prepared to curtail individual liberties. It is prepared to curtail political discussion in this state because it does not like what it is hearing.

We all know that only 22 per cent of Queenslanders support the direction being taken by this government. Polling conducted by this government, paid for by Queensland taxpayers—in excess of $50,000—put in the *Sunday Mail*, shows only 22 per cent of Queenslanders support the direction of this government. I put on the record so that the Attorney can read it when he is inclined to that I have had many people in my electorate come to me and say that they are absolutely disgusted that this government wants to curtail the ability for trade union movements and other organisations to put a dissenting voice in the political debate in Queensland. This is about tying up trade union organisations in red tape, making it absolutely impossible for them. They do not like being challenged, they do not like dissent.

Mr STEWART (Sunnybank—LNP) (5.23 pm): I rise today to contribute to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. The bill continues our government's tough stance on crime as well as aims to combat the unacceptable levels of recidivism in our local communities. I recently conducted a state-wide survey in my Sunnybank electorate asking people to identify the issue that was the most important to them. The overwhelming majority of respondents listed fighting crime and antisocial behaviour as the biggest concern in our local suburbs. That is why I fully endorse this government for proactively targeting offenders and putting in place significant deterrents to engaging in these types of activities.

Recidivism is a major concern for our criminal justice system. It is my understanding that about 60 per cent of those in custody have been in prison before. This pattern of reoffending is clogging our courts and tribunals and driving up costs. Consequently I support the amendment to the Bail Act 1980 which will allow magistrates to impose rehabilitation, treatment or other intervention programs as a condition of bail. Can I say to the House today that from my experiences and working in Corrective Services for seven years I do have my reservations about the programs on offer and whether or not they are actually beneficial. From speaking with many inmates one would actually find that a lot of them go through the process of these programs without actually taking anything on board and are purely doing it so that they may have a favourable outcome at the next bail hearing and also to keep themselves busy. That is definitely backed up by that figure of 60 per cent of offenders in prisons have already been inside.

While I stress that as a government we must ensure that any penalty is proportionate to the crime, we must also try to break the cycle of these repeat offenders. These programs and special conditions are one way in which this could be achieved. Those offenders who traffic drugs or who supply a dangerous drug to a child under 16 years are themselves contributing to the cycle of crime, and it is appropriate that the penalties that can be imposed on such offenders reflect the recurring damage that their actions take on the lives of those they come in contact with as well as the significant broader social harm they cause. I believe the amendments to the Corrective Services Act 2006, as well as the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, would help to achieve this.

I am also encouraged by the proposal to increase the maximum penalty for graffiti offences from five to seven years. Graffiti offences have been a major concern in Sunnybank, especially at the train stations that are dotted around my electorate. Constituents such as Denis Higgins have become increasingly exasperated with the futility of reporting incidences of graffiti in these areas. Mr Higgins informed Queensland Rail of extensive graffiti at Altandi Railway Station, which was promptly attended to by the Queensland Rail officers. However, within days of repairs being undertaken graffiti had appeared again. Since 2009 councils have spent more than $15 million on graffiti enforcement and removal.

This government, as well as local councils, has proposed a number of initiatives to attempt to target graffiti offenders and stop this blatant disrespect for public property. In June this year the Attorney-General proposed changes to the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 which would give councils the ability to use offenders between the age of 12 and 16 to remove graffiti in their own communities. These changes would come into effect with the passing of this bill.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stewart, adjourned.

MOTION

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (5.28 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the date for the Education and Innovation Committee's inquiry into assessment methods for senior maths, chemistry and physics be extended to Monday, 14 October 2013.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Auditor-General's Reports, Referral to Portfolio Committees

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (5.28 pm): I wish to advise the House of determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 194B that: the Auditor-General report titled *Report to Parliament No. 15 2012-13: Enforcement and collection of parking fines*, tabled on 27 June 2013, be referred to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee for consideration; and the Auditor-General report titled *Report to Parliament No. 1 2013-14: Right of private practice in Queensland public hospitals*, tabled on 11 July 2013, be referred to the Health and Community Services Committee for consideration.

Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (5.29 pm): The committee has also resolved pursuant to standing order 135A that: the Education and Innovation Committee report on the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013 by 7 October 2013; the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee report on the Transport Legislation (Port Pilotage) Amendment Bill 2013 by 5 September 2013; and the Health and Community Services Committee report on the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013 by 7 October 2013.

MOTION

Education, Better Schools Plan

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

- acknowledges the importance of education in providing equality of opportunity to all Queensland children;
- recognises that the federal government's Better Schools initiative will result in more funding for Queensland students;
- notes that the Liberal-led governments of New South Wales and Victoria have recognised the benefits of the Better Schools initiative and reached agreement with the federal government, as have the Catholic and independent education sectors.
- acknowledges that the Newman government has been more focused on closing schools and selling off land than securing a better outcome for our students.
- note that the government's failure to sign up to the Better Schools initiative will result in Queensland state school students being denied extra funding.

This was the motion that the opposition was hoping we would not have to move in this House. However, just 24 hours ago our fears that Queensland children would be left behind were fully realised when the Newman government failed to sign up to the federal government's Better Schools program. The 5.30 pm deadline passed and, once again, Queensland has missed out on joining a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to improve our education system. On the one hand, the failures of the Newman government and the education minister, John-Paul Langbroek, are not surprising. After all, they have always adopted a very negative attitude to the funding reforms put forward by the federal government. Both the Premier and the minister seem to relish the chance to engage in some good old-fashioned Canberra bashing, making wild claims that the funding would lead to a federal takeover of education and a sea of extra red tape.

I think most Queenslanders expected these two men, given their positions of high responsibility in the state government, to eventually overcome their partisan, parochial stance and get stuck into some hard negotiations with the federal government. Why did we think that? Because these reforms should have been above politics, and they are. That is evidenced by the fact that the Liberal-led governments of New South Wales and Victoria have signed up to the reforms. They have shown that conservative state governments can find a way to move beyond the politics and successfully negotiate a good deal with a federal Labor government. Sadly, Premier Newman and Minister Langbroek were either not up to the task or were prepared to put the interests of Tony Abbott ahead of Queensland state school students. Either way, our children and their parents rightfully should feel let down.

Queensland is the only jurisdiction on the east coast of Australia to miss out on the Better Schools initiative, the funding reforms inspired by the Gonski report. The irony of this situation is that, despite the abysmal negotiating efforts of the Premier and the minister, some Queensland children will enjoy increased funding from the federal government. That is because the Catholic and independent school sectors have successfully negotiated a Better Schools funding deal. About one-third of Queensland students attend non-government schools, so more than 30 per cent of Queensland's children will benefit. However, sadly the other two-thirds, those who attend state schools, have missed out. Now we have the ludicrous situation in some cities, towns and suburbs whereby a non-government school on one street will receive extra funding and the state school just around the corner will miss out.

It has been reported that yesterday there was a hurried exchange of letters between the Queensland and Commonwealth education ministers as it finally dawned on the Newman government that time was running out. They had been shamed into action by the Victorian government, which successfully finalised negotiations on a deal at the weekend. I clearly remember Minister Langbroek being quite surprised that Victoria had reached this deal. Now what we have seen is that Queensland—

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Queensland has fundamentally missed out while New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and the ACT will benefit. I understand that the federal government was happy to take into account the Newman government's Great Teachers = Great Results scheme, despite the questionable benefits of this misguided policy. The federal government was also happy to guarantee that Queensland would maintain autonomy over its education system. However, unfortunately, the Minister for Education could not bring himself to make a counteroffer. Of course, during this time he was able to sit around the cabinet table and give himself a 41.9 per cent pay rise, but when it comes to the students of Queensland there was not much action at all.

Perhaps the minister had his hands full considering the closure of eight schools across Queensland without any substantive basis for his decision, as was revealed during the estimates hearing. Let us not forget that the minister's own Schools Planning Commission handed down its preliminary report about population trends and future school requirements almost three months after the minister was making the decision about whether or not to close eight schools. Instead of investing more in education, the Newman government is determined to save money by closing small schools—the sort of schools where teachers know the names of every student and students know the names of every teacher. In that process, the minister has raised anxiety amongst students and families of eight schools across Queensland that face the axe: Fortitude Valley State School, Nyanda State High School, Everton Park State High School, Old Yarranlea State School, Toowoomba South State School, Wyreema State School, Charlton State School and Stuart State School in Townsville.

This followed on the minister's decision last year to close the Queensland school for travelling show children. There is one main similarity between his decision last year and this year's move to potentially close eight more: his failure to consult fully. In fact, last year the minister actually breached his own legislation by failing to provide sufficient notice to the school community and the public about his intention to close that school. He is also pursuing a range of asset sales without a mandate by selling Education land worth more than $100 million in 2012-13 and 2013-14. He has even tried to sell off school ovals at Balmoral State High School and Whites Hill and Earnshaw colleges. The LNP is prepared—

Mr Johnson: At least he's telling you what he's doing. You've never told anybody what you're doing.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, member for Gregory.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms PALASZCZUK: The LNP is prepared to flog off our children's future for the sake of a few dollars.

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Madam Speaker, if they want to make some noise they can go and join the rally.

Mr Johnson: That's your rally. You organised that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Anyone is welcome to attend. It is worth recapping how we have ended up in this situation where Queensland kids are going to miss out on the Better Schools reforms. The federal Labor government has a vision of lifting education standards in Australia over the next decade and has backed up that vision with significant extra funding. It has offered to work in partnership with state governments to provide this extra funding on a needs basis. That means that, for every $2 in extra funding that the federal government provides, states have been asked to provide about $1. That two-for-one offer is unprecedented, particularly when it comes with a guarantee that funding for all schools will increase by at least three per cent each year, but somehow the Newman government cannot see value in those arrangements.

Overall the Better Schools Plan would require the Queensland government to contribute about $1.3 billion in extra funding over six years. As I mentioned earlier, the federal government has indicated that it is even prepared to consider the Great Teachers = Great Results program. Clearly, the Premier and the minister are unwilling or unable to secure extra funds from Treasury for Queensland children. What that means essentially is that Queensland students will miss out.

Recent events have also highlighted that the Newman government's political posturing on this matter has backfired. Their resistance to federal Labor's offer could perhaps be interpreted as understandable given that the LNP in Queensland no doubt expects Tony Abbott to romp home in this year's federal election. But all that changed last week when the federal shadow education minister, Christopher Pyne, declared that a future Abbott government would honour the Better Schools agreements with the states. Regardless of who wins the federal election, extra funding for schools and students will start flowing from the Commonwealth coffers, but it will not be coming to our Queensland students.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (5.41 pm): Stuart State School in Townsville recently celebrated its 122nd birthday. Since 1891 it has a proud record of educating children from outlying areas, including from Cungulla, Alligator Creek, Mount Elliot, Oak Valley, Wulguru and Stuart. Not surprisingly, it is cherished by those communities because its contribution over many, many years has been terrific.

It continues to thrive. There are approximately 80 students on the roll from prep to year 7. But that does not matter to this Newman government. It does not see the value of Stuart State School to its students and to the communities it serves. When the government looks at Stuart State School it sees dollar signs. It sees an asset that it can close and sell, as it does many schools around the state.

A case in point is the Toowoomba area where three primary schools are threatened with the axe—Wyreema, Toowoomba South and Charlton. For good reason there is anger in those communities when you consider the disruption to students, parents and teachers who cannot understand why their schools have been earmarked for closure. The campaigns to keep the Toowoomba schools open have focused on the population growth in those communities. The catchment of Wyreema State School has been identified as a major growth area in coming years. Protestors have rightly questioned the wisdom of closing and selling a school now when demand will necessitate the building of a new school in the next five to 10 years.

The policy does not stand up to scrutiny—people all over are struggling to understand. As the government scrambles to close schools and sell assets, the first report of the Schools Planning Commission suggests the number of schools needed to be built across the state, to keep pace with the growth in the school-age population, is in double digits. The study concluded that up to 23 new schools will be needed in just three of the top 20 high-growth areas—Brisbane metropolitan north, Caloundra and Townsville, where Stuart State School is fighting for its survival. Quite simply, this government does not care about making sense, does not care about the value to regional communities of the local school and the community hub that it provides and does not care that it is seeking to close and sell schools in areas where the proper demand mapping has not yet been done. What matters is the government's bottom line and the value of the land those schools sit on.

During the estimates hearing this year the LNP released a list of 33 properties sold by the department of education for around $38 million, including vacant land at Edmonton for $900,000. This land in my electorate—on Farmer Street adjacent to Petersen Park—was originally acquired for a future school but, as development is anticipated to the south of Edmonton, the department of education looked to the future Mount Peter development area instead.

Since elected, I have worked with Edmonton Storm and council to change the purpose of this land to expand the rugby league footprint at Edmonton. In early 2012 my lobbying paid off and Education Queensland agreed to hand over the land to council on the understanding that at some

stage in the future council would acquire a suitable parcel of land at Mount Peter for a school several years down the track. This was to ensure a swift end to negotiations that had been going on for several years and to ensure council's short-term budget considerations would not be a hurdle. For whatever reason, the new government ditched the land swap approach, instead requiring the land to be purchased by the new council, delaying the process for another 18 months. That being said, I am happy that the issue has finally been resolved. I congratulate the Cairns Regional Council on the acquisition of the land to expand the Petersen Park sports fields.

Let me go back to this government's closure policy. It means even those schools that escape the axe this year will face an uncertain future. Every year every school could be forced to justify its continuing existence. That would be bad enough if it were the only consequence of the haphazard and disjointed way that the Newman government is handling the education of Queensland's children, but, of course, it is not. This government has politically and arrogantly turned down the advantages of the Better Schools Plan which would provide additional money for students from the most disadvantaged backgrounds. The Newman government is also betraying Indigenous students, students with a disability, students at regional, rural and remote schools—and this will be of great interest to those fighting to save those schools threatened with closure—students at small schools.

The Better Schools Plan would dramatically increase the amount of funding for such students, underpinning the viability of those schools and enhancing their educational opportunities. The Better Schools Plan acknowledges the value schools like Stuart State School provide to their students and the wider community. It is a real shame that this government by its actions and its ideology does not acknowledge the value of our schools and this program.

For the benefit of the Minister for Education, Tony Abbott telegraphed his intentions last week in no uncertain terms. The minister failed to read between the lines. It was a big fail. This is an opportunity missed. When the federal government puts on the table two-for-one funding you find a way to make it work and sign up, and you certainly pay attention to the leader of the federal opposition who says that they want to accept this and go forward. What we do know is this: the federal leader of the coalition, Tony Abbott, does not want to be seen with Campbell Newman. Now the decision has been made by this government not to sign up to the Gonski reforms he obviously does not want to be seen with them in a classroom environment either.

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (5.46 pm): I move—

That all words after "children" be deleted and the following words inserted:

- condemns Prime Minister Kevin Rudd for offering a better deal on education funding for Victorian students than for Queensland students;
- condemns the former ALP government for underfunding education and disability services in this state while wasting money on the disastrous Health payroll system and other failed projects;
- condemns the federal Labor government's proposal, which will see cuts to funding for kindergartens, the training sector and universities; and
- endorses the Newman government's commitment to increasing funding for education and disability services and for its focus on improving student outcomes in schools and training.

We have heard the contributions from those opposite. We have heard the Manager of Opposition Business speak about school closures. This motion is about the future of schooling and the future of school funding. We saw those opposite close 139 schools during the time they were in power—1989 to 2012, except for the couple of years between 1986 and 1988 when the coalition was in power. In terms of asset disposal, they sold $59 million worth of assets in the last five years or so that they were in power.

The Leader of the Opposition cannot even get the statistics right when it comes to what it is Queensland is to contribute to supposedly be part of the Gonski negotiations. She said it is $1.3 billion over six years. Yesterday Kevin Rudd said it was $2.5 billion and we are about four months too late. That did not seem to affect him when he was having negotiations with Victoria on Friday and criticising them. He then satisfactorily signed them up by Sunday.

The Rudd government reached new lows on the last day of its term before we entered caretaker mode. On 11 July we put an offer to the federal government. It was very clear. We wanted three things: to recognise the $1.8 billion the Queensland government has committed to education over the next six years, including $537 million for the first four years of Great Teachers = Great Results; to stop the new Canberra bureaucracy that was to be set up under the Rudd and Gillard plan

and leave the running of schools to the states and their principals; and to halt the stripping of $1.5 billion out of kindergartens and $2.3 billion out of universities that the Labor Party have done in this year's budget only. This adds to other cuts in the last midyear economic and fiscal outlook.

I was very surprised when last week Bill Shorten came out and said that the Queensland government had never put an offer to the Commonwealth. I stood up and said to him again, 'Here are the three things that we want from the deal.' Still we heard nothing. The next twist in this saga was over the weekend. Despite attacking each other on Saturday, the Victoria and Commonwealth governments reached an agreement by Sunday. Having heard that announcement I thought I would make it really simple for Bill Shorten and Kevin Rudd—'Give us the same deal as Victoria.' I am sure honourable members heard me say that on Sunday night. It was pretty clear. You would not think it would be that hard. You get the document, you walk down to the photocopier, you cross out 'Victoria' and write 'Queensland'. Instead of that Bill Shorten and Kevin Rudd spent yesterday doing all they could to avoid the deal. The Commonwealth said to Victoria, 'You only need to increase spending by 1.3 per cent, but Queensland you need to increase it by three per cent.' The Commonwealth said to Victoria, 'You guys only need to reach 92 per cent of the school resourcing standard, but Queensland you need to reach 95 per cent.' The Commonwealth said to Victoria, 'You guys can include money you have already committed, but in Queensland you cannot count your $1.8 billion of new spending.'

So I am astounded that Bill Shorten was able to move mountains for his state of Victoria to get their deal across the line but that Kevin Rudd could not strike a deal for Queensland even though we made it really easy for him to do so. And this is a Prime Minister who says it is a 'once-in-a-lifetime opportunity'. Didn't we hear that about the Building the Education Revolution? Didn't we hear that about the Digital Education Revolution? There is no maintenance funding for those buildings and now they are pulling out of computers—another 'once in a lifetime opportunity' the states are left to manage.

While I have a few seconds left, I want to point out that misleading the voters is in the DNA of those opposite and their brethren who are out there protesting tonight. The QTU this morning was saying that our education spending is the lowest amount of any of the states. For the benefit of the House, the latest report on government services shows that Queensland spends $14,853 per student; New South Wales, $14,448; and Victoria, $13,449. I will be expecting a letter of apology from the QTU president to the Premier and me in the near future. We are committed to education. We have a plan and we have funded it.

(Time expired)

Mr BOOTHMAN (Albert—LNP) (5.51 pm): I rise today to speak to the amendment moved by the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. First of all, I commend the minister on his speech. It was spot on and it went right to the heart of the issue. This government is committed to building a better education system for all Queensland students. We should see the importance of all levels of education, and we firmly believe that stripping $1.1 billion out of the kindergarten program and $2.3 billion out of universities will certainly disadvantage many Queensland students. The federal Labor government gives with one hand and certainly takes with the other.

All we want is a fair deal. Bill Shorten, as the minister alluded to, was able to move mountains and part the Red Sea for his home state of Victoria. Yet Prime Minister Kevin Rudd could not strike a deal for his home state of Queensland. The Leader of the Opposition comes into this House this morning and says, 'Kevin is a Queenslander.' Come on! All we want is the same deal as Victoria. It is that simple. As the minister alluded to, all the Prime Minister needs to do is change a couple of letters on the deal—change 'Victoria' to 'Queensland' and that would suffice. But, no, this Prime Minister has to play the political game. He is not interested in Queensland schools. He just wants to play the political game. So, as I said, all we want is the same deal as Victoria.

I will talk about my electorate, the wonderful electorate of Albert. Thirty-two per cent of my population are young working-class families, aged between 25 and 44, and children aged between zero and 14 make up about 25 per cent of the population. I have previously stated on many occasions that my electorate is part of the development corridor of the southern Logan and northern Gold Coast region. When it comes to education, this government is really delivering for my constituents in the Albert electorate.

Let's talk about some of the wonderful educational facilities Albert has received in recent times because, if we left it to the Labor Party, they would say that we are not getting anything out there. Cedar Creek State School just recently, after years and years of petitioning, got their car park sealed. So no longer do the kids have to sit and watch dust storms come flying through their classrooms from

the staff car park. This is because the local P&C, the local principal and the staff are passionate about their school and they want to make a real difference. Therefore, they work with this government and they get real outcomes.

I will read out a list of maintenance backlog funding allocations in 2012-13: Gaven State School, $154,600; Mount Warren Park State School, $160,000; Pimpama State School, $160,000; Upper Coomera State College, $160,000; Windaroo State School, $115,800; Windaroo Valley State High School, $160,000. When it comes down to it, we are not playing politics. We want to get on with the job. If Kevin Rudd behaved decently, he would give us the same deal as Victoria. Therefore, the opposition should have been out there on Monday saying, 'Look, we want the same deal because we care about our schools, too.' So where were you?

Mrs SCOTT (Woodridge—ALP) (5.55 pm): Yesterday was a sad day for education in Queensland. It was the day that the Newman government and Minister Langbroek in particular decided to put politics ahead of students. Instead of signing up to the Better Schools initiative with the federal government, the LNP prefer to deny our students access to the extra funds that would flow from signing up. Under the plan Queensland was required to put in an extra $1.3 billion over six years, while the federal government was going to provide $2.5 billion extra over the same time period. $2.5 billion over six years would make a world of difference to students in Queensland and particularly in my electorate of Woodridge.

The Liberal governments of New South Wales and Victoria have been able to put aside their political differences and embrace the initiative. Even Tony Abbott performed a backflip with a reverse 1½ twist pike in agreeing to honour the deals if he were to win the election. Luckily that appears unlikely.

The intractable approach of the LNP government means that the vision for improvement that the federal government has brought to education in this country over the past six years will come to an abrupt end. The federal Labor government is committed to improving education standards and the quality of schools. This is because Labor is the party of education. It is the Labor government that has a true appreciation of how education can dramatically improve life outcomes for our students.

The education reform agenda is being implemented with unprecedented levels of investment in Australian schools and, importantly, it is contributing to the promotion of social inclusion and closing the gap in Indigenous disadvantage so that everyone has the opportunity to learn and work. That is what matters in my community. That is what is making a real difference in the lives of families in Woodridge.

For better outcomes for low socio-economic status school communities, the National Partnership Agreement on Low Socio-Economic Status School Communities is providing $1.5 billion to support actions in education reform for approximately 1,700 low socio-economic status schools around the country. These reform activities include incentives to attract high-performing principals and teachers, tailored learning opportunities for students, and innovative and flexible school operational arrangements.

Then we have the National Partnership Agreement on Literacy and Numeracy, which is providing $540 million over five years to over 1,000 schools to help them improve the performance of students in basic literacy and numeracy. The strategies and practices used in these schools and the trends in performance are being closely monitored to ensure that any further investments in literacy and numeracy can build on the efforts of these schools.

Not only does Labor support students; Labor also supports teachers. Through the National Partnership Agreement on Improving Teacher Quality, the Commonwealth is contributing $550 million over five years to help attract the best graduates to teaching through additional pathways; improve the quality and consistency of teacher training; develop national standards to promote excellence in the profession; and develop and enhance the skills and knowledge of teachers and school leaders through improved performance management and professional learning.

All students will benefit, from those beginning their formal education to those leaving schooling and transitioning to further educational training. The National Partnership Agreement on Youth Attainment and Transitions commits governments to improving the education and attainment of young people. The government's 90 per cent attainment rate target for year 12 or equivalent has been brought forward from 2020 to 2015. The LNP government and Minister Langbroek should hang their heads in shame for failing the students of Queensland and the students of Woodridge for the sake of cheap political point-scoring.

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (6.00 pm): There is no argument that local schools need reform and appropriate long-term funding for education in Queensland. I have met with local schools and local Queensland Teachers Union representatives on many occasions and we agree that something needs to be done after years of Labor neglect and mismanagement.

As has been raised on this side of the House many times during debates, I am extremely frustrated and disappointed in the former ALP government and the previous member for Burnett for underfunding education and disability services in this state while wasting money on the disastrous Health payroll system and other failed projects. The current Gonski debate—or whatever it is called now—is not about the money. The debate is about very important principles that this LNP state government takes seriously. We do not want to see funding for universities cut. The funding for Gonski proposed by the federal government comes by taking away money from our local universities. We do not want to see funding for our kindergartens cut. Federal funding for kindergartens continues only until December 2014 and then it stops.

In last Friday's pre-election economic statement the federal government cut $242 million in funding for apprenticeships and trainees. The LNP government must ensure that 300 schools are not worse off. We want federal Labor to get rid of the red tape and the bureaucracy meddling in Queensland schools. It is the height of hypocrisy that we see today pork-barrelling by the federal Labor government making a desperate pitch to Queenslanders, promising $450 million to boost after school care programs. I am confused: Labor can cut funding to universities, kindergartens and hospitals, but refuses to give the students and teachers in my electorate a good deal on school funding. If these reasonable assurances were provided to the school students and people of Queensland, the Queensland government would sign up to the proposed reforms. However, the government is not going to sign up to something when federal Labor is not prepared to negotiate on these important issues.

Now that the federal election has been called and all the bullyboy tactics of the Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, are evident, all we want is a fair deal. What is truly unbelievable is that we were not offered the same deal on education funding as Victorian students and schools. Why would the Prime Minister, a Queensland Prime Minister, treat our Queensland students and teachers with such disrespect? In contrast, the Queensland government knows that real differences to our education system are made in the classroom, not the bureaucracy. Our approach is to provide timely and targeted investment in practical measures to improve education through committing $835 million over five years in additional funding. In addition to Great Teachers = Great Results and the almost $6 billion a year already invested in education, the recent Queensland budget also provides for an increase in Education expenditure of 6.6 per cent.

With all the talk about the unknown details of the proposed $6.5 billion Labor Gonski reforms, it is timely to remind Queenslanders about the LNP plan to improve teacher quality and give young Queenslanders the best possible start in life. The plan would invest $535 million of additional funding in Queensland's schools. We need to focus every dollar on the things we know work. Teachers play a critical role in the lives of Queensland children by providing them with the knowledge and skills needed to achieve success in their futures. The initiative provides an opportunity to recognise our high-performing teachers as well as reward them with accelerated career pathways. The plan focused on two crucial areas: professional excellence in teaching and boosting school autonomy. The initiative consists of 15 actions including a structured annual performance process, mentoring for beginning teachers, accelerated progression and paid postgraduate study for high-performing teachers, and fast-tracking autonomy initiatives for schools. We also want to enhance discipline powers across the state school system and allow the school community to play a greater role in the selection process for principals by removing union representatives from selection panels.

What is of real concern in this ongoing debate is our commitment for a better deal for Queensland schools and the ineffective procession of federal education ministers who would not, or could not, provide the schools in my electorate with an appropriated expected outcome. I have heard that you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. That was said by Abraham Lincoln in a memorable contribution. However, federal Labor has tried to manipulate this serious issue and debate, it is clear, with complete contempt for the electorate. Labor believes you can fool enough of the people enough of the time to persuade the electorate that your 'new way' of politics does indeed represent a break from the past and that public disgust with a Labor minority government is somehow not relevant to Labor's desperate campaign for re-election. However, Queenslanders are a wake-up to Kevin Rudd. They know what Labor and Kevin Rudd did to Queensland previously, and what Labor is doing to

Australia. People in my electorate want a responsible, grown-up government to fix Labor's mess. We will be honest and upfront about the mess left by state Labor and we will be honest and upfront about what is needed to fix it. We will be fixing it by sorting out Labor's waste and inefficiency, not by raising taxes and raiding people's savings.

I support the education minister's amendment. I support the LNP's endeavours to get better funding for my schools in my electorate. I think it is very important that the LNP and Queenslanders go on the journey with the LNP. We need to be a wake-up to Kevin Rudd.

Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (6.05 pm): As I rise to speak today we are hearing the public servants outside chant, 'Campbell Newman, come out here.' That is where he should be: out there facing the public servants whom he sacked.

Once again we see members of this Newman LNP government penalising the people whom they are supposed to represent, the people who now realise they were dead wrong to put their trust in LNP members at the ballot box for nothing more than their own narcissistic political gains. Only this time this mob is penalising the most important Queenslanders: our children and our children's children who will shape our state into the future. What an arrogant disgrace that this government will not sign up to the landmark Better Schools plan. How shameful, how blatantly reprehensible that this government will not sign on to the reforms that they know will work, reforms that they know are for the benefit of the kids currently in our schools and for future generations. Why will they not sign up? Because the education minister and Premier Newman think they know better than the experts, because the education minister and Premier Newman could not bear the fact that the federal Labor government has devised the best educational reforms in a generation. What did they do? They took their bat and ball and they sulked in a corner in George Street, refusing to do the right thing by tens of thousands of kids in this state. They know that what they are doing is shameful. They have been put to shame by their LNP mates in New South Wales and Victoria, who have signed on. Even the tories interstate know the good deal that they got.

While I know that this education minister does not have the attention span, tonight I would like to provide him with some facts and just maybe they will sink in. He is not in any way an expert in the educational field. That is why the federal government engaged real experts for the Better Schools plan. Those are the people who at least have the decency to acknowledge the importance of education in providing the best opportunities to all Queensland children. This education minister needs to look and learn at the examples set by Bundamba State Secondary College through its involvement in national partnerships. What they have achieved is absolutely brilliant. They have an agreement that has allowed them to establish close links between their junior school in literacy and numeracy areas with both the University of Queensland and Queensland University of Technology. They have established strong links with their senior maths and science students and they have come so far that they are travelling to NASA in the United States next month. This Bundamba school's opinion survey shows that staff morale, with this money, has gone up from 53 per cent to 93 per cent in 2012 and parents' ratings have also risen in key areas also. Bundamba State Secondary College is doing a fantastic job. Clearly, these results are lost on this government. This government arrogantly does not care. They do not care about the students at Redbank Plains State High School, either. We find that wonderful partnerships have been built, thanks to this money, with the Wacol and Carole Park businesses in the industrial estates. They do not care that last year every student in year 12 at this school graduated with a qualification and a pathway through to university, TAFE or a job. They do not care that their training programs have been so successful that the parents are also lining up to be trained at Redbank Plains State High School.

This is a whole-of-community initiative funded by the federal Labor government. What we see here is postcode education. We have seen the independent and Catholic schools sign on because they know what a good deal it is. We are also seeing this rotten, arrogant government not sign so that the kids in the state schools in my electorate will not get the benefit of this money and the benefit of a better education. We in Labor believe in education. We believe in the opportunities that education provides for our children, and we will always give our kids the best help and the best opportunity in life so that they can be the best that they can be.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mrs MILLER: Education is one of our core values. It is in our DNA, unlike the LNP opposite.

Mr LATTER (Waterford—LNP) (6.10 pm): I really do feel for the member for Bundamba in so many ways. The education debate is, and should always be, an important and emotive debate. After all, what could be more important than our children and their future? While the principal issue of the debate appears limited to funding, and the opposition and current federal government would have you believe that this Queensland government has somehow reduced funding to education and as such is disadvantaging our youth, it is unquestionably a convenient line for the opposition and the Rudd-Gillard—my apologies, the Rudd government. It is sometimes hard to know where the federal government merry-go-round will stop—nevertheless, the convenient line that this government is somehow reducing funding and disadvantaging our youth could not be further from the truth.

The truth is that this government has not maintained the former level of state government funding; it has increased it. In the Waterford electorate there is concern about a reduction in funding. In fact, I am concerned about a reduction in the level of funding that some of my schools had available to them. It was, as the member so eloquently stated previously, the national partnership funding—federal funding—that ended which is the reduction in funding that is affecting my schools. All of those wonderful things that the member for Bundamba and the member for Woodridge spoke about were indeed as a result of national partnership funding. In fact this government, in trying to negotiate an outcome with the federal government, sought a guarantee from the federal government that if an agreement could not be reached, they would at the very least maintain the current level of funding, including national partnership funding. Could they do that? No, they would not.

While the state government has increased its commitment to education and increased funding into our schools, it is the federal Labor government that has reduced funding to my schools. This responsible government, despite what others would have you believe, entered into good faith discussions with the federal government in order to reach some agreement or understanding regarding the direction that education funding in Queensland would embark on. As the minister said, on 11 July this government put an offer to the federal government which was very clear. There were three very simple things previously mentioned: recognise the $1.8 billion that the Queensland government has committed to education over the next six years, including our $537 million for Great Teachers = Great Results—and thank you, member for Woodridge, for acknowledging that having great teachers is a great result; to stop the new Canberra bureaucracy that was to be set up under the Rudd-Gillard plan and leave the running of schools to states and their principals; and halt the stripping of $1.5 billion out of kindergartens and $4 billion out of universities that the Labor Party has in this year's budget. They are three very simple terms and, one would think, simple enough for the Commonwealth government to be able to come to the table with. But they just could not do it. The truth, of course, is that no deal was ever going to be good enough for either one of the two Labor prime ministers because it was not convenient politics for either of them to do the right thing for Queensland.

To add further insult to injury and further insult to Queensland, the Commonwealth changed its position to strike a deal with Victoria. With some hope that the Commonwealth would do the right thing for Queensland and that Kevin Rudd would stop pretending to be about Queensland and start acting for Queensland, we made it even simpler. We said, 'Give us the same deal. Do for Queensland what you are prepared to do for Victoria and we will sign on the dotted line.' You see, when you try to engage in responsible adult conversation with the Labor federal government, it seems the best you can hope for is a remarkably resounding silence, because anything else is just utter rubbish.

Madam Speaker, in closing I would say to Mr Rudd through you: 'Prime Minister, if you are not prepared to work with or for Queensland, then get out of our way and let us do our job.' I commend the Premier's commitment to increasing funding for education and disability services and for the government's focus on improving student outcomes in schools and training.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (6.15 pm): I joined the Australian Labor Party because I believe in one of its fundamental tenets, and that is that all Australians—

Mr Seeney: You would be better off joining the LNP. You should have come and joined us.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from the Deputy Premier. I think after today's front page of the *Courier-Mail*, Deputy Premier, I would advise every woman in Queensland not to join the LNP. I joined the Australian Labor Party because I believe in equality of opportunity, and I believe that the Australian Labor Party has always strived to afford every Australian equality of opportunity by building a strong economy and by providing free quality education wherever Australians live. That is the

legacy of so many Labor governments. It has always been Labor that has driven education reform, and education reform has built this country into one of the highest performing countries in the world in terms of education. It was the Whitlam government that introduced free tertiary education and opened up universities to working class kids and kids from poor backgrounds right across Australia. Middle-aged women particularly who were looking for a life after raising their kids can thank Gough Whitlam. Next it was the Hawke reforms that introduced competition and opened up universities, making it possible for all kids to attend university and get a qualification. That is the Hawke Labor government legacy. In our state of Queensland it was the Labor government that introduced prep; year 7 into high school is a Labor government initiative. And Building the Education Revolution, which has seen new facilities introduced in all schools right across our country: Labor. All of these have been Labor initiatives.

What will this government's legacy be? Closing schools, sacking teachers and turning their backs on one of the most significant education reforms to be presented to the Australian people. The Better Schools funding deal will distinguish Australia and set up the smart economy of the future, and this arrogant LNP state government is turning its back on this once-in-a-generation education reform for cheap political point-scoring. It is nothing more than cheap political point-scoring by the government.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Members, the interjections are not being taken and I would ask for them to stop.

Ms TRAD: It is cheap political point-scoring from an arrogant government that knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing. This government will leave a legacy of closing schools and having tried to force mergers.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Member for Gregory!

Ms TRAD: Let us look at this government's track record to date. The education minister has a stellar idea. He said, 'We have a capacity crisis at Brisbane State High School. We have a school over here that is struggling. Let's merge them together.' My community knew that this was a dud deal from a dud minister. You know what? They proved him right.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Member for South Brisbane, that is unparliamentary. I ask that you withdraw it.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. It was obviously a dud deal and the community did not want it. The community rejected it. I was pleased that at the estimates hearing the education minister acknowledged my efforts and acknowledged that his backdown in relation to the merger was because of the community campaign that I was involved in. I put on record my congratulations to the broad community of South Brisbane that worked so hard to defeat this dud idea. I say to all of those schools out there—Nyanda, Fortitude Valley, Old Yarranlea: keep up the fight. What the merger proves is that this government, with its vacuous ideas and its inability to sell a message, is doomed.

(Time expired)

Mrs RICE (Mount Coot-tha—LNP) (6.21 pm): I rise to speak in support of the amendment to the motion. I commend the minister for the policies and initiatives he has implemented and continues to implement to ensure all Queensland students are well equipped and provided with equal opportunity to reach their full potential.

What we see today is the Queensland ALP clutching desperately at straws. For the members opposite to stand in this place and support Kevin Rudd's position to provide a better deal for Victorian students without offering that same deal for Queensland students is simply outrageous. For those opposite to suggest that Queensland should sign off on a deal that means Queensland students will be worse off than their Victorian peers is hypocritical. I reiterate the minister's sentiment that all this government wanted and, frankly, expected was the same deal that our Victorian counterparts were offered. What we got was Mr Rudd and his education minister ultimately delaying any chances of striking a deal before the caretaker government deadline. All this from a Prime Minister who is supposedly from Queensland.

Our role as a government is to ensure Queensland students have equal opportunity to a solid education. The Premier and Minister Langbroek have always regarded a commitment to a strong curriculum, improved teacher quality and more autonomy for Queensland schools as the key educational priorities for our great state. And we are doing this by focusing on what is really

important—to students, to teachers, to principals and to parents. We are improving the quality of teachers in the classroom through the Great Teachers = Great Results policy. We are giving the schools that want more autonomy the opportunity to become independent public schools. And we are improving discipline in the classroom by cutting the red tape for principals around suspensions and exclusions.

At the same time as this government is focused on and investing in providing the best educational opportunities for Queensland students, from crayon to career, we see the federal government doing the exact opposite by pinching money from kindies, universities and the training sector to fill their big budget black holes. We now know about the Rudd government's plans to slash a total of $3.8 billion from the university sector to fund Labor's Gonski school reforms. This is ironic to say the least, not only because a key purpose of schooling is to prepare students for work and university but also because the dysfunctionality of this federal government has them suggesting, through the *Australia in the Asian century* white paper, that the ambition is to have 10 Australian universities in the world's top 100 while at the same time they are slashing funding to the tune of $3.8 billion.

As the Assistant Minister for Technical and Further Education, I am also extremely concerned about the future of vocational education and training, and particularly apprenticeships and traineeships in Queensland, given that this reckless and careless Rudd government is continually pinching money from vocational education and training to again fill its massive budget black holes. In another abysmal policy announcement from the Rudd government just last Friday, the Australian Apprenticeships Incentives Program will be slashed by $241 million over the four years to 2016-17. These cuts will end the standard completion incentive payments of $3,000 to employers engaging existing workers as apprentices or trainees. The changes cut support to and for apprentices and trainees who are already doing it tough. These cuts will clearly exacerbate the phenomenal decline in apprenticeship and traineeship commencements and completions. The National Centre for Vocational Education Research has already attributed the decline in apprentice commencements in the March quarter directly to the first cuts to incentive payments announced by the dysfunctional federal Labor government in July last year.

Not only that, as we already know, the federal government wanted to play political games with Queensland students earlier in the year by delaying the final sign-off of the national partnership agreement implementation plan that cost Queensland around $56 million. This was equivalent to more than 18,000 training places. And they try to fool Queenslanders that they are all about education!

While the federal government continues to play games and pinch money from the university, training and skills sector, we are getting on with the job. The Queensland government reform action plan for further education and training was released on 7 June 2013. Unlike the chaotic, dysfunctional federal Labor government, our plan outlines real opportunities for Queensland students and real incentives for employers, apprentices and trainees through the Group Training Additional Apprentice Bonus and the School to Trade Pathway.

This government is committed to growing a strong four-pillar economy, and we have a plan to improve student outcomes, boost productivity and increase participation in the workforce. Perhaps most importantly, we are creating an effective contestable training market that will build the sector's overall capacity and lift quality by encouraging innovation in service delivery, course content and training outcomes.

In closing, despite the federal government's political games and money grabs, I can assure Queenslanders that this government is absolutely committed to ensuring Queensland students have the best opportunities available to them.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 59—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Cripps, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 11—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, agreed to.

Madam SPEAKER: For this division, the bells will ring for one minute.

AYES, 60—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Cripps, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 10—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

- acknowledges the importance of education in providing equality of opportunity to all Queensland children;
- condemns Prime Minister Kevin Rudd for offering a better deal on education funding for Victorian students than for Queensland students;
- condemns the former ALP government for underfunding education and disability services in this state while wasting money on the disastrous Health payroll system and other failed projects;
- condemns the federal Labor government's proposal, which will see cuts to funding for kindergartens, the training sector and universities; and
- endorses the Newman government's commitment to increasing funding for education and disability services and for its focus on improving student outcomes in schools and training.

Sitting suspended from 6.40 pm to 7.40 pm.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2329, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr STEWART (Sunnybank—LNP) (7.40 pm), continuing: Before the debate was adjourned I was saying that since 2009 the council has spent more than $15 million on graffiti enforcement and removal. This government as well as local councils have proposed a number of initiatives to attempt to target graffiti offenders and to stop this blatant disrespect for public property. In June this year the Attorney-General proposed changes to the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 which would give councils the ability to use offenders aged between 12 and 16 to remove graffiti from their own communities. These changes would come into effect with the passing of this bill. Recently this government announced its invisible weapon in its war on graffiti: a virtual fence comprising thermal cameras deployed in graffiti hot spots which have led to four arrests in June 2013. However, with more than 1,000 charges laid against the graffiti vandals on rail assets in 2013, it appears that the message is still not getting through. That is why I fully support this government's decision to increase the maximum penalty for graffiti offences to seven years.

The amendments to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 are an example of good governance and I congratulate the minister for including these in the amendments. As part of the Finance and Administration Committee inquiry into WorkCover, I found that current self-insurers have a structure in place to continue to provide this service to their employees without disadvantaging anyone. I thank the minister for adopting this recommendation from our lengthy inquiry and allowing discretion for self-insurers that continue to have a solid performance history.

This bill fulfils the government's pre-election commitment to tougher sentencing laws for drug traffickers who target children and to establish a tougher penalty regime for graffiti crime. These commitments were reiterated in the six-month action plan from July to December 2012. The Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 appropriately balances the need to have penalties in place to deter first-time offenders as well as alternatives to prison sentences which give repeat offenders an opportunity to break free from a cycle of crime. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. JA STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (7.43 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise to contribute to the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012, introduced in the House by the Attorney-General and member for Kawana on 29 November 2012. As the Attorney-General highlighted in his introductory speech, this bill fulfils a number of the Newman government's

pre-election pledges to toughen sentences for a range of important law and order issues. The main objectives of the bill are to amend the following: the Corrective Services Act to toughen penalties for drug trafficking, other legislation to toughen sentences for drug offences, the Bail Act 1980, the Victims of Crime Assistance Act, the Criminal Code and a range of subsequent legislation to provide tougher penalties for graffiti offences. Prior to the March 2012 election, the LNP was unapologetic in championing our tough approach on addressing law and order issues and, since coming into government, the Attorney-General, Minister for Police and Community Safety and other ministers are to be applauded for the swift and efficient manner in which they have introduced legislation which has made significant inroads towards cleaning up our streets.

Drug traffickers are the scum of society for the misery that they inflict, not just on those who use illicit substances but also the families of those involved. With the passage of this bill, drug traffickers will be mandated to serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence before parole eligibility. This amendment relates only to those sentenced to immediate full-time imprisonment and will not prevent the court from sentencing a drug trafficker to any other sentencing it deems appropriate, including suspended sentences. Many honourable members have reiterated the sentiment of this government that we are committed to ensuring Queensland is the safest place to raise a child. Toughening penalties for adults who supply dangerous drugs to children under 16 years is a crystal clear example of this government delivering on that commitment. These amendments provide a new category into the offence of aggravated supply, with the maximum penalty increasing to life imprisonment where the drug supplied was a schedule 1 drug, including heroin and amphetamines. The maximum penalty will now be 25 years imprisonment for a schedule 2 drug, including the supply of cannabis. These changes provide the courts with the means to hand down adequate sentences to these low-life criminals who prey on our vulnerable youth and wreck their future.

Amendments to the Bail Act are a positive step in providing far greater flexibility to the courts in handing down their judgements. Specifically, a Magistrates Court will be able to impose a condition of bail requiring the defendant to participate in a rehabilitative treatment or other intervention program and omits the statutory requirement for such a program to be prescribed. I note that amendments will also render it an offence for a defendant to fail to comply with the condition of bail that requires participation in a rehabilitation program. Facing up to such antisocial behaviours and ultimately accepting responsibility for them is a giant leap in the right direction. This bill also provides amendments to ensure that, if a victim so wishes, the court will be mandated to allow the victim to read their victim impact statement aloud to the sentencing court. However, the victim does still reserve the discretion to not read their statement, as the bill's intention is for this process to be therapeutic for the victim. There are also a range of provisions which provide for the victim impact statement to be given via closed-circuit television or with a screen to obscure the offender from sight and a number of other measures to ensure the process is as stress free as allowable for the victim.

I turn now to the extensive amendments to graffiti offences. Graffiti is a visual disgrace imposed on our local communities. The social and financial toll that graffiti places on innocent people who have had their properties defaced is immeasurable and, quite frankly, unacceptable. I have been fortunate enough to represent Currumbin for close to a decade and I can say that two of the local initiatives I am most proud to have championed include my antihooning and graffiti campaigns, which have resulted in a significant reduction of these activities. However, there is still more that needs to be done to curb this behaviour and this bill will provide stronger deterrents to offenders. Like many honourable members, I could share with the House countless examples of properties in my electorate that are constant targets of graffiti. I can only imagine how upsetting it must be to walk outside to find your house, fences and other property defaced. To then have to dip into your own pocket to paint over the graffiti and in a matter of weeks it is back again is just not on. It is unacceptable and no-one should have to tolerate this behaviour. Quite often graffiti targets public property which honourable members will no doubt agree puts enormous strain on the public purse. Every dollar that local councils spend on cleaning up graffiti is a dollar they cannot spend on bettering our community. It is disgraceful and it is about time those who participate in this incredibly unsocial and unacceptable behaviour are put to task over their actions.

In 2008 whilst in opposition the LNP introduced into this House the Criminal Code and Other Acts (Graffiti Clean-Up) Amendment Bill aimed at making all people convicted of graffiti offences held responsible for their actions through compulsory community service clean-up orders in addition to any other penalties issued by the courts. On 27 August 2008 when debating this legislation I said—

Graffiti is a scourge that not only creates unfavourable impressions of the area but also negatively impacts on local residents as it lowers property values, makes people feel unsafe and encourages other types of crime if it is not adequately addressed.

Whilst it really does defy common sense, those opposite voted against this legislation, so I am very keen to see how they intend to vote on the current bill before us tonight. But Labor has a very long track record of being soft on graffiti, soft on crime and soft on protecting our communities.

It was Labor's stubborn refusal to adopt measures to address the problem and a constant stream of complaints from residents that prompted me to launch the Currumbin Graffiti Watch program in 2010, providing a straightforward method for residents to quickly and accurately record graffiti offences with the hope of both having the graffiti moved swiftly and the offenders caught and held accountable. This program has had great success over the years and I look forward to promoting it further among my community with these new amendments. I would like to acknowledge local police officers, including Senior Constable Kurt Foessel and Senior Sergeant Chris Ahearn, for their diligent work in this area.

This legislation, introduced by the honourable member for Kawana, proposes a number of commendable amendments, including a new mandatory community based order, to be termed a graffiti removal order, that will apply to all offenders convicted of a prescribed graffiti offence and that will see them mandated to undertake a certain number of hours of graffiti removal commensurate with their age and the nature of the offence. This order can apply regardless of whether a conviction is recorded and can be imposed in addition to other sentencing orders. Noncompliance with such an order would be an offence and those who do not comply may be resentenced for the original graffiti offence. Further, for adult offenders aged 17 years and older, if a thing including a mobile phone, camera and the like owned or possessed by the person has been used to record or disseminate images of the graffiti the court will have the power to forfeit that property to the state.

This long-overdue, common-sense approach is a fair and cost-effective way to deal with the odious nature of this problem and sends a clear message to those who participate in the defacing of private and public property: if you choose to deface property, you will clean it up and, if it is not your own, then it will be somebody else's mess. It provides a workable solution to removing graffiti and offers a mechanism to educate the perpetrators that crime simply does not pay.

Additionally, there will be increases to the maximum penalty for the basic graffiti offence from five to seven years, removing the distinction between a basic graffiti offence and a more serious one involving obscene or indecent representations. All graffiti crime will now attract a maximum penalty of seven years because, honourable members, all graffiti is loathsome, punishable crime and it is about time legislation reflected that. After almost 20 years of an incompetent government from those opposite, Queensland residents were accustomed to a limp-wristed approach to addressing law and order. Legislation such as this Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2), which is currently before the House, indicates that the LNP state government is serious in its commitment to the good people of Queensland to clean up their streets and make their neighbourhoods safer. I congratulate the Attorney-General on bringing forward this bill and I commend it to the House.

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (7.52 pm): I rise to speak to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2). This is a broad-ranging bill with a range of great initiatives, indicative of the Newman government's continued commitment to being tough on crime. Before the election, the LNP committed to allowing for the reading of a victim impact statement in court should the victim wish for this to occur; toughening the sentences for drug traffickers who target children; requiring drug traffickers to serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence before being eligible for parole; and requiring all graffiti offenders to remove graffiti and strengthening the maximum penalty for graffiti crimes. This bill delivers on those promises. Over the past two years the Mudgeeraba electorate has seen a year-on-year decrease in graffiti of around 75 per cent. That is an extraordinary achievement. Once again, I would like to place on record my appreciation of the efforts of the Mudgeeraba police, led by Senior Sergeant Mark Anderson, and the efforts of the Mudgeeraba Police Community Consultative Committee, led by Earle Hinschen, who, as a delegate from Mudgeeraba, will undoubtedly continue to make a significant contribution to the Queensland Plan not only in relation to local crime but also in relation to the arts.

As I have previously mentioned in this place, the PCCC's results have been extraordinary, but the residents of the Mudgeeraba electorate will not be satisfied until they see graffiti wiped clean from their area, both literally and figuratively. Requiring graffiti offenders—I refuse to call them artists—to remove graffiti themselves is a measure that sensible people have been calling for and I am delighted to see that today we have moved to make this a reality. It is the first thing someone raises when raising their own frustration with graffiti—'Why don't we make them clean it up themselves?' By amending the Youth Justice Act children aged from 10 to 16 years who are convicted of a graffiti offence will receive a new and mandatory community based graffiti removal order. In addition, under

the act new mechanisms will see children made to remove graffiti without the need for the involvement of the courts. This bill increases the maximum penalty for wilful damage—graffiti from five to seven years imprisonment.

Part of the appeal for graffiti offenders is being able to show off their handiwork. In the past, for those people it was an article of pride that their vandalism could be seen by so many people and often the goal is to deface surfaces as high profile and easily visible as possible. With the advent and mainstreaming of social media, part of that goal can be achieved electronically through digital distribution. This bill provides that, for adult offenders, if the court is satisfied that a device—say a PC, mobile or digital camera—has been used to spread images of the graffiti, it can be confiscated. Main Roads does a great job in removing graffiti when on its property, such as on the sound barriers in my electorate along the highway, as does the Gold Coast City Council in conjunction with its distribution of graffiti removal kits to residents. But residents should not have to clean up the graffiti. Our taxpayer dollars should not have to be spent on cleaning it up. 'Make the vandals clean it up themselves,' is what the residents of the Mudgeeraba electorate have been telling me for years. This initiative will be incredibly well received in the community as being sensible, just and overdue, as are the initiatives within this bill that go to protect our children from those peddling drugs in our communities.

This bill increases the maximum penalty to life imprisonment for the supply of a schedule 1 drug to a child under the age of 16 and 25 years imprisonment for supplying a schedule 2 drug. Supplying drugs to minors when they are impressionable, when they are developing as people and when they are likely to be under greater pressure from their peers is truly a despicable act. When a child makes a decision to take illicit drugs, that child may be making a decision that will follow them for the rest of their lives and it may be the first step towards a lifelong dependency. It is right that suppliers are now subject to life imprisonment. They may be part of delivering a lifetime sentence to their juvenile customers. Today, the impact that drug suppliers can have on the lives of their customers is further acknowledged by ensuring that all drug traffickers who are sentenced to immediate full-time imprisonment are required to serve 80 per cent of their sentence before becoming eligible for parole.

In addition to these initiatives, today we move to give more power to victims of crime who can sometimes feel like the court system does not take their views and experiences into account, despite the fact that the accused is before the court due to the impact their actions had on the life of that victim. Today, we move to allow for victim impact statements to be read aloud in court and ask that the sentencing court takes that into account, along with the harm done to the victim. Of course, this is only if the victim wishes to do so. The bill also allows support for the victim to allow for CCTV or the presence of a support person as they go to read their statement in acknowledgement that this can be an extraordinarily difficult task for some victims. Again, that is a sensible initiative that gives voice to some who until now have felt silenced and powerless. The Newman government continues to show its commitment to combating crime in Queensland. I commend the Attorney-General and the bill to the House.

Mr PUCCI (Logan—LNP) (7.57 pm): I rise today to contribute to the debate in favour of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. Our government is unashamedly tough on crime. So far during the term of this 54th Parliament, our government has introduced a significant amount of legislation to make our communities' streets safer. It is my honest hope that, unlike the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2012 that was passed by parliament last year, the Labor opposition puts aside its petty political and socialist agenda and does something positive for communities across Queensland by supporting this bill.

The Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 focuses on several key areas that set out to impose tougher sentences on offenders who prey on children in the illegal trade of narcotics and other offences that degrade the exemplary standards of our community. I would think that all honourable members share my sentiments that illegal narcotics are a cancer on our society. It is particularly heinous when such vile individuals who push drugs prey on children. As a parent of two grown children and two school-aged children, and like many other families across our community, my wife and I share the deep desire that every deterrent is made to ensure that the safety of our children is preserved. This amendment bill will enable the criminal justice system to increase the maximum penalty for the aggravated supply of a drug to a minor from the current 25 years imprisonment to a new maximum life behind bars. Those who seek to prey on the innocent have no shame and have no place among our society. The only place for them is behind bars.

This bill inserts a new category to the offence of aggravated supply, namely, where an adult supplies a dangerous drug to a person under the age of 16. In such circumstances the maximum penalty increases to life imprisonment where the drug supplied was a schedule 1 drug, such as heroin or amphetamines, and to 25 years imprisonment for a schedule 2 drug such as cannabis.

Such a strong stance is yet another way that our LNP government is rectifying the soft approach towards offenders that has been at the very core of the former Labor government's half-hearted, failed attempt to establish an effective criminal justice system. This amendment bill continues its fight against the parasitic drug traffickers that infest our communities. This bill enables the justice system to sentence an offender convicted of drug trafficking to serve a minimum of 80 per cent of their sentence before being eligible to apply for parole release. The mandatory non-parole period will apply irrespective of the length of immediate full-time imprisonment imposed.

The Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 also tackles another serious issue that is nothing more than a visible scar on our communities. Logan, as the jewel of the south-east, is a wonderful community in which to live, work and raise a family. From our bustling urban areas of Browns Plains and Heritage Park to our pristine rural regions of Logan Village and North Maclean, our community has always taken pride in our public and private property. Sadly, there are always those who seek to vilify and degrade the property of communities. Many offenders who are convicted of graffiti and subsequent related crimes of destruction of private and public property often commit these offences out of sheer lack of respect. With a significant portion of graffiti offenders being minors, it is time to hold them accountable for their actions. The cost to remove graffiti from our streets poses an unneeded burden on our local governments across the state. Last year Logan City Council received $110,000 from this LNP state government to tackle graffiti on our streets. That was part of a $1.5 million boost to 73 councils across Queensland. However, financial support to our councils alone is not enough. Holding offenders accountable is a must. Making them see the negative impact their actions are having on our community is a welcome step in defeating this culture of disrespect and vandalism.

As I mentioned earlier, some offenders are of adolescent age. This should not be an excuse for them to be treated too lightly. The Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) will establish a new amendment to the Youth Justice Act 1992 to insert a new mandatory community based order called the graffiti removal order to apply to young offenders convicted of a graffiti offence under the Criminal Code. This will see youth offenders undertake a prescribed 40 hours of unpaid graffiti removal whilst under the supervision of an authorised officer. For mature-age offenders this amendment will toughen through increasing the maximum penalty for the basic graffiti offence from five to seven years imprisonment. The amendment eliminates the current penalty distinction between the basic graffiti offence and graffiti that involves obscene or indecent representations.

This amendment bill also adds power to the voice of a victim of crime. As it stands currently, a victim statement is a written document that sets out the details of harm caused to the victim. This may further include photographs and medical reports that would add to the testimony of a victim during the sentencing period of a trial. This bill will clarify that the sentencing court must allow a victim who desires to do so to read aloud a victim impact statement before the court. This amendment seeks to support the victim by giving them greater opportunity in seeking justice for an offence that has been committed against them. No longer will the voice of the victim be pushed aside.

I commend our honourable Attorney-General and Minister for Justice for his efforts in delivering on our government's objectives and for his pursuit of an appropriate criminal justice system that enables residents of our state to live in a safe and protected community. I also commend the efforts of his ministerial and departmental staff. I must also recognise the work of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I recently had the privilege to stand in for the honourable member for Toowoomba North during the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee estimates hearings and I commend my colleagues on their diligence in executing the duties of this committee. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr HOLSWICH (Pine Rivers—LNP) (8.04 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. This bill is yet another bill that fulfils the pre-election commitments of the Newman LNP government and particularly in this case to take action against crimes that deeply concern our communities. This bill, once passed, will ensure that drug traffickers serve a minimum of 80 per cent of their sentence prior to becoming eligible for parole. It will also strengthen sentencing laws against drug traffickers who target children. It will give victims an option to have a victim impact statement read out in court if the victim so wishes. This bill also strengthens the maximum penalties

for graffiti crime and will allow provisions for graffiti offenders to be ordered to remove graffiti. It will achieve a number of other aims, but it is those I have mentioned above that I will concentrate on in my short contribution this evening.

In late 2012 I undertook an electorate-wide survey of the Pine Rivers electorate asking a range of questions, including questions about law and order. Around 82 per cent of respondents indicated that they did not think that sentencing generally reflects community standards. This general feeling amongst the Pine Rivers and no doubt the wider Queensland community is part of the reason that this bill is so important. This bill strengthens sentencing options for several crimes and provides our courts with additional sentencing options that more accurately reflect general community standards and expectations.

Drug trafficking crimes are unacceptable in Australian society and need to be dealt with in the severest possible manner. Any move to discourage drug trafficking and to take those convicted of trafficking crimes off our streets is a move that I know will be welcomed by the Pine Rivers electorate and is certainly welcomed by me. Ensuring those convicted of drug trafficking serve a minimum of 80 per cent of their sentences is a positive step. Similarly, drug traffickers who target children are an abomination to our society and deserve to be dealt with in the harshest possible manner. I concur with the rationale behind these new penalties, being that those who supply drugs to children should be subject to higher maximum penalties than those who supply drugs to adults. A maximum penalty of life imprisonment for supplying a schedule 1 drug and 25 years for supplying a schedule 2 drug sends a strong message about our government's intent in discouraging and punishing illegal activities that target Queensland children.

Whilst graffiti is a different type of crime to the drug trafficking crimes dealt with by this bill, it being a crime against property rather than specifically a crime against a person, it is nonetheless a crime that is unacceptable in Queensland society and one that needs to be stamped out and dealt with. Again in my electorate-wide survey of Pine Rivers in late 2012, graffiti crime featured prominently, listed amongst the top five crimes of most concern to my local community. Our government made a commitment prior to the 2012 election that we would crack down on graffiti crime and this bill is just a part of our government's response to fulfilling that commitment. This bill increases the maximum penalty for graffiti crime from five years to seven years imprisonment, which is a commendable move that indicates the seriousness of this crime and the way it is perceived by our community. However, the real key to cracking down on graffiti crime in this bill is the introduction of the graffiti removal order, a mandatory community based sentencing order ensuring that graffiti offenders remove graffiti and contribute to cleaning up public places as part of their sentence. It is only right that those who choose to vandalise public and private property are made to right their wrong in this particular manner. This bill also allows for mobile phones or cameras used to record or capture images of graffiti to be confiscated from the offender. Graffiti offenders are well known for their desire to share their work with others. A step such as this to provide tangible consequences for sharing their crime with others is one to be applauded.

Our government is unashamedly committed to strengthening sentences and doing everything within our power to discourage crime and to adequately punish those who choose to commit crimes in our great state. This bill is a strong step in that direction and I am pleased to commend the bill to the House.

Mr SYMES (Lytton—LNP) (8.09 pm): Tonight I rise to speak in support of the Attorney-General's Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) as it will tick off another one of the Newman government's long list of achievements since coming to office.

Mr Bleijie: We do what we say, Neil. We do what we say we are going to do.

Mr SYMES: We do, which is unlike those opposite. It reaffirms my commitment and that of the rest of my colleagues to our respective electorates that a vote for the Liberal Nationals was a vote for a government that will get tough on crime, as a vote for the coalition government on 7 September will mean direct action on crime throughout the nation.

Under the amendments the Attorney-General outlined in his opening address, there are nine major objectives that will make Queensland a safer place to raise a family. I will speak briefly on four of the nine objectives surrounding the amendments to the Criminal Code, the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and the Youth Justice Act 1992.

Firstly, the bill will increase the maximum penalty for wilful damage under section 469 of the Criminal Code in special cases—item 9, graffiti—from five to seven years imprisonment. This will show criminals and people who disobey and disrespect our communities that collectively the government and the community will not tolerate graffiti or property damage any more. For example,

late last year at a gala dinner the Premier was asked about introducing laws around graffiti and wilful damage by members of the Wynnum & Districts Chamber of Commerce. Today I can go back to those business owners who invest so much energy, time and finance in getting rid of graffiti on their business walls and shopfronts and tell them that the Newman government is committed to working shoulder to shoulder with them in fighting crime and stopping graffiti in our local communities. The chamber of commerce must be congratulated for partially funding its own rapid response graffiti unit for the Wynnum CBD, to help in getting any sign of graffiti off business walls quick smart. The bill will amend the Criminal Code by the insertion of a provision regarding forfeiting property used to record, store or transmit images of graffiti, which will combat the growing problem with adult graffiti offenders and, therefore, giving the police more powers to confiscate materials and assisting the courts and law enforcement agencies in cracking down on this antisocial behaviour.

By amending the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, the bill will increase the maximum penalty for supplying a minor with dangerous drugs to life imprisonment for schedule 1 drugs and 25 years imprisonment for schedule 2 drugs. I thank the Attorney-General for getting tough on drug dealers who prey on the most vulnerable people in our society, that is, Queensland kids.

The Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) will set up a new community base order known as a graffiti removal order, which will apply to children aged from 12 to 16 years. That will provide the reforms needed that go to the heart of youth crime. This reinforces the community view that graffiti is an act of vandalism. The reforms outline that, as part of the punishment for breaking the law, the removal of vandalism of private property or businesses is an appropriate step as it makes an offender give back to their community after taking so much. The removal of graffiti and the wilful damage of property in this great state cost communities and victims significant resources, both financially and in time.

This bill is part of the Newman government's pre-election commitment to Queenslanders that the government will get tough on crime and antisocial behaviour. Furthermore, these amendments target drug dealers and traffickers who supply minors and children, that is, those who are most vulnerable. We should get tough on criminals who want to exploit them for financial gain through illegal activities. The Newman government is committed to reducing crime and being tough on offenders. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (8.13 pm): Tonight it is my pleasure to rise to speak in favour of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2). I commend the Attorney-General for his commitment to getting tougher on crime in Queensland. I am proud to be part of an LNP government that, over the past 12 months, has introduced a number of measures to clamp down on crime. I am particularly pleased with the measures we undertook last year in regard to sexual offences against children. Tonight, it is my pleasure to speak in favour of this legislation on a number of levels. I particularly want to speak about the ninth objective of the bill, which specifically states that young people and children who create 'works of art' or undertake graffiti illegally will be subject to graffiti removal orders. Over the past 10 years in my electorate of Southport, as a Gold Coast city councillor on many occasions I received phone calls from constituents, businesses and other people within the community complaining about the amount of graffiti that was appearing within the community. It has been a longstanding issue that has caused enormous frustration for us as a society. I do not think it reflects all that well on us as a community. It is incredibly sad to drive around parts of the state and parts of our local communities and see the amount of graffiti that has been put out there.

From my experience as a city councillor, I know that one of the most effective ways to deal with graffiti is through proper graffiti management programs. I know that for the local police dealing with graffiti has been an incredible source of frustration, as they have had to photograph the tags and the so-called 'works of art' and then track the offenders, only to be frustrated by the fact that the previous legal system provided them with no real recourse against those offenders. Only just last week, one young person said to me that he felt that under the previous government the graffiti management laws were a joke, because when someone offended by going into the community and vandalising a front fence or the side of the building, and the police went through all the frustration of tracking them down and identifying them through a fairly significant program of photographing and tracking the tags and building up an evidence base, many of the offenders got away with a bit of a gentle slap on the wrist. That is not good enough. This LNP government is committed to bringing in tougher laws on crime and actually giving real heart and real encouragement to our police and other community members and councillors who are trying to clean up our communities in this regard. I am sure that the council and the police within my electorate, and down at the Gold Coast generally, will be absolutely delighted to know that this government is getting tough on graffiti.

I am particularly pleased that in objective No. 9 of the bill we talk about inserting a new mandatory community based order called a graffiti removal order to apply to any child aged 12 to 16 years who is convicted of a graffiti offence under the Criminal Code. It is important that people take responsibility for their actions and that the government provides the police with the legislative framework to take that sort of action. As a young child, I remember hearing the old saying that if you do the crime you do the time. In my home, as young people we were taught that if we did something wrong against someone, we needed to make amends. Therefore, I believe this is an excellent objective. It is fantastic that we will have the powers to say to young people who create offences—while they are young; in their early years—that if they get caught and we can identify them as the vandal or the source of the damage, we can insist that they play an active role in cleaning up some of the graffiti.

My family attends METRO Church on the Gold Coast. Over many years, we have run some very successful graffiti clean-up programs where members of the church and members of the community have gone out on weekends to clean up businesses, homes, fences and public property as a bit of a drive to improve things. Over many years we have involved some of the offenders in transformations on the Gold Coast. Those young people may have come through a drug rehab program. They came with a sense of remorse about their past and their past behaviours. They have actively participated in some of the graffiti removal programs. Not only has it been a redemptive thing for them but also it has helped them appreciate the problems and the challenges that they create. It is so easy to put the graffiti on. It is so easy to make that mess, stand back and think what a great job you have done, but it is a whole other story when you have to clean it up. Therefore, I absolutely commend the Attorney-General for this initiative within the legislation, because it is a really important step forward in better managing graffiti across the state.

I commend the bill because of the new measures that we are undertaking in respect of those who would seek to peddle drugs to our kids. What an absolutely abhorrent practice that is. These tougher measures are so important. I am absolutely proud to part of a government that is getting tough on crime, particularly in regard to drug trafficking.

I know as a young person growing up on the Gold Coast that many of my friends got involved in drugs. When I talk to them today—and I have run into many of them at high school reunions and other events in recent years—they all utter the words, 'If only I had not been exposed to drugs. If only I had not gone down that path.' Even more abhorrent is when adults, who should know better, actually go out of their way to prey on our kids. I think that is one of the most disgraceful forms of crime. It is not just a crime on society but right up there with some of the worst crimes we can think of.

When we talk about bad crimes we usually think about murders and assaults and often downplay the seriousness of peddling drugs. Yet so many young people who get involved in drugs end up going down a fairly slippery slope that leads to all sorts of addictions. It destroys their lives and it destroys relationships. It often leads to petty crime and then later in life to more significant and serious crimes.

To be sending that message at this point in time and for us to be taking a much tougher stance on crime is something that I am incredibly proud of. I am pleased to stand here as a member of this parliament and commend the Attorney-General on this new legislation. It is with great pleasure that I commend this bill to the House tonight.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (8.21 pm): I rise to speak to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. I guess many of us are saying much the same thing. I think it is important that as representatives of our communities we put on the record what our communities in Queensland feel about some of these offences.

The first issue I wish to speak to is the graffiti removal orders that will be implemented as a result of the passage of this legislation. The previous speaker referred to these. Over the years the comment I have heard repeated most by those in the community in terms of graffiti is, 'If they graffiti why are they not made to clean it up?' If they had to clean it up they would get an understanding of its cost to the community and the effort required to get rid of it. The Attorney-General is doing exactly that. From my community's perspective, I would be surprised if there were anybody who did not agree with this initiative. If they graffiti a surface then they need to be part of the effort to remove it. I certainly support the amendments to the Youth Justice Act.

The amendments to the Bail Act that provide that the Magistrates Court may impose as a condition of bail that the defendant participate in a rehabilitation, treatment or intervention program is welcome too. It is not mandatory. It gives the Magistrates Court the opportunity to impose such a rehabilitation or treatment order as a condition of bail.

Some offenders will own and accept their behaviour and take the initiative when it comes to remediation, whether that is counselling or learning anger management skills or whatever. Some of our worst offenders will not acknowledge that they have a problem, will not acknowledge that they are a participant, will not acknowledge that it is their responsibility to change. For those, the ability of the Magistrates Court, especially if there is a history of previous offending, to require the offender to take part in some kind of intervention or counselling to ensure that they face what they are doing, acknowledge what they are doing and work through opportunities to address that offending is welcome.

The Corrective Services Act will be amended to require all drug traffickers sentenced to immediate full-time imprisonment—it is a serious offence and they are incarcerated—to serve a minimum non-parole period of 80 per cent of the sentence imposed. Again, it is a longstanding view of the community that if a person does the crime they should do the time. I have heard that said here earlier today. I remember when I was first elected and spoke about these issues that I said that people in my community were saying that if people are sentenced to seven years jail that they do seven years. Because of circumstances at the time it was a very strongly held view. At the time there were those on the parole board who took me aside and explained why it was important for offenders to have something to look forward to in terms of parole release.

I do not think there would be too many in the community who would see drug traffickers as not having too much to remedy in terms of their behaviour. Where there is serious offending, particularly involving young people, I believe it is welcomed by the community that they serve a minimum non-parole period of 80 per cent of the sentence imposed.

The Drugs Misuse Act will be amended to increase the maximum penalty for aggravated supply under section 6 where an adult supplies a dangerous drug to a child under 16 years of age. An offender will be liable to a maximum penalty of life imprisonment—that is not life as in the term of one's natural life; it is only a period of life—for a schedule 1 drug offence and 25 years imprisonment for a schedule 2 offence. Again, I believe that the community will support that.

Other speakers have spoken about the destructive nature of drugs. We discussed in this place some years ago the issue of portal drug taking. Some people believe in it—I happen to—and others do not. They say, for instance, that marijuana is not a portal drug. I certainly have knowledge of enough people to believe that it is, but I am not a scientist and I am certainly not a doctor. However, to give drugs to minors is unforgivable and reprehensible. Again, I believe that the community will welcome these changes.

Finally, the amendment to the Victims of Crime Assistance Act will allow for a victim who wishes to read their victim statement to the court to be allowed to do so. For many victims it is more than they can cope with and beyond their ability to cope. But for others the opportunity to articulate the pain and the damage that they have been through physically, psychologically and emotionally is cathartic and for them it will allow for a small measure of closure. It will also make the offender face the reality of what they have done and the impact of what they have done. Sadly, for some offenders it will give them a thrill to know how badly they have affected the victim. I would like to think that those sorts of people are in the minority.

It is important that if a victim of crime feels strongly that they need to articulate the impact of that crime that they not be impeded from doing that. There have been cases in the past where victims have been refused the opportunity to articulate that impact and it has exacerbated the damage to them. I welcome those changes.

There are some late amendments that have been circulated. I will be listening to the debate on the amendments in the consideration in detail stage very closely to determine which way to vote. However, I commend the Attorney-General on the primary legislation, the amendment bill, that we have before us. I believe that the vast majority of people in the community will support these changes. Indeed, they have been asking for these changes for a long time.

Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (8.28 pm): I rise to speak to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2). It amends the Corrective Service Act 2006 to require all drug traffickers sentenced to immediate full-time imprisonment to serve a minimum non-parole period of 80 per cent of the

sentence imposed. The bill amends the Criminal Code to increase the maximum penalty for the offence of wilful under section 469, punishment in special cases, item 9 graffiti, from five to seven years imprisonment.

The bill implements the Liberal National Party's pre-election commitment to ensure that victim impact statements are read out to the sentencing courts if the victim wishes, toughen the sentencing laws for drug traffickers who target children, require drug traffickers to serve at least 80 per cent of their sentences before parole eligibility, and require all graffiti offenders to remove graffiti and strengthen the maximum penalty for graffiti crime. I think that is something that the majority of people will no doubt support.

I recall working in the railway. I worked at Mayne Station back in 1987-88. I remember all the electric trains that came in from all the stations at night-time. At least every second one of those trains would be covered in graffiti. But it was the railway employees who had to clean up the mess. Many times they caught those offenders and the feedback that I received was that many of the offenders were youths—some of them were not—and that they would be handed correctional sentences or get a slap on the wrist. They would go in there with their free boots, enjoying themselves. I believe deep down that the taxpayers cannot afford to keep paying to clean this up.

I think it was the former mayor of New York, Rudy Giuliani, who took the bull by the horns and made a decision to crack down hard on graffiti artists first. I believe that from the time he did that everything started to fall into place—the incidence of graffiti fell and likewise crime and murder. The city was not totally cleaned up but it was more respectable than it was due to that decision being made. I commend the Attorney-General for this because I do not think we can argue with that.

The explanatory notes state that one of the primary objectives of the bill is to amend the Criminal Code to 'increase the maximum penalty for the offence of wilful damage under section 469, punishment in special cases, item 9 (Graffiti), from five to seven years imprisonment'. I think that is definitely something to look at because you do not want to put so much time, money and effort into graffiti artists who are in jail from five to seven years. Graffiti artists need to be given the opportunity to decide whether they want to spend five to seven years in jail or three years cleaning up graffiti in the city. I believe that that opportunity could be offered to them, whether they want to be looked after by the taxpayer but achieve nothing in jail when they could be out cleaning up graffiti.

The objective of one of the amendments to be moved during consideration in detail by the minister is to 'amend the Industrial Relations Act 1999 to ensure industrial organisations cannot avoid their obligation in regard to the requirements for spending for political purposes, to make technical amendments and to remedy drafting errors and omissions'. I feel that this an offence within itself. It is an insult to bring something like this into such important legislation—an amendment that deals with spending for political purposes.

Every different political organisation has its purpose. Whether it is the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the Democrats, the KAP—everyone has their purpose. They are all different lobby groups and somewhere along the line they have a purpose. Not everyone is right. But I feel that it is an offence to include the issue of unions spending for political purposes in a bill about drug trafficking to young children. That is sad. This is what people are sick of with regard to politics. They are sick of this type of politicking where you try to legislate any opposition out of existence. We have seen it before.

We had a rally out the front of Parliament House today and there were people out there who were very concerned about their job security. We had nurses out there who play a big part. We had firies. We had ambos. We had people from all different political persuasions. They showed an advertisement—and they were aware that this bill was going to come before the House—of the Premier assuring all the public servants that they would be looked after and that they had nothing to fear—'We're about building and growing and supporting the Public Service,' which ended up being a lie. It is disappointing that this bill, which is good legislation—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order! Member for Dalrymple, that language is not parliamentary. I ask you to withdraw please.

Mr KNUTH: I withdraw. But it is disappointing because this is a good bill. This is good legislation, but there is now a political tag to this bill that never had to be included in the first place. There is no doubt that it is disappointing that the backbenchers are not mentioning this. This is why people are turned off politics. This is why people are protesting outside, for the very reason this clause has been put in—

Mr Bleijie: How many were outside?

Mr KNUTH: Maybe 2,000, I think.

Ms Bates: Four hundred.

Mr KNUTH: No, 2,000. I did not see the Attorney-General or any—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Dalrymple, please come back to the subject.

Mr KNUTH: Like I was saying, this is what the Attorney-General promised, the LNP promised, and basically I supported that promise. At the same time I will never support including unions in a criminal bill, a bill that deals with drug trafficking to children. I think it is beyond a joke.

Mr BERRY (Ipswich—LNP) (8.36 pm): Without digressing too much from my speech, I would like to comment on the speech of the member for Dalrymple. I simply cannot agree, and I suppose that is quite understandable. But the reality of the position is that union power was taking grasp of a loophole. Simply what this amendment does—and it needs to be done as quickly as it possibly can—is plug the loophole. It is very clear as to the intent of the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Act 2013. It is to empower members. It is to ensure that members have a vote, and I cannot understand how there can possibly be opposition to that. It just simply means that they are able to vote on matters relating to political purposes, not industrial purposes.

I rise to speak to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. This bill raises important matters relating to the age-old problems of illicit drugs and offender behaviour where they are raised. I now turn to the amendments to the Bail Act 1980. A court will now have the added power to impose a condition on an accused that the accused participate in rehabilitation treatment and other interventionist programs which may or may not be prescribed. The bill provides for the offender who is not fulfilling the condition to be held in breach.

Perhaps I might give an example of what I thought was relevant to an issue such as this. It might be an example where there is one accused who is charged with 20 or 30 offences, and he intends to plead guilty to 19 of them or 29 of them but does not want to plead guilty to one or two. He can do it either one or two ways. He can say to the judicial officer that he intends to plead guilty or he can say, 'Your Honour, I am not going to contest 29 of them but I want to contest the 30th. I am pleading not guilty and I want a trial.' Surely in a case like that a judicial officer can give consideration to having that man start a program. The program is not a right; it is a privilege to be able to change his way in life. I cannot possibly see what opposition there would be to it when in fact it is the magistrate or judge who needs to rule whether in fact that person is able to undertake that program. It seems to me very clear. If it is inappropriate, you do not do it. If it is appropriate, you do do it.

The reality is that this process is another judicial arrow in the judicial quiver. I think it is an innovative idea and something which ought to be explored and not criticised too hastily. The position is that society must attempt to have offenders undertake rehabilitation programs. It is a benefit to society in this person undertaking a program to become a productive member of society, to reap the benefits that come from steady employment and to become a functioning member of society and hopefully bestowing the benefits on his family and children so they also, in turn, enjoy the fruits of being a valued member. It is one small step in the right direction and it ought to be applauded. The penalty for an accused not fulfilling the requirement is a maximum prescribed penalty. It does not mean he is going to get the maximum; it means it is for the judge or the magistrate to determine, on all the facts, what is important to get this fellow back on track. The judicial officer will be given all the facts upon which to impose a penalty. The process has been working well for a substantial number of years and will continue to do so.

Amendments to the Corrective Services Act 2006 has sent a message to all drug traffickers that they will fulfil 80 per cent of their sentence before being released on parole. The proliferation of drugs in our society is responsible for the addiction of thousands of members of our society. It is the role of government to listen to our constituents, who clearly indicate that they want to get tough on drugs. It is a responsibility of government on our society's behalf to make sure that the message is put out in relation to sentencing. Our system of justice operates on a number of principles in the sentencing process and one needs to examine those to better understand why that may work in the way in which it will. There is not a prescriptive set of principles involved each of equal weight. It is a matter of interplay between the rehabilitation of offenders, the protection of the public and setting the community aspect. It is this aspect of setting the community standard to say, 'If you commit this type of crime, if you want to get into drugs, then you will serve 80 per cent of your sentence.' That is not an unfair system of justice when one considers that it is an indictment on our society that drug trafficking has been allowed to reach the stage it is at currently. It is a reasonable proposition for the offender to

serve a prison sentence. When we are talking about 80 per cent, we are talking about the case where a judge has assessed that somebody ought to be in prison. So we are beyond those people who have been diverted to another regime of rehabilitation.

The reality of life is that the judge is faced with somebody who is undertaking a term of imprisonment and this legislation is simply saying, 'If you deal in crime of that nature, then you will serve 80 per cent before you will be considered for parole.' It is a deterrence aspect and one would hope that that deterrence has an effect because that is the system upon which we operate. It is about setting deterrence in this House. It is about creating a set of circumstances where we tell the public that if they commit a certain crime they will receive a certain punishment.

It seems to me that what society has cast upon us is the role, as part of our policy before the election of March 2012, to impose heavier sentences, to get tougher. That is what our society expects and that is certainly what the constituents of Ipswich expect. I do not think it deserves the term 'mandatory sentencing'. 'Mandatory sentencing' are very emotive words and ones that you cannot trespass. The reality of life is that if the judge has sentenced the person to a term of imprisonment, just because it is set at 80 per cent does not mean it is mandatory sentencing. I cannot understand how that can be bandied about in the way in which it has been. It simply is not mandatory sentencing. We are not saying, 'If you do this crime you must go to jail.' We are just saying, 'Look, the judge has sentenced you. It is to do with this sort of crime. You do 80 per cent.' It is that deterrence aspect.

The amendments to the Drugs Misuse Act 1986 increase the penalties where drug traffickers target young people and encourage them into drug taking by selling drugs to those under the age of 16 years. Members on all sides of the House would find abhorrent the tactics they use in having young people enter that world of illicit drug taking. Of course, we know that some of our young people are vulnerable to those sorts of habits. We do not all come from middle class families. Some of us come from vulnerable families or dysfunctional families and are perhaps more attuned to imbibing illicit drugs. Illicit traffickers are predators and they ought to be dealt with as such.

It is only appropriate that the maximum sentences be increased, again, to show that society does not accept that behaviour. Again, it is for the sentencing judge to impose a sentence which is appropriate. However, the Chief Justice has already indicated that, if the legislature increases sentences, that is a clear message to the judiciary that the penalties ought to be increased, because that is what the legislature requires and the legislature does what our constituents require of us through policy.

Under the amendments dealing with the Penalties and Sentences Act, the bill sets out the basis for ensuring that illegal graffitists clean up their mess. I have heard many speakers today and, quite frankly, I think we all share the same view. The reality of life is that we have so many public and private edifices damaged by graffiti, yet the cost to society in having to clean it up and the cost to the moral fabric of our society in having to have CCTVs and security guards to protect our public assets from graffitists is enormous. If one worked it out, setting aside the cleaning costs, it is something we can ill afford. Sometimes we wonder why do we suffer these things because society does not have a limitless purse of money? We have homelessness, which needs to be addressed; there are hospitals and waiting lists that need to be addressed as well as roads and other costs. Yet we are diverting funds which should go to families and citizens across our fair state and not to cleaning up other people's mess.

I know that graffiti has been around for a considerable period. If one goes and visits the Romeo and Juliet balcony in Italy, one will see graffiti. It is so sad and unfortunate to see that graffitists have actually plagued those buildings. It really does not do Italy proud to see those marks upon what we would consider to be a literary treasure in that William Shakespeare wrote about that balcony. Again, it is a matter of upping the ante. If people do it, they have to remove the graffiti. Forty hours is not an inconsiderable period. I think I heard the minister say that they should get out in the sun and start cleaning it up. Graffiti needs to be cleaned up quickly. Certainly the evidence seems to be that the quicker the graffiti is cleaned up, the less likely it is to return. Graffitists love to have their tags, marks, edifices, in a position for a considerable period. This will at least go in some way, in some part, to making sure that it decreases.

There is a provision under the Youth Justice Act for graffitists aged between 12 and 14 to also clean their graffiti—and others of course—ranging from five to 20 hours. The cost of graffitiing is just too expensive for our state to afford, particularly in the circumstances in which we find ourselves with an enormous debt. We need to be able to divert funds away from these sorts of activities into mainstream.

In one of my conversations with the mayor of Ipswich he indicated the cost of cleaning up, and I was absolutely astounded. It is something that we can do something about. Why not have these provisions? It is a problem, and this is a way of solving the problem. That includes the provisions relating to the forfeiture of mobile phones when they are being used for taking and transmitting images, which effectively is boasting of illegal activity.

I will turn to victim impact statements and indicate that I am certainly very much in favour of them being read out in court. With crime there are victims, and with victims go the consequences of actions upon the victim which sometimes affect them for a considerable period of time and often for life—not only the victims but also their families. The difficulty is that a victim does not have a lot in his or her armoury to be able to tell society how they feel about how they have been affected. This is an important measure, and I might refer to just a couple of words from the Hon. Justice Fryberg's caution in the case of Singh, where he said—

The purpose of those statements is primarily therapeutic. For that reason victims should be permitted, and even encouraged, to read their statements to the court.

In the quotation from that judgement he sought to set out the checks and balances. Obviously if the impact statement has things in it that are improvable, then it puts the prosecution to proof if in fact there are some evidentiary matters that need to be taken into account. But it is the judge who decides in the sentencing process what he accepts and what he does not accept. While this might be therapeutic, it is an empowering provision because victims are often powerless. That is how the whole system works, that they are robbed of their dignity—and usually a lot of other things as well. This bill reflects not only the government's pre-election commitment but also the expectation of the community.

I certainly listen to my constituents, and they have raised the fact that they are having difficulty adjusting to the sentences which are being imposed. I appreciate that they do not know the principles by which our judges and magistrates decide sentences, and of course we do not necessarily always believe newspapers in regard to the sentencing process, but that is the position we face. Our constituents must have faith in not only the legislature but also our court system. That faith must be strengthened. It is the case that this bill ticks all the boxes when it comes to making criminal law more tough for those who extend the resources of our society, and I do commend the bill to the House.

Mrs SCOTT (Woodridge—ALP) (8.55 pm): I rise to speak on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012. I notice that the member for Redcliffe has joined us in the chamber tonight.

The purpose of the original bill includes: a provision that the Magistrates Court may impose as a condition of bail that the defendant participate in a rehabilitation, treatment or other intervention program; to increase the penalty for graffiti offences from five to seven years; to create a graffiti removal regime for graffiti offences; to impose a mandatory minimum non-parole period for certain drug trafficking offences; and to require victim impact statements to be read out in court if the victim so desires. The Leader of the Opposition has already indicated that the opposition will be opposing the government's amendments in relation to graffiti offences. It is astonishing that this government—

Mr Bleijie: Shame! Soft on crime.

Mrs SCOTT: Attorney-General, come to Woodridge. We have hardly any graffiti in Woodridge, believe me. It is astonishing that this government would not wish to distinguish between obscene graffiti images and those that are less offensive. The changes in penalty also mean that graffiti offences will attract the same maximum penalty as many offences of violence.

The government's original bill was subject to parliament's committee process, allowing stakeholders and the public to express their views on the proposed legislation. Unfortunately, opposition stakeholders and the people of Queensland have now been denied any input into the amendments that were introduced by the Attorney-General just this afternoon.

One of the amendments is particularly offensive, which is to amend the Industrial Relations Act 1999 to ensure industrial organisations cannot avoid their obligations in regard to the requirements for spending for political purposes, to make technical amendments and to remedy drafting errors and omissions. At the last sitting of parliament the government guillotined debate on the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendments Bill 2013. As members will no doubt recall, that bill was aimed at silencing the voices of unions. Why? Because unions have had the audacity to question the government's actions in relation to industrial relations and workers. They have dared to query the Newman government's callous decision to sack more than 14,000 workers in the past 12 months. They have been so bold as to question the value of

cuts to front-line services in a number of areas, particularly health and education. They voiced the concerns of many when the LNP granted itself a 41.9 per cent pay rise, gifting the Premier a salary comparable to that of the US President Barack Obama. They have even been prepared to make public comment about the Newman government's failure to meet its own election commitments, particularly in relation to integrity, transparency and asset sales. In a healthy democracy—

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order. The member on her feet is not taking interjections, and there are constant interjections. I ask for your ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order! My ruling is that it is not a point of order. The member is speaking quite provocatively. When it gets to the point where I cannot properly understand, then I will ask for order in the House. I ask the member to continue.

Mrs SCOTT: In a healthy democracy a divergence of views is not just tolerated; it is encouraged. But under the Newman government, a government with the largest parliamentary majority in Australia's history, any dissenters must be silenced. For a party with so many compliant members on the back bench, they are still very sensitive when someone utters something critical. That is why the government rushed their legislation through the last sitting. But that was not sufficient for an Attorney-General who is determined to flex his legislative muscles and attack the union movement further.

But the LNP are not just attacking unions; they are attacking people who need support and rely on collective actions. We have seen them attack the rights of clothing outworkers, some of the most vulnerable and lowest paid workers in Queensland. We have seen them cut Skilling Queenslanders for Work and make savage cuts to front-line services like community centres, hurting decent people who need a hand getting back on their feet and into the workforce. They have tried time and time again to silence the voices of Queensland workers who have been so harshly dealt with by this extreme government.

The government cannot believe that they attack workers time and time again but they are still standing strong, demanding a fair go in this state. What a glass jaw the Premier has! He simply cannot believe that the masses do not love him. So to prove how tough they are, they will go after unions any way they can.

These amendments reinforce the absurdity of the substantive legislation passed a few months ago. It is illogical and counterproductive to try to create political and electoral reform through the means of industrial relations. It just exposes the true purpose of these changes—to have a go at the union movement because it has the gall to stand up against the extremes of the government.

It should be noted that these legislative amendments are deliberately targeting unions, yet there is no evidence of any wrongdoing by unions in Queensland.

Mr Bleijie: $50,000—Bill Ludwig—commission of inquiry into Queensland racing.

Mrs SCOTT: I understand that is just under inquiry, Minister. In fact, at last month's estimates hearings the Attorney-General's own department revealed that in the past decade the only organisation that has been investigated for financial irregularities is an employer organisation.

Ms Palaszczuk: Which one is that?

Mrs SCOTT: It is the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association, the organisation once controlled by Scott Driscoll, the member for Redcliffe.

I note that the amendments also make changes to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Berry): Order! Member for Woodridge, I am not entirely sure if that is sub judice. Is that being handled by another tribunal?

Ms Palaszczuk: No, it is not. It is not before a court.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge.

Mrs SCOTT: I note that the amendments also make changes to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 regarding self-insurance licences. I also note that this amendment implements a recommendation of the Finance and Administration Committee's inquiry into Queensland's workers compensation scheme. However, one recommendation of that inquiry that the Attorney-General continues to conveniently ignore is the one regarding the definition of 'worker' under the act. The Finance and Administration Committee spent a year investigating the workers

compensation scheme, holding numerous public hearings and taking submissions from a wide range of stakeholders. After this long deliberation, the government controlled committee—and remember, the LNP has five of the seven positions—

Mr Bleijie: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Woodridge is talking about the definition of 'worker', which was changed in a bill six to seven weeks ago. There is nothing about the definition of 'worker' in this bill. I ask that she be taken back to the bill at hand and not live in the past.

Ms Palaszczuk: Oh, you never go off topic, do you? Never! Not you!

Mr Bleijie: It is not in the bill.

Ms Palaszczuk: You never go off topic.

Mr Bleijie: Did you ever pull me up on it? It is not in the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I be involved in this conversation? The Attorney-General is right. It is not relevant to the issue. Perhaps you will just come back to the point, if you would not mind, member for Woodridge. Please continue.

Mrs SCOTT: Let me just skip the details. The Attorney-General knows exactly what I refer to. Despite this recommendation, the Attorney-General changed the definition of 'worker' at the last sitting of parliament, meaning that some injured workers are now likely to miss out on the compensation they deserve. Given that the Attorney-General, with these amendments, is willing to implement some recommendations of the Finance and Administration Committee inquiry into workers compensation, I urge him to revisit recommendation 1.

Mr KAYE (Greenslopes—LNP) (9.03 pm): I rise in the House tonight to make a short contribution to the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2). As someone who has witnessed firsthand the damage crime causes to the community, I commend the Attorney-General on his decision to introduce this bill. This bill delivers on election promises to empower victims of crime, crack down on drug traffickers and erase graffiti culture.

This bill aims to stop crime at its source by helping to prevent young people from falling into a life of crime. It does so by greatly increasing the penalties for anybody who supplies illegal drugs to a child under 16. Under the proposed amendments an offender would be liable to face life imprisonment for a schedule 1 drug or 25 years imprisonment for a schedule 2 drug. Even to Queensland's most irresponsible, reckless and degenerate individuals who deal drugs to children, the prospect of losing many years of their life sends a clear message that dealing to children will never be worth the money. By keeping children away from drugs during their formative years we can be sure that we are giving the young generation the best possible chance to grow up as productive, well-balanced citizens, rather than allowing them to fall into the inevitable pit of decay which follows long-term drug use.

This bill also seeks to amend the way our courts deal with graffiti related offences. It introduces several new measures which will have a positive effect in reducing reoffending and gang culture among young adults. Graffiti costs our state valuable resources at a time when we are struggling to meet costs. It demonstrates a complete disregard for the property of others and it diminishes the morale of everyday commuters who are forced to look at graffiti every time they look out the window of a train. It also has an impact on community members who value and take pride in their neighbourhood and in the property they own.

This bill introduces the common-sense measure of mandatory graffiti removal orders, giving offenders some idea of what it is like to be on the other side of their selfish vandalism and helping them see the foolish nature of damaging the property of another. This bill also attacks the heart of graffiti mentality by providing the option of compulsorily acquiring any property used to disseminate or share images of graffiti between adult offenders, as well as increasing the maximum sentence for adult offenders from five to seven years imprisonment.

Additionally, this bill will give victims of crime a voice. Any victim who wishes to do so will be allowed to read aloud their victim impact statement before the sentencing court, where it is reasonable to do so. It will also allow magistrates courts to impose strict conditions when granting bail, ensuring that the person receives rehabilitation or another form of treatment during that time.

I spent 23 years of my life dealing with offenders, and I can tell members of this place that the majority I have dealt with think the current laws are a joke. They simply did not care less about being apprehended and, sure enough, they would be repeating the same offences soon after. As a police officer there is nothing more frustrating, and who could blame police for thinking, 'Why bother?' There must be a deterrent to bad behaviour, to prevent offences occurring, and this legislation delivers that.

Overall, this bill reflects this government's move towards a fair and equitable justice system whilst also delivering criminal law reforms which will deter potential offenders and over time reduce crime in our communities. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.07 pm), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contribution to this important debate tonight—once and for all getting the balance right on the scales of justice, putting the rights of the victims back in the equation. We know that for years now victims have been neglected and forgotten by the Labor Party.

When this government was elected we had made numerous commitments with respect to a lot of these issues. Some of them are dealt with in this bill, and I am pleased that we are able to debate them tonight. I refer to the proposed amendments to the Bail Act that members have spoken about. We talk about the Magistrates Court imposing as a condition of bail that the defendant actually participate in a rehabilitation, treatment or other intervention program. If they are ordered to do that by the magistrate and they do not or they breach the bail condition or breach that order then that will be a breach offence. We are actually making it a specific offence of a breach of bail, if they are committed to undertake certain programs or activities.

We are also amending the Corrective Services Act, as members have said, to require all drug traffickers sentenced to immediate imprisonment to serve a minimum non-parole period of 80 per cent of their sentences. I will get to the debate and particularly the opposition's contribution in a minute. In the context of what we have debated this afternoon, after this bill passes the parliament drug traffickers in Queensland will serve at least 80 per cent of the sentence imposed.

We are also amending the Criminal Code to increase the maximum penalty for the offence of wilful damage, in special cases graffiti, from five to seven years. The opposition leader said a bit about that in her contribution, and I note that she has tweeted about that particular issue. I will respond accordingly in a minute.

We are also introducing amendments to the Drugs Misuse Act to increase the maximum penalty for aggravated supply under section 6 where an adult supplies a dangerous drug to a child under 16 years. An offender will be liable for a maximum penalty of life imprisonment for a schedule 1 drug and 25 years in prison for a schedule 2 drug. We are also amending the Penalties and Sentences Act to insert the new mandatory community based order called a graffiti removal order to apply to offenders convicted of a prescribed graffiti offence. That also includes amendments to the Youth Justice Act. So now for the first time there will be, for those convicted of these graffiti offences, a graffiti removal community based order which we are calling the graffiti removal order. This will actually apply to people under the Youth Justice Act, so 12 to 16 year olds will now be forced to go and clean up their mess. Never before have they been forced to clean up their mess or someone else's mess, and we are doing that for adult offenders as well and I will address the debate in terms of that aspect in a minute.

Finally, the bill amends the Victims of Crime Assistance Act by making sure that victim impact statements can be read out in court if it is the desire of the victim. There are two further amendments to this legislation tonight, including the amendment with respect to workers compensation to ensure that Q-Comp has the discretion to allow those self-insured companies—good companies that currently have approvals through Q-Comp to participate in the self-insured scheme—to continue in special cases. Finally, there is the amendment that I am moving tonight with respect to industrial organisations in Queensland that ensures that those who attempt to break the law in Queensland with respect to political campaigning at the industrial organisation level—if they do not abide by the Queensland law; if they set up dodgy companies, as the Together union has—will be captured as an associated entity, and I think that is probably a good place to start.

Mr Cripps: I was wondering how long it was going to take you.

Mr BLEIJIE: Well, we are getting there. In terms of the laws with respect to industrial organisations and accountability, integrity and transparency, I note the opposition leader had a lot to say about this particular amendment. The opposition leader will know all too well about the definition of associated entities, because in 2010 and 2011 the Labor Party government at the time introduced

reforms to the Electoral Act. In those reforms to the Electoral Act—going from $3½ million in public funding to $24 million—the Labor Party also had a little clause in there. It said that if you are a corporation giving to a political party and you are an associated entity—that is, under the corporations legislation an associated entity—then you are considered and deemed one and the same—one person and therefore only giving one donation. However, there was an exemption in that and let us guess who had the exemption. Unions! Trade unions had an exemption! The opposition leader talks a lot about associated entities. They had a bill in this place a few years ago where they were tying up all associated entities' companies but they had an exemption. We are not applying an exemption here. The same law will apply to all industrial organisations.

With respect to this dodgy company arrangement that Alex Scott has set up, let me make a few more comments. There are a few reasons why we are doing this, and I will use the union example here, because the union—the Together union—is the one that set up the dodgy arrangement to filter and siphon the money from the union to a company to then go and do the political campaigning in advertising. Firstly, the member for Woodridge says that there have been no issues with unions in Queensland. I suspect that Bill Ludwig's legal fees of $50,000 being paid for by union fees and Bill Ludwig signing the cheque to pay his legal fees is a particular issue that Queenslanders would have an interest in. I also think the members of the Bill Ludwig union would have an interest in their hard-earned money and membership dues going to Bill Ludwig's cash account to pay his legal fees tied up of course with the racing board.

In 2013 all honourable members would have got the shock of their lives when only a couple of months ago an ad appeared in the *Courier-Mail* from the Electrical Trades Union with references to Hitler. Queenslanders would not expect this sort of rot to be advertised in 2013, particularly referencing in the same newspaper article Adolf Hitler and Martin Luther King—and of course authorised by Peter Simpson, Secretary of the ETU. I keep this; this is the same copy I had at the time. It is getting a little ripped now because I have shown it a few times at estimates, particularly to the member for Bundamba in estimates. This is the rot that unions are now running in Queensland, as well as the gutter politics we saw at the 2012 state election campaign. And guess where it all comes from? The back houses of the Labor Party and the back houses of the unions! That is one of the reasons why Queensland members of the unions want to have a say in where their money goes, because I would say that if union members of the ETU knew that their secretary was going to put an ad in the paper with references to Adolf Hitler, offending many in our community—hopefully all in our community—they would be ashamed. We gave them the chance to actually have a vote on that and a say on that. Alex Scott and Peter Simpson from the unions do not want their members to have a say so they can keep running rot like this right across Queensland.

It is impeccable timing just as we got to the discussion of the ETU and the grubby, dirty politics that the member for South Brisbane should enter on cue. I would suggest to honourable members that she was sitting up in her office working hard, watching the TV screen and, seeing that I am having a crack at the unions, the defender of the unions had to come down. But then, honourable members, also on cue was the member for Bundamba when I started talking about Peter Simpson. We know the member for Bundamba's strong support for the ETU.

Mrs Miller: Absolutely!

Mr BLEIJIE: Does the member for Bundamba support these?

Mrs Miller: Absolutely! The ETU is very good—

Mr BLEIJIE: Does the member for Bundamba support these types of advertisements? Does the member for Bundamba support these types of advertisements?

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Berry): Attorney-General, address your comments through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I take the interjection from the member for Bundamba that she fully supports the ETU. Therefore, she is accused of supporting the ETU's advertising campaign with references to Adolf Hitler. That is the grubby, dirty politics that the member for Bundamba is surrounded by. That is the only politics they know—the dirty, grubby politics. But let me say to the member for Bundamba—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable members!

Mr BLEIJIE: I am so grateful that the members for South Brisbane and Bundamba have joined the debate. In terms of the dodgy company that Alex Scott and the Together union set up, let us have a look at another advertisement that appeared in the paper. Here is the advertisement from only a few days ago advertising the big rally out the front tonight. A few of us went out there and had a look. It is always interesting when they are singing *Solidarity Forever*. They were not in tune I might add, but they were singing. I counted about 500 people out the front, if that! This was the union's big storm on Parliament House. This was the union's storm on Parliament House—500 members! If honourable members want the calculation that the union would suggest we believe—the unions will not believe it, but it is the case—I suspect we had about 500 members of the Together union. There are 200,000 public servants in Queensland. Do the equation of 500 Together union members out the front, and that is about a 0.25 per cent of one per cent membership of the union out the front. This was Alex Scott's big opportunity and his big 15 minutes of fame and he ended up getting about 500 people out the front. I get more at an AFL and soccer game in the Kawana electorate on a Saturday or Sunday than the unions had out the front here. More people who turn up to—

Mr Powell: AFL and soccer?

Mr BLEIJIE: We support all sports in Kawana. With regard to this little advertisement that appeared in the paper in the last few days, let me draw honourable members' attention to the fine print. It says 'Authorised by Alex Scott'—now, generally, it would have 'Together union'—'Working for Queenslanders Ltd'.

This is his dodgy little company that he has set up that his members have no idea how much money goes to. So already the union has set up its company and it is filtering the money through this company. The other day when I walked out of my office I was handed the brochure for the union rally tonight. I said that, unfortunately, I am busy and I cannot go. The brochure also says—

Authorised Alex Scott Working for Queenslanders LTD 27 Peel Street—

And we also know what else is in Peel Street, do we not, colleagues? Yes, the head office of the Labor Party in Queensland. So we have evidence now of Alex Scott and his dodgy company arrangement. This is what we are going to stop. That is why we have introduced the anti-avoidance legislation. Just as the Labor Party made associated entities for electoral donation laws, we, too, will make the unions and their associated entities subject to the laws of Queensland that every other industrial organisation has to abide by.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Berry): Order! Members to my left!

Mr BLEIJIE: I am only warming up, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have another article that I thought the member for Hinchinbrook, the honourable minister, would be interested in, because it is of 8 July and it talks about the AWU. We know that the boss of the AWU is Paul Howes. In this article, which I will table at the end of my speech with highlighted sections for members' reference, of July this year Paul Howes said—and I ask members to remember that he is the boss of the AWU—

I can't see any reason why anyone in the union movement would fear having the same penalties that apply to company directors. If you're a crook, you're a crook.

The article then goes on to state—

Australian Workers' Union—

Ms Palaszczuk: Relevance? What's the relevance?

Mr BLEIJIE: This is relevant directly to the anti-avoidance legislation. Paul Howes is talking about the coalition's policy on union accountability laws. You cannot get any more relevant to the debate than this. In that article the journalist states—

Australian Workers' Union boss Paul Howes—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, they do not want to hear it. I ask members to believe this—

has called for tougher penalties for union corruption and criticised—

the federal Labor—

government for not matching the Coalition's policy to bring the penalty regime for unions in line with corporate law.

He goes on to state—

Mr Howes said the increased penalties for union officials introduced last year by his predecessor and Workplace Relations Minister Bill Shorten did not go far enough.

I quote Paul Howes—

I can't see any reason why anyone in the union movement would fear having the same penalties that apply ... As far as I'm concerned, there's no penalty harsh enough for those who rip off workers and that's what dodgy union officials do.

I am saying to members that a company arrangement set up by Alex Scott is a dodgy union deal from a dodgy union official and nothing less. In this article Paul Howes from the union movement also says—and my honourable colleagues will not believe this one—

I have no issue with the Coalition policy.

He then goes on—

Ms Trad: It's your policy.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection from the member for South Brisbane about our policy. Our policy is a copy of the coalition's policy, but our policy is a little tougher. We have the union leader saying that the Labor Party did not go far enough and that it should have copied the coalition's policy. The article goes on—and I will finish on this aspect—

Mr Abbott—

the Leader of the Opposition—

seized on Mr Howes's statement, saying the Rudd government should adopt the Coalition's policy to protect low-paid workers from 'dodgy union bosses'.

'When even Paul Howes is calling for tougher penalties, it shows just how out of touch Kevin Rudd and Bill Shorten are,' he said.

'We should never forget that former HSU national president Michael Williamson became national president of the ALP on Kevin Rudd's watch.'

So we have in Queensland a dodgy union deal, a dodgy company set up. That is why it is important that we get this amendment through with the anti-avoidance legislation. I note that tonight the member for Woodridge, in her woeful contribution, said that the most shameful aspect of this whole bill and the amendments tonight is that the LNP government is going to make the unions abide by the law. If it is okay for every other industrial organisation and if it is okay for every other Queenslander to abide by the law, so, too, should the unions.

The opposition members in their contributions talked about these amendments to the anti-avoidance legislation and said, 'It's a last-minute, sneaky amendment. We didn't know about it.' I would have thought that, having the most overresourced opposition in Australia's history, they would have seen my press release that was issued this afternoon. As far as I know, press releases are not secret. Press releases go to the world at large. They are on a website. I think we tweet it. I think we Facebook it. So secret was my amendment that I put out a press release. My amendment was so secret I wanted it hushed and have this pass without proper due debate tonight. I put out a press release titled 'Government to end sneaky union scheme'. If the title did not give it away, certainly the following 20 paragraphs would have.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection from the Minister for Environment. It was a very sneaky press release. We will try to release our press releases not as sneakily the next time. We will send them to only 100,000 people and not 200,000 people.

It is important that we introduce the anti-avoidance legislation because, essentially, Alex Scott is saying that he does not trust his members, who pay their union dues, to have the right to vote on what the union movement spends its money on and on campaigns over $10,000. In light of this anti-avoidance legislation, any person who is desperate enough not to have their members have a say in how to spend their money is a person worthy of consideration. For someone like Alex Scott of the Together union, who has to rush through a dodgy union deal to set up a company, then questions should be asked of him. We will not let Mr Alex Scott forget about this. We will not let his members forget that he does not want them to have a say in where they spend their money and what they spend their money on. The bosses of unions should be accountable for the dues that are paid by hardworking union members—men and women in Queensland. If they are not going to be accountable to their membership then they have to be accountable to the Queensland public. That is why we have introduced these tough new measures.

The opposition leader also talked about the statement that I made recently with respect to court ordered parole and suspended sentences. Let me tell the opposition leader a few facts about court ordered parole and suspended sentences. If the opposition leader wants to have a debate about whether the Labor Party in Queensland continues to support the current court ordered parole and

suspended sentence regime, then that is a debate that this side of the House is more than willing to have. I can assure the opposition leader that when I announced that the government was considering those laws with respect to court ordered parole and suspended sentences, honourable members were very supportive and the Queensland public was very supportive. When I announced that the government is looking at court ordered parole and suspended sentences, this idea came from Queenslanders. This idea came from victims of crime. For far too long under the Labor Party the scales of justice have been tipped in the offenders' way. We are rebalancing the scales. When we debate laws in this place we will put the victims first and at the forefront every time. We will stick up for the victims.

I mention to the opposition leader the youth justice survey that we released recently and had submissions and feedback on. Some 4,200 victims of crime responded online to that survey. The message is clear: things are not working in Queensland. The Labor way on sentencing regime and the policies of the Labor Party did not work, do not work and the people of Queensland do not want those policies enacted anymore. So if tonight the opposition leader is telling us that she continues to support court ordered parole, if the opposition leader continues to support 300 offenders a month breaching their parole orders, then good on the opposition leader. If the opposition leader is telling us that she supports 40 per cent of those people on court ordered parole not serving any jail time at all, then good luck to her.

I can tell the opposition leader that the Queensland community do not. The Queensland community are sick and tired of 40 per cent of those on court ordered parole not serving any jail time. Queenslanders are sick and tired of offenders walking from the courtroom, thumbing their nose at the law, sticking their finger up at the camera saying, 'I'm out. Thanks a lot.' The victim has to live with that for the rest of their life. That is why on this side of the House the LNP government will always put the rights of the victim ahead of the rights of the offender. We are unapologetic in that regard.

When we talk about these things the Labor Party do not give a position. They do not say they are for it, they do not say they are opposed to it. They are on the fence. They really want to support it because Queenslanders support it, but they cannot bring themselves to say they support the LNP government because the Queensland people support those policies the LNP government are looking at. They cannot bring themselves to do it. When laws come into this place toughening those issues with court ordered parole and suspended sentences, I very much look forward to seeing whether the opposition leader is going to stand up for Queenslanders or stand up for the 300 offenders a month who breach parole and the 40 per cent of those on court ordered parole that serve no jail time at all. Where is the member going to stand?

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The opposition leader says, 'Show us the consultation', 'Show us what the Law Society says, the Bar Association, the Chief Justice.' That is three organisations. We are talking to four million Queenslanders. That is who we consult with on these law reform issues. If the government has a policy objective then we will consult with the Chief Justice and the other heads of jurisdictions. In the same breath that the opposition leader talks about separation of powers she says 'But you are not consulting the Chief Justice. If the Chief Justice has not given his blessing for court ordered parole where is the separation of powers?' Where are the days where legislators could walk into this place on behalf of the Queensland people and put in legislation according to what the people of Queensland want? That was not the Labor way. Far too often they have had the ear of the civil libertarians and nothing in Queensland changed for 12 years. We went to the election with a strong commitment and we were elected with a strong mandate to sort these issues out once and for all.

I thought I had heard it all until tonight I heard the opposition leader say that she does not support increasing the penalties for graffiti offences. In fact, she quoted in her speech one of the submissions, which I suggest she then supports, which states, 'It is only some paint on a wall.' That is what the opposition leader said: it is some paint on a wall therefore someone ought not be convicted to serve jail time. Tell that to the victim. Tell that to the business owner.

Mr Pitt interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take note of the laughter from the member for Mulgrave and the opposition leader. Tell it to the wall, they say. I say talk to the business owner who continually has to pay to scrub off the graffiti from the offender week in week out. Talk to the owner of the house that is near a

shopping centre that the graffiti offender goes past every Saturday night and sprays the fence. Tell that to the people of Mulgrave, not the wall, member for Mulgrave. Tell that to constituents right across the state who are continually battling with graffiti offenders. We are taking a zero tolerance approach to graffiti in this state.

I note that the Minister for Local Government, David Crisafulli, has been working with local governments in terms of GraffitiSTOP. Local councils understand the cost to the community and the economy of graffiti vandals. We say enough is enough. We are increasing the penalty from five to seven years. We are doing it because we are saying enough is enough and the people of Queensland want us to take a serious and hard line on graffiti offences.

I note the Labor Party said it will not support that provision. Again good luck to the opposition leader selling to her constituents in Inala at the next election that she voted against increasing graffiti offences. The one piece of correspondence many members get all the time is about graffiti offences. When I conduct law and order forums across the state one of the biggest issues raised is graffiti offences and how people are not made to clean up their efforts. We are going to make them go and clean up their graffiti offences. If it is not their offence, not their paint on a wall, it is going to be someone else's paint on a wall. They will have graffiti removal orders made against them. It is about showing the people of Queensland that we are serious about tackling these issues.

I thank the Queensland Homicide Support Victims Group and Ross Thompson. They have advocated for the victim impact statement to be read out in court. This is a provision that I am particularly proud to be introducing. The Queensland Homicide Support Victims Group do an amazing job dealing with the incredible circumstances of loss of a loved one, family or friend to homicide. Ross Thompson and the crew do an amazing job helping people grieve, helping them through the processes and helping in particular if bodies are not found. They help immensely with what victims really need because with a homicide there is the entire family and friend network.

I congratulate Ross Thompson and the Queensland Homicide Support Victims Group which I was pleased to give some extra money to. Out of our $2 million package we were able to give the Homicide Support Victims Group some extra money to help support victims of crime. That was out of a bundle of about $2 million that we gave to victims groups. It shows the dedication and commitment of LNP members of this House. When we say we are on the victim's side we mean it. Not only that, we pass laws to assist the victims and we give money to victims support groups.

To the Homicide Support Victims Group I say thank you very much. If it were not for you this legislative change would not be before the House tonight. It is unfortunate that it took years and years to get someone to listen to them and to get this legislative amendment through. I am proud to say that this LNP government under Campbell Newman did it within a year and a half of its first term in office. To the Homicide Support Victims Group I say thank you. We are listening. We are more than happy to talk further about ways that we can assist your organisation, but also ways that we can assist other victims support groups right around Queensland.

I apologise to every other member of the House who contributed to the debate. Time has run out and I have not had a chance to respond, but I do collectively thank all honourable members for their great contributions tonight. Unfortunately time does not permit going into all your contributions. I only got to the opposition leader. These are important reforms. Queenslanders support these reforms. We are serious about tackling these issues. We are getting tough on crime. That is what we had a mandate to do.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1—

Mr BLEIJIE (9.38 pm): I move the following amendment and I table the explanatory notes—

1 Clause 1 (Short title)

Page 8, lines 4 and 5—

omit, insert—

'This Act may be cited as the *Criminal Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013*.'.

Tabled paper: Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [3160].

This is a minor amendment that amends the short title of the bill to reflect that the bill only relates to criminal law related matters.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 postponed.

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Ms PALASZCZUK (9.39 pm): I raised this issue in my speech earlier this evening. This clause removes the exemption from the Bail Act offence provisions for breach of a condition that the defendant participate in a program prescribed under a regulation. A person on bail has not yet been convicted of that offence and the court has determined that they should be released from custody pending the hearing of their charges on condition that they participate in a program. If they fail to do so, they will not benefit from completion of the program when it comes to final sentencing. In addition, the court can reconsider the issue of bail, further conditions can be placed on the bail and, in fact, the bail could be revoked and the person remanded in custody. Therefore, the opposition is opposed to removing this provision.

Mr BLEIJIE: The opposition leader is right in terms of the bail provision. However, what we are doing here is saying that the court can impose a condition on that bail for the offender to participate in a particular rehabilitative program. If the court orders that person to participate in a program and they do not, that is a breach of bail. We are making it an offence to breach that condition. The discretion is with the court. They can put particular conditions on a bail. If someone is granted bail and they are subject to certain conditions, then they should abide by those conditions. If they do not abide by the conditions, the court will deal with them appropriately. This amendment makes it a particular offence if they breach what the court has ordered them to do.

Division: Question put—That clause 5, as read, be agreed to.

AYES, 69—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Cripps, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Mander, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendment No. 3 to omit clause 10. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling today, the question for that clause is out of order.

Clause 11—

Mr BLEIJIE (9.51 pm): I move the following amendment—

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

Page 11, lines 11 and 12—

omit, insert—

'Criminal Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013'.

Amendment No. 4 amends the heading of new chapter 7A, part 7 under clause 11 of the bill, consequential to the change to the short title of the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendment No. 5 to omit clause 14. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling today, the questions for the clause are out of order.

Clause 15—

Ms PALASZCZUK (9.53 pm): Basically, this provision increases the penalty for graffiti offences from five years to seven years imprisonment. I want to make it very clear that no-one likes graffiti. We all know that it happens in our neighbourhoods. We all know that there are people who clean it up and make sure that it is repaired and that people's homes and properties look the same as they did before the graffiti offences happened. What we are objecting to here is that the penalty for graffiti offences will be seven years imprisonment. Seven years imprisonment is the penalty for other offences such as violence, serious fraud—

Mr Johnson: So you support damage to property?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No. Let us put it into context. The government is increasing the penalty to seven years imprisonment, which is the same as the penalty for offences of violence, serious fraud and assault occasioning bodily harm. It is the same as the penalty for receiving bribes as a member of parliament. It is the same as the penalty for official corruption. It is the same as the penalty for escaping from lawful custody. Now it will be the same as the penalty for sending a threat in a document to murder someone. It will be the same as the penalty for unlawful wounding. It will be the same as the penalty for glassing someone in a bar-room brawl.

What we are clearly saying is that increasing the penalty to seven years imprisonment is out of context when it comes to the other serious offences that are contained in legislation at the moment. It also makes the penalty in Queensland far greater than the penalty in any other jurisdiction in Australia. That is what I said very clearly. For the Attorney-General to get up and say that we are soft on crime is completely and utterly wrong.

As I have said very clearly, and let me say it again, no-one likes graffiti, but sending a young kid away for seven years is not the right thing to do. Some members may have had friends or a family member commit a graffiti offence in the past. What you are saying is that that person deserves to be locked away for seven years. That is not right. If a young person has made a mistake, are members saying that they should not be rehabilitated so that they do not make that same mistake again? What those opposite are saying is wrong. The penalty is out of proportion with the penalty for the serious offences that I have outlined tonight.

(Time expired)

Mr KNUTH: In relation to this clause, we are extending the punishment from five years to seven years imprisonment. I support this measure, but point out that it costs taxpayers a lot of money to have people in jail for seven years. I ask the minister, who is not listening at the moment, whether it would not be preferable for those people sentenced to this maximum period to be given the option to spend three years cleaning up graffiti? If they are prepared to spend three years cleaning graffiti then it could reduce the time they are in jail. We feel that it will cost taxpayers a lot of money to have them in jail for that time. I think it is sensible to do something productive like clean up graffiti when they are the ones who have graffitied trains, windows and people's shops. Would it not be much better to give them the option to clean up graffiti for three years or go to jail for seven years?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Before the minister replies I would seek clarification. This is a seven-year maximum sentence. It is not mandatory. The judge has the discretion to determine whether the offence is serious enough and whether, on the basis of the perpetrator's offending in the past, a more serious term of imprisonment is required. I would seek the minister's clarification.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will not talk much on this provision because most of it I covered in my contribution in reply to the second reading debate. The opposition leader has come in here opposing tougher penalties for graffiti offenders. This is actually one of the election commitments that we went to the 2012 election with. Even though the Queensland public get a say on this particular policy and overwhelmingly endorse it and some 78 members of the House at the time were elected on that platform, the opposition leader still cannot bring the Labor Party to support this new penalty regime.

It is a maximum. It does not mean that every graffiti offender that goes to court is going to receive the maximum penalty. It is the judge's discretion to determine the penalty. I suspect if we have an offender who commits graffiti offences day in and day out that they will get a little more time than a first-time offender, but that is up to the judge's discretion. We are changing it from five to seven years imprisonment.

As I go around the state and do law and order forums—I was in Cleveland recently doing a law and order forum with the local member, Mark Robinson—one of the issues that continually gets raised, particularly by local governments, is graffiti offences. We are wanting to take a tough approach

on graffiti offences. I said to the opposition leader in my reply speech, 'Talk to the small business owner who continually has to go to their business on a Saturday or Sunday morning and wash the graffiti off at their expense. Talk to the resident who lives next to a shopping centre and every week has to remove graffiti at their cost.' The local government minister mentioned the personal cost and cost to the community of graffiti offences. We are wanting to stamp it out. We are taking a zero-tolerance approach to these sorts of things. That is why I am surprised that the opposition leader would be opposing tougher penalties for graffiti offences.

I tweeted tonight that, believe it or not, the Labor Party is opposing tougher penalties for graffiti offenders. The opposition leader retweeted and said, 'Believe it or not you are misleading.' The opposition has just told us she is not supporting the tougher penalties for graffiti offenders so let the vote proceed and see how they vote.

Division: Question put—That clause 15, as read, be agreed to.

AYES, 68—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Cripps, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Katter, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Mander, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—

Ms PALASZCZUK (10.07 pm): The opposition will not be opposing this clause, but I just want some clarification from the Attorney. This clause raises some questions about the situation where an owner of an object who has done nothing wrong can be deprived of the property and not be compensated for it. There is a general practice that where government compulsorily acquires property the owner should be compensated. There are obviously exceptions to this principle where the commission of an offence is involved. Anyone who commits a crime cannot expect to be compensated for property confiscated as a result of that crime. But a person whose property is used in the commission of a graffiti offence without their knowledge or without any reasonable suspicion that it might be so can still lose their property, and we are concerned about that situation. What protections can the Attorney provide to those people?

Mr BLEIJIE: This, of course, relates to the new provision with respect to a new offence that we are inserting that deals with recording a graffiti act, for instance. If someone records the commission of the offence, their property can be forfeited to the state. I am not aware of any particular protections in there with respect to the property belonging to another. Suffice it to say, I would suggest that if the mobile phone is being used in the commission of an offence then that is the property that can be forfeited to the state. However, the state is under no obligation to have that forfeiture. I guess the reasonableness test will apply—that if it can be explained whose property it is then we would not want to put anyone in a situation.

However, it would all depend, of course, where the property came from. On the one hand, it might be stolen property and the owner of the property had no idea where it was or who stole it and then it was used in the commission of an offence. On the other hand, it might be that the person was there and gave their phone to someone to film the recording of that particular offence—that is, graffiti. If that is the case, then they probably ought to have known better not to give their phone and be involved in the commissioning of that particular offence. Whilst we proceed, I am happy to get the opposition leader some more information and clarification, but I suspect that the provisions do not offer the level of protection the opposition leader seeks. Suffice it to say, a reasonable person as they are applying the test will make inquiries about where the property comes from.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendments Nos 6 and 7 to omit clauses 17 to 36. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling today, the questions for the clauses are out of order.

Clauses 37 and 38, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mr BLEIJIE (10.10 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendment—

8 After clause 38

Page 22, after line 32—

insert—

'Part 6A Amendment of Industrial Relations Act 1999

'38A Act amended

'This part amends the *Industrial Relations Act 1999*.

'38B Insertion of new s 246BA

'After section 246B—

insert—

'246BA Acting vice-president

'(1) This section applies if the vice-president temporarily can not perform the functions of office.

'(2) The Governor in Council may, by gazette notice, appoint a person to act as the vice-president.

'(3) The person must be a person who is qualified for appointment under section 246A(2).

'(4) The person can not be a person mentioned in section 246A(3).

'(5) A person who has acted as vice-president may attend sittings of the court for the purpose of giving a decision in, or otherwise completing, proceedings that were heard by the person while acting as vice-president.

'(6) The person's decision in the proceedings is taken to be the decision of the vice-president.'.

'38C Amendment of s 341 (Appeal from commission, magistrate or registrar)

'Section 341(1), after 'determination under'—

insert—

'section 149'.

'38D Amendment of s 355 (Power to require documents to be produced)

'Section 355(1)—

omit, insert—

'(1) An inspector may require a person to make available for inspection by an inspector, or to produce to the inspector for inspection, at a reasonable time and place nominated by the inspector—

(a) a document issued to the person under this Act; or

(b) a document required to be kept by the person under this Act; or

(c) a document relating to an employee, including, for example, a time sheet or pay sheet; or

(d) a document relating to a matter under chapter 12; or

(e) if a document or information required to be kept by the person under this Act or relating to an employee or a matter under chapter 12 is stored or recorded by means of a device—a document that is a clear written reproduction of the stored or recorded document or information.'.

'38E Amendment of s 372B (Employer's notice about place to inspect information)

'(1) Section 372B, heading—

omit, insert—

'372B Employer notice in response to entry notice'.

'(2) Section 372B(2), from 'inspect'—

omit, insert—

'exercise the powers under section 373 that are stated in the entry notice.'.

'(3) Section 372B(3)(a), after 'workplace'—

insert—

', or a particular route to be used to access the part,'.

'(4) Section 372B(3)(b), before 'another'—

insert—

'if the entry notice states that the officer intends to inspect records—'.

'38F Amendment of s 373 (Right to inspect and request information—authorised industrial officer)

'Section 373, heading—

omit, insert—

'373 Rights of authorised industrial officer after entering place'.

'38G Amendment of ch 12, hdg (Industrial organisations)

'Chapter 12, heading, after 'organisations'—

insert—

'and associated entities'.

'38H Amendment of s 530C (Definitions for div 5)

'Section 530C(1)—

insert—

'***spouse***, of an officer, does not include a former spouse of the officer.'.

'38I Insertion of new s 530G

'Chapter 12, part 9, division 5—

insert—

'530G Inspection of statement of interests

'A statement of the particulars of an interest held by the officer or the officer's spouse and filed by the officer may be inspected by the following—

(a) the registrar;

(b) an inspector;

(c) another person permitted by law to inspect the statement.'.

'38J Insertion of new s 553DA

'After section 553D—

insert—

'553DA When an entity is an *associated entity* of another entity

'(1) An entity is an ***associated entity*** of another entity (the ***principal***) if—

(a) the entity is, under the Corporations Act, an associated entity of the principal; or

(b) the entity receives payment from another entity (the ***third party***) for—

(i) goods or services provided by the principal to the third party; or

(ii) the third party's membership of the principal.

'(2) Also, if—

(a) an entity (the ***first entity***) is an associated entity of another entity (also the ***principal***); and

(b) an entity (the ***second entity***) is an associated entity of the first entity;

the second entity is an ***associated entity*** of the principal.'.

'38K Amendment of s 553F (Particular spending for political purposes must be authorised by ballot)

'Section 553F, heading, after 'purposes'—

insert—

'**by organisation'**.

'38L Insertion of new s 553FA

'Chapter 12, part 12, division 1B, subdivision 2—

insert—

'553FA Particular spending for political purposes by associated entity of organisation must be authorised by ballot

'(1) This section applies if—

(a) an associated entity of an organisation intends to spend an amount for a political purpose for a political object in a financial year for the organisation; and

(b) the associated entity has spent or, if the amount is spent, the associated entity will have spent, in the financial year, more than $10000 for the same political purpose and the same political object.

'(2) The associated entity may spend the amount for the political purpose only if the spending is authorised by an expenditure ballot.

Maximum penalty—85 penalty units.

'(3) The spending of an amount for a political purpose is authorised by an expenditure ballot if—

(a) the spending was the subject of the expenditure ballot; and

(b) more than 50% of the valid votes cast by the members of the organisation authorised the spending.

'(4) The organisation must take all reasonable steps to ensure the associated entity conducts an expenditure ballot before spending the amount for the political purpose.

Example of a reasonable step—

giving the associated entity a roll of voters for the expenditure ballot in a way that complies with the rules prescribed under section 553G

Maximum penalty—40 penalty units.

'(5) The associated entity must not use a document or information given to the associated entity under this section for any purpose other than conducting the expenditure ballot.

Maximum penalty—40 penalty units.

'(6) The associated entity must, within 10 days after the declaration of the result of the expenditure ballot, give the organisation the particulars about the expenditure ballot mentioned in section 553I(2).

Maximum penalty—40 penalty units.

'(7) For an expenditure ballot under this section—

(a) section 553I applies to the organisation; and

(b) subdivision 3, other than section 553I, applies as if a reference in the subdivision to the organisation were a reference to the associated entity.'.

'38M Amendment of s 570 (Report and statement must be filed and published)

'Section 570(1)(b), after 'general meeting'—

insert—

'or management committee meeting'.

'38N Amendment of sch 2 (Appointments)

'Schedule 2, part 1A, section 4C(1), before 'vice-president'—

insert—

'president,'.

'38O Amendment of sch 5 (Dictionary)

'Schedule 5—

insert—

'***associated entity***, of an entity, see section 553DA.'.

'38P Amendment of sch 5 (Dictionary)

'Schedule 5, definition *spouse*—

omit, insert—

'***spouse***—

(a) of an employee, includes a former spouse of the employee; or

(b) of an officer, for chapter 12, part 9, division 5, see section 530C(1).'.'.

Amendment No. 8 deals with a few things. It inserts the following new clauses. New clause 38A indicates amendments are made to the Industrial Relations Act 1999. New clause 38B simply corrects a drafting omission in the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Act 2013. New clause 38C corrects a drafting error in that same bill. New clause 38D clarifies that the inspector powers to require documents to be produced are not limited to time and wages records. New clause 38E clarifies that employer's notice under section 372B may be used in response to any power to be exercised under section 373 including the inspection of records. New clause 38F is a technical amendment. New clause 38G is a consequential amendment. New clause 38H clarifies that the term 'spouse' does not include a former spouse for the purposes of an officer making a statement of interest. New clause 38I clarifies who may inspect a statement of interest.

New clause 38J inserts the new provision, which was subject to much debate tonight, to deal with industrial organisations setting up companies in order to avoid the balloting requirements for certain political expenditures. To counter these arrangements it is proposed that, if the associated entity meets certain criteria in terms of its relationship with industrial organisations, the associated entity is subject to the same expenditure balloting requirements as the industrial organisation. These provisions have been adapted from the transfer of business provisions of the Commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009 and the Corporations Act 2009—Commonwealth. The provisions concerning the associated entity will have effect from 1 September 2013.

This amendment also inserts new clause 38K, which is a technical amendment. New clause 38L inserts a new provision setting out when an associated entity of an organisation is required to conduct a ballot authorising certain political purpose expenditure. New clause 38M is a minor technical amendment. New clause 38N makes it clear that an associate may be appointed to president. New clause 38O is a consequential amendment to the dictionary. New clause 38P is a consequential amendment to the dictionary.

I will also clarify the previous issue that the opposition leader raised. The discretion will rest with the judge if the property is from an innocent third party.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Attorney for getting back to us regarding that previous clause. We are satisfied with that.

The opposition will be opposing amendment No. 8. In relation to the industrial relations changes, I notice on the *Brisbane Times* website there is an article, which states—

The Queensland government has lost its bid to boycott the union and directly ballot tens of thousands of workers on its wage deal.

Together Secretary Alex Scott says the Commission made the right decision.

"It was an outrageous attempt by the government to stop the union talking and consulting with members," he told AAP.

So there is some good news this evening for workers.

I turn now to amendment 8 before us. I think it is a bit embarrassing that the government has had to come back and amend a piece of legislation that was passed only a few months ago. Unfortunately, there has been some more union bashing, and only the Attorney knows how best to do that in this House.

I want to go through some of the elements in particular. New clause 38E deals with the employer notice in response to the entry notice. This clause places further specific restrictions on the right of entry, an element of industrial relations that goes to the core of the ability of union officers to do their job of representing workers. It would almost be funny if the broader issue were not so serious. Here we have an Attorney-General who complains every day about red tape and government overreach. Now he is in this chamber putting in place tighter and tighter prescriptions for controlling the requirements for not only notice of entry but also what purpose, which rooms, which entry and which route must be taken. The simple question is: if the government is so concerned about the specific route that union officers take into a workplace, what are they worried that those officers could see?

I will now move on to clause 38J, which is the insertion of new section 553DA. This clause deals with the concept of associated entity. Again, I would like to note that the Attorney-General has refused the opposition access to any departmental advice or briefing. Even in these circumstances, where these matters have not gone through a committee process, the opposition has been denied the basic decency that the Attorney has in the past offered us: a briefing in relation to clauses on which we would seek some clarification. Regarding this clause in particular, it would have been useful to explore with the department exactly who and which organisation it would capture. The definition—

(Time expired)

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I rise to speak in relation to the recognition of associated entities and also the imposition of constraints on those entities in relation to spending for political purposes. I supported the principle of this legislation, which we debated several months ago. At that time I said that I supported the principle that unions or indeed any organisation that is expending people's money needs to be accountable for that money. I believe that political campaigns do have a significant influence on people's thinking. However, my concern is not with the accountability measures that legislation required of unions and, in this instance, associated entities. My problem is with the threshold for the balloting of the members of the union, and that is the threshold of $10,000. In our current economic climate and considering the cost of advertising and other similar enterprises, $10,000 is an extremely low threshold. Again, I support the accountabilities. I do not support this amendment purely on the basis that the threshold at $10,000 is extremely low.

Mr KNUTH: I rise to speak to these industrial relations amendments. I feel that debating these amendments during debate on this bill links unions with drug traffickers who sell drugs to children. I believe it is an insult to include this in a debate regarding political organisations whose only crime is to stand up for the people they represent. This issue could have been resolved—and I do believe that it did not have to come to this—if the Premier had fulfilled his promises from the beginning when he said he would be public servant friendly. If he had done that these changes would not be coming in right now. Had he informed the unions that everything was going to be okay and had he fulfilled that promise, he would not be introducing these changes right now.

Had he not sacked 10,000 workers he would not be introducing these changes, so it is not the union's fault. Everyone has a responsibility: AgForce is there to represent landowners; unions are representing public servants and workers; the Liberal Party is out there representing multinational companies and foreign buy-ups; the Labor Party is out there representing their constituencies; and the KAP is out there, too. It is not a crime to represent your constituency but when you legislate against opposition, then it becomes a crime. It is legislating against any union to mount up a campaign, because the crime is against those who were sacked. That is what they are legislating against. That is the crime that the unions are committing at this present moment because they are standing up for those who are being sacked.

Last year they removed KAP's funding. Why? Because they do not want opposition. Likewise they are increasing the threshold for small parties to receive electoral funding from four per cent to 11 per cent. Why? Because they do not want any opposition. John Howard took it for granted when he introduced the 700-page bill and $50 million advertising campaign to promote his industrial relations changes. If you want to win the people you win them with good policies, not by legislating against any opposition. That is what these clauses do.

Mr HOPPER: The principle of what is happening here tonight is what we in Katter's Australian Party will not support.

Government members interjected.

Mr HOPPER: We can hear the interjections here. In 2002 the Beattie government made a councillor resign before he stood for parliament. That government was trying to annihilate the source of the opposition, so they used this chamber for the same thing as we are seeing tonight. We have seen the LNP do to Labor what the Labor Party did to the LNP. The Labor Party put in place the $1,000 donation limit, which restricted the income to the opposition at that time, yet the Labor Party could rely on the union movement for their funding. When Labor was in power they were able to strangle funding coming to the opposition. What we are seeing tonight is a payback by the LNP to the Labor Party, so now the LNP is strangling the Labor Party's funding. We heard the Attorney-General speak about $50,000 that was paid to Bill Ludwig by a union, but when the Attorney-General was still a wiener Russell Cooper was paid something in the order of $500,000 by the National Party at the time.

The principle of what is happening in this chamber tonight is: as soon as you get the power, destroy the enemy. As the member for Dalrymple said just a minute ago, we saw the Deputy Premier stand in this chamber and take funding and staff away from the KAP and strip us of our resources. Bob Quinn, Joan Sheldon and David Watson had the funding to be a political force in Queensland, and as soon as you become a threat these people take that funding away. That is what we are seeing in this clause tonight: their arrogance. You have to get 10 per cent of the vote to gain funding? That is a protection mechanism. It is an either/or. It is either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. There is no National Party anymore in Queensland. The National Party has been absorbed by the Liberal Party. The National Party paid their debts, and now they have sold their souls to sit in this chamber tonight and watch it all happen.

Ms TRAD: Given that there has been absolutely no consultation on the associated entities provisions, the opposition seeks clarification on the following issues. This amendment is obviously just another insertion in this arrogant government's attacks on Queensland workers and their representative organisations, so perhaps the Attorney-General can answer and clarify these questions. Who is this clause meant to capture? Will it capture political parties or political forums like the QForum? Will that be captured in relation to the associated entities insertion? Could it capture individual businesses or employers who constitute an industrial organisation? Will it capture organisations who do not have any decision-making link to an industrial organisation and whose only link is through the provision of goods and services? Could it capture law firms, for example, who represent workers and/or employers on behalf of the industrial organisations to which these employees belong? Will it have any implications for industry super organisations? Will it have any implications for industry health providers? Will it have any implications for training organisations and workplace health and safety programs?

These are serious questions that demand more substantial answers than the flippant responses that we have seen so far from the Attorney-General, whose hatred of workers and the Labor movement absolutely clouds his judgement and is an impediment to him recognising that on very rare occasions he may not in fact know everything and may actually benefit from real consultation and genuine debate. These are genuine and legitimate questions that require clarification. We look forward to your responses and your genuine discussion and feedback in relation to the associated entities clause, which is, quite frankly, from what we have been told already tonight, just another blatant ideological attack by a government that has run out of ideas. All it has is a big stick to belt people with.

Mr MULHERIN: The opposition is opposed to clause 38. This new paragraph extends the restrictions imposed on industrial organisations in the Industrial Relations (Transparency and Accountability of Industrial Organisations) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2013 to an associated entity of an organisation. On 5 June we opposed this amendment when it applied to industrial organisations, and we oppose it now. It is a curtailment of the freedom of political expression of industrial organisations.

The QCU has already indicated that they will be challenging this legislation in the High Court. It will be an extreme embarrassment to the Attorney-General when this is struck down by the High Court, which is the highest court in the land. The Attorney should be getting used to this by now. He was embarrassed in the Court of Appeal a few weeks ago when his appeal was struck out because he lacked the capacity to bring it.

I can only repeat what the Leader of the Opposition said during the debate, because this encapsulates exactly the opposition's objection to this amendment. This bill seeks to fetter the political activities of trade unions and seeks to shackle and gag those charged with the responsibility of speaking out for some of the most disadvantaged workers against the excesses of government with a massive majority. It appears to have taken the majority as a mandate to attack workers and suppress their industrial rights.

The Labor Party will always support freedom of speech. We will always stand for ensuring that organisations representing workers can do so with the same sort of freedom that we enjoy as members of parliament. It is unthinkable in a Western democracy such as ours that a government can announce a decision that impacts on union members and spend millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on a public education advertising campaign, but a trade union cannot spend more than $10,000 without first undertaking a ballot of its members. This bill strikes at the very heart of freedom of speech; it strikes at the very heart of freedom of political expression; and it is happening right here in the heart of Queensland.

Mr BLEIJIE: In relation to the member for South Brisbane's question—she rattled off a number of people and asked whether the clause covers them—I can advise that everyone who is meant to be covered pursuant to the legislation is covered in the legislation.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. This is consideration in detail, where we put questions to the Attorney-General. Let it be noted that he has no answer as to who it applies to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, that is not a point of order; it is a point of view.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Queenslanders need to know who this applies to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will resume her seat.

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

AYES, 63—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Cripps, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Mander, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 14—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Hopper, Judge, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendment No. 9 to omit clauses 39 and 40. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling today, the questions for the clauses are out of order.

Clauses 41 to 46, as read, agreed to.

Clause 47—

Mr BLEIJIE (10.36 pm): I move the following amendment—

10 Clause 47 (Insertion of new pt 5A)

Page 32, line 4, after 'chief executive'—

insert—

'(corrective services)'.

Amendment 10 amends new section 110G(7) of the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, as inserted by clause 47, which establishes the new graffiti removal order regime, to make it clear that the reference to chief executive is a reference to the chief executive of Corrective Services and not the chief executive of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, as the current provision reflects given the administrative arrangement orders. The chief executive of Corrective Services is uniquely placed to comply with the statutory duty created by the provision and has the necessary information to do so.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 47, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 63, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendment No. 11 to omit clause 64. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling today, the question for the clause is out of order.

Clauses 65 to 69, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendment No. 12 to omit clauses 70 and 71. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling today, the questions for the clauses are out of order.

Clauses 72 to 78, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mr BLEIJIE (10.38 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendment—

13 After clause 78

Page 47, after line 4—

insert—

'Part 12A Amendment of Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003

'78A Act amended

'This part amends the *Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003*.

'78B Amendment of s 71 (Issue or renewal of licence to a single employer)

'(1) Section 71(2)—

renumber as section 71(4).

'(2) Section 71—

insert—

'(2) However, if the Authority is not satisfied of 1 or more matters mentioned in subsection (1)(a) to (g), the Authority may still issue or renew a licence to be a self-insurer to a single employer if the Authority is satisfied that, despite the Authority not being satisfied of the matters—

(a) special circumstances justify the issue or renewal of the licence; and

(b) the employer can appropriately—

(i) perform the functions and exercise the powers of a self-insurer; and

(ii) meet the obligations of a self-insurer.

'(3) Without limiting subsection (2)(a), special circumstances that may justify the issue or renewal of a licence to be a self-insurer to a single employer who fails to satisfy the Authority only of the matter mentioned in subsection (1)(a) include the following—

(a) the employer—

(i) holds a current licence to be a self-insurer under the laws of 2 or more other jurisdictions; and

(ii) has demonstrated a history of compliance with those laws and the conditions of those licences, and of acting reasonably in the performance of functions and exercise of powers under those laws or licences;

(b) for a renewal of a licence—the employer has demonstrated a history of compliance with this Act and the conditions of the licence, and of acting reasonably in the performance of functions and exercise of powers under this Act or the licence.'.

'(3) Section 71—

insert—

'(5) In this section—

jurisdiction means the Commonwealth or a State.'.

'78C Amendment of s 72 (Issue or renewal of licence to a group employer)

'(1) Section 72(2)—

renumber as section 72(4).

'(2) Section 72—

insert—

'(2) However, if the Authority is not satisfied of 1 or more matters mentioned in subsection (1)(a) to (h), the Authority may still issue or renew a licence to be a self-insurer to a group employer if the Authority is satisfied that, despite the Authority not being satisfied of the matters—

(a) special circumstances justify the issue or renewal of the licence; and

(b) the employer can appropriately—

(i) perform the functions and exercise the powers of a self-insurer; and

(ii) meet the obligations of a self-insurer.

'(3) Without limiting subsection (2)(a), special circumstances that may justify the issue or renewal of a licence to be a self-insurer to a group employer who fails to satisfy the Authority only of the matter mentioned in subsection (1)(b) include the following—

(a) the employer—

(i) holds a current licence to be a self-insurer under the laws of 2 or more other jurisdictions; and

(ii) has demonstrated a history of compliance with those laws and the conditions of those licences, and of acting reasonably in the performance of functions and exercise of powers under those laws or licences;

(b) for a renewal of a licence—the employer has demonstrated a history of compliance with this Act and the conditions of the licence, and of acting reasonably in the performance of functions and exercise of powers under this Act or the licence.'.

'(3) Section 72—

insert—

'(5) In this section—

jurisdiction means the Commonwealth or a State.'.

'78D Amendment of s 570 (Powers of court on appeal)

'Section 570—

insert—

'(4) Despite subsections (1) to (3), the court can not decide to issue or renew a licence to be a self-insurer under section 71(2) or 72(2).'.

'78E Insertion of new ch 30

'After section 674—

insert—

'Chapter 30 Transitional provisions for Criminal Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013

'675 Definition for ch 30

'In this chapter—

commencement means the commencement of this section.

'676 Application of s 71 to current applications by single employers

'(1) Subsection (2) applies to an application for the issue or renewal of a licence to be a self-insurer that—

(a) was made by a single employer before the commencement; and

(b) has not been decided under section 71 at the commencement.

'(2) The Authority must decide the application under section 71 as in force after the commencement.

'(3) Subsection (4) applies to the following—

(a) a decision of the Authority under section 77 relating to—

(i) a submission made by a single employer under section 77 before the commencement for which the Authority has not made a decision under section 77(4) at the commencement; or

(ii) a submission made by a single employer under section 77 after the commencement (if the period within which the submission may be made under that section ends after the commencement);

(b) a decision of the Authority under section 80 relating to—

(i) a submission made by a single employer under section 80 before the commencement for which the Authority has not made a decision under section 80(4) at the commencement; or

(ii) a submission made by a single employer under section 80 after the commencement (if the period within which the submission may be made under that section ends after the commencement).

'(4) The Authority must make the decision on the basis of section 71 as in force after the commencement as if that had been the law in force when the matter the subject of the submission was decided.

'677 Application of s 72 to current applications by group employers

'(1) Subsection (2) applies to an application for the issue or renewal of a licence to be a self-insurer that—

(a) was made by a group employer before the commencement; and

(b) has not been decided under section 72 at the commencement.

'(2) The Authority must decide the application under section 72 as in force after the commencement.

'(3) Subsection (4) applies to the following—

(a) a decision of the Authority under section 77 relating to—

(i) a submission made by a group employer under section 77 before the commencement for which the Authority has not made a decision under section 77(4) at the commencement; or

(ii) a submission made by a group employer under section 77 after the commencement (if the period within which the submission may be made under that section ends after the commencement);

(b) a decision of the Authority under section 80 relating to—

(i) a submission made by a group employer under section 80 before the commencement for which the Authority has not made a decision under section 80(4) at the commencement; or

(ii) a submission made by a group employer under section 80 after the commencement (if the period within which the submission may be made under that section ends after the commencement).

'(4) The Authority must make the decision on the basis of section 72 as in force after the commencement as if that had been the law in force when the matter the subject of the submission was decided.'.'.

Amendment 13 implements recommendation 30 of the Finance and Administration Committee's report. I have dealt with this in some detail. It essentially means that Q-Comp will have the flexibility to determine whether to renew or extend approval for a company to self-insure. We want to make sure that particular companies that have self-insurance—good corporate citizens—can continue to participate in a self-insurance scheme. This amendment changes the legislative structure so that Q-Comp has the discretion, in exceptional circumstances, to look at the particular company and be satisfied that, even if they do not meet the requisite requirements in terms of the number of FTE employees and so forth, it can continue to self-insure.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 79 to 93, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now consider postponed clause 2.

Clause 2—

Mr BLEIJIE (10.40 pm): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 8, lines 14 to 16—

omit, insert—

'(2) Sections 38G, 38J to 38L and 38O commence on 1 September 2013.'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.40 pm): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.41 pm): I move the following amendment—

14 Long title

Long title, from 'the *Drug Court Act 2000*' to 'the *Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009*'—

omit, insert—

'the *Drugs Misuse Act 1986*, the *Industrial Relations Act 1999*, the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*, the *Summary Offences Act 2005*, the *Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009*, the *Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003*'.

Amendment agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Acting Manager of Government Business) (10.42 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Newman Government, Performance

Mr BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (10.42 pm): I recently received some correspondence from an old colleague. He is now retired. I worked with him for over a decade in the defence department. While we often discussed policy, I frankly thought his politics were tory. Prior to his work with Defence, he had been a very successful senior executive with one of the nation's major companies—hardly a screaming pinko socialist by any stretch of the imagination. His comments struck home to me just how much trouble this government is in, and I will paraphrase some of those comments. He said—

Bill I have hesitated to write but my recent experiences are causing increasing concern for me and my family.

My recent—

poor—

experience with my mum and mother-in-law in Queensland government hospitals where I saw the pressure of reduced numbers of staff. The idea of losing highly qualified and experienced registered nurses in favour of cheaper graduates is frankly ludicrous.

The psychological trauma surrounding aged care facilities is nothing short of a disgrace.

The failure to negotiate agreements under Gonski, the potential closure of schools, and increasing teacher-student ratios are indefensible.

Major increase in cost of electricity, water, transport and insurance on the same day that state MPs received a massive pay increase is bizarre, revealing at least Gross insensitivity, more likely stupidity.

At the same time this government is doing everything it can to cut further public service positions by surreptitiously offering voluntary redundancies to an increasingly disenchanted workforce. In my view, this will be a fatal mistake.

It continues—

The real killer recently, was where that Premier's bride thinks so little about cost pressures on Queenslanders she publicly preferred telling tales of spending sprees after marital tiffs. Mate this is simply pathetic.

Obviously, the Premier is counting on you guys taking several elections to become competitive again; our reality is that we cannot afford that to happen. If it does I really fear that we will have no public assets left by 2018. You know my experience in the private sector, and it is—

the private sector—

really excellent at increasing shareholder value but frankly doesn't give a stuff about the people of Queensland and Queensland's long-term future.

It continues—

It is lunacy to pretend that a failure to provide capital for currency of IT infrastructure in state departments will be magically solved by outsourcing. I cannot believe the naiveté of such thinking.

He goes on to say that the abject failure of the Commonwealth in IT outsourcing should be a case for all to study. With a man like this with his experience lost to this government, it can only reflect what the rest of the community is thinking.

(Time expired)

Ferny Grove Electorate

Mr SHUTTLEWORTH (Ferny Grove—LNP) (10.45 pm): This evening I rise in the House to outline some magnificent events that have occurred throughout the Ferny Grove electorate since our last meeting here. Some time has passed and during June and July there were a number of fantastic changeover events with the Lions, Rotary and the Leo Clubs around the electorate, of which there are a number. The Ferny Grove State High School and Ferny Grove State School joined together to undertake a chaplaincy fundraising dinner. What impressed me so much about this particular dinner was that it was not the school community alone which attended; a number of people from far and wide throughout the community showed a great deal of support for chaplaincy in our schools. As a government, we have an ongoing commitment to that program, of which I am very proud.

Then there was the Samford Show on 13 and 14 July. This year was the first year in some years that I can recall when we have not been rained out on at least one of those days and, as a result, we enjoyed 14,000 to 15,000 people through the gates—a record for that show. That is not surprising given the fantastic weather over the course of the weekend. Events such as that are not possible without fantastic volunteerism throughout our community, and pretty much every community based organisation—Rotary, Lions, Probus, CWA and others throughout the community—provide outstanding volunteers to ensure that the events occurred and were a great success over the course of the weekend. Of course, I give particular note to the President of the Samford Show Society, Frank Lippett, and all of the other executives who have again this year turned out a magnificent event.

Another very important event which has not occurred just yet but commenced today—as members may have seen walking throughout Parliament House this evening—is the number of parliamentary interns who will be undertaking particular events in various electorates throughout the state. I have the great privilege of having a number of interns come out to the Ferny Grove electorate. They will be undertaking a project with the Samford progress association, which was successful with the application of an Everyone's Environment grant earlier in the year. They will be working very closely with that community group to undertake some benchmarking of local waterways to ensure that we have a satisfactory point from which to measure the success of this outstanding program in the years to come. I wish them all the very best when they come to my electorate in the coming weeks.

Gold Coast Hospital

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (10.48 pm): I rise tonight to refute the outrageous comments made recently by the member for Gaven in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* regarding the use of the Southport hospital. It would appear that Dr Douglas had nothing better to do with his time than craft a media release voicing his own opinions on the future use of the hospital site and his personal views on my mental wellbeing. The member for Gaven alleged that I had been struck down with dementia and had all but forgotten my constituents. He asked—

Does the member for Southport remember what he was elected to do?

I can assure members that I remember a lot more than he does. I remember that I was elected as a proud member of the Liberal National Party to serve my home of Southport. I remember that my constituents had faith in the Liberal National government and that they had faith in my ability to represent their interests in state parliament. The member for Gaven seemingly forgot that he was elected as the member for the LNP when in November last year he declared that he was an Independent. But it appears he also forgot about that, too, because in June this year he declared that he would now not only be the Queensland parliamentary leader of the PUP party—the Clive Palmer party—but also the next Premier of Queensland. Both the Premier's office and my office have been contacted many times by disaffected Gaven constituents looking for assistance and angry that Dr Douglas could so blatantly abuse the electorate's trust. They thought that they were supporting a member of the next government, a member of the LNP. But as I stated earlier, they ended up with a PUP.

Quite apart from the fact that Dr Douglas thoughtlessly threw around inappropriate accusations of dementia, condemned by everyone from the editor of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* to Alzheimer's Australia, the member for Gaven continues to make inaccurate statements in this House. Today we heard him criticise our government, the health minister and the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Board based on claims in one letter from a single complainant, obviously a disaffected doctor in the area.

The member for Gaven claims that the new hospital has only 400 public beds, 50 fewer than the current Southport hospital. This claim is completely false. I am not sure from where the member for Gaven is getting his information, but it is certainly not from the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service. Had he made inquiries with chairman Ian Langdon, he would know that the new Gold Coast University Hospital will open with a significant increase in beds, with the capacity to grow to 750 beds as health services expand.

Furthermore, Dr Douglas would also know that this year the Newman government increased its spending on health services in the Gold Coast region by almost 18 per cent—nearly three times the average across the state. This increase represented $178 million and took total health spending on the Gold Coast to almost $1 billion. I am proud to be part of this government. Unlike the member for Gaven, I remember all too well my responsibilities to my constituents.

(Time expired)

Ward, Mr B

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (10.51 pm): Tonight, I rise with great sadness to acknowledge a young life that tragically ended on Sunday. Billy Ward was educated at local primary and secondary schools and he was a young man with a mop of really red, curly hair. When I had the opportunity to speak with him, he was very quiet but he had a mischievous grin. Billy's passion was boxing, rising through the ranks until reaching a life goal, the 2012 London Olympics. Billy did not bring home a medal. However, he carried on his shoulders the respect and admiration of his family, his friends, his community and his fellow boxing fraternity. Billy enjoyed great community support, with fundraising events prior to his leaving for the Olympics including raffles and other fundraising options. Billy was a gifted sportsperson, a much loved son and family member and a cherished friend to many. His death is a tragedy.

I would encourage young people and older people alike who are struggling with dark thoughts, sad emotions and a sense of hopelessness to reach out for help. There are many organisations that people can reach out to if they do not feel that they can speak to their family or their loved ones. If people do not feel that they can reach out to their friends—and there could be very valid reasons for that—if they do not have a close relationship with a doctor or other counsellor, they could ring or contact Lifeline, beyondblue, or Black Dog. There are so many organisations that have very well qualified people who can assist people through these dark times.

We have lost a wonderful young man. The community's thoughts and prayers are with his family, particularly his mum and dad and all of his friends in the boxing fraternity. Billy will be greatly missed. As I said, Billy was much loved in our community. Rest in peace.

Rochedale State School

Hon. IB WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts) (10.54 pm): It always gives me pleasure to rise to speak about the wonderful things happening within the electorate of Mansfield, particularly among the tremendous schools that I have within my electorate. Tonight, I want to speak about one in particular, and that is Rochedale State School. On 14 June, I had the pleasure of being at Rochedale State School to open RPAC. Queensland has QPAC; Rochedale State School has RPAC—its performing arts centre. It is one of a number of tributes to the work of the P&C within the Rochedale community, because that P&C has raised some $370,000 to convert an old tin shed into an amazing performing arts centre at the school.

The P&C then received an additional $37,000 grant for seating. It is about to install $80,000 in lighting and sound equipment over the next few weeks. That will mean that the Rochedale community will be able to hold substantial musicals and dramatic productions in that hall, which will be a great boon to the school and its curriculum.

It is only one of the many things that the P&C does for that community. It is an outstanding P&C led by a lady called Sharon Allison. Sharon came with me to Mackay as part of the Queensland Plan summit. She is joined by Amanda Ross and Joanne O'Connor, who are the vice-presidents and also the fete conveners and they look after all fundraising. Sylvia Bromley is the treasurer and has been in that role for the past four years. Alia Smith is the secretary. Those people are a very stable team within that P&C.

The major fundraiser for the school is the annual fete. It will be held on 7 September this year. There will be a bit of traffic chaos as people come to vote, but they can get some coconut ice while they are there at the tremendous fete that the school puts on. Last year, that fete raised $55,000 in profit and it is expected that a similar profit will be able to be earned this year.

The P&C also owns the after-school-care facility on the site. That raises some $250,000 to $280,000 profit per annum for the school. It has a coordinator, two assistant coordinators and 20 staff. It was opened last year at a cost of $625,000. It provides a great service to the school and to the local community. Throughout the past seven years, the P&C has fundraised and air conditioned every classroom in the school. In fact, the office is now the only building without air conditioning. Every classroom has electronic whiteboards, again provided by P&C fundraising.

The P&C has also bought a multipurpose photocopier at a cost of $15,000, a tractor at a cost of $36,000—the school is in a semirural area—and also undertakes to give $40,000 in unconditional funding to the school each year. The principal uses that to give to each teacher for resources. The P&C is a great P&C and I commend it for its fantastic work.

(Time expired)

Neville, Mr P

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (10.57 pm): I rise to share my gratitude and congratulations to the federal member for Hinkler, Mr Paul Neville. Paul has been a great mentor and supporter and I appreciate the assistance in, firstly, getting me elected and his consequent support. Paul has announced his intention to retire from the federal political arena.

Paul Neville is married to his lovely wife, Margaret, who will have to find ways of adjusting to having Paul around a little more. Before entering parliament, Paul spent 20 years with the Bundaberg and District Tourism and Development Board as deputy chair and later as CEO. Paul took the federal seat of Hinkler from the ALP in 1993 with a swing of 4.8 per cent and he has won every election since then. The Hinkler electorate is traditionally one of the most marginal electorates in Australia and Paul is now the longest serving member for the electorate, after putting up tough fights at each election.

The Hinkler electorate has a good mix of urban and part-rural areas and is located in the Wide Bay region. After the electoral redistribution of 2009, it includes parts of the Fraser Coast Regional Council and the Bundaberg Regional Council, incorporating the cities of Bundaberg, Bargara, Hervey Bay and towns like Childers, Woodgate and Howard. Paul has been a National Party whip since October 1998 and while in government was the chair of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Transport and Regional Services and the Government Policy Committee on Communications and Information Technology. Paul currently chairs the Coalition Policy Committee on Education and Industry and is deputy chair of the House of Representatives Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government Committee. Paul Neville has a well-deserved reputation for strong and effective representation. On many occasions I have witnessed the respect that Paul gains from his peers and constituents and it is all well deserved. The most telling memory I will take away from knowing this great local member is the high esteem in which he is held on all sides of the political divide.

Paul has produced a number of high-profile reports on rail, road funding, shipping, regional aviation, racing services, fatigue in transport and radio services to regional Australia. Paul has taken a leading role on key issues for the electorate and for Australia, such as improving Medicare and local health services; making local key roads safe and maintained for all motorists; fixing television black spots in regional and remote areas; regulating media ownership and its diversity; enhancing the live and local nature of regional radio and TV; extending mobile telephone coverage and broadband services throughout regional Australia; standing up for fishing, pork and sugar and horticultural producers, including the current issues with the ginger and pineapple industries; battling to keep services in regional Australia; giving more entitlements to our much-deserving war veterans; and retaining a focus on public infrastructure.

Paul will be missed for the strength of his political experience and knowledge and his dedication to the electorate. We will all miss the wit and, in moments of need, the jokes—the frog joke, the students at the Torbinlea races and many more. I take this opportunity to personally wish Paul and his wife Margaret all the best in the endeavours they pursue knowing they have made the Hinkler electorate a better place. Paul and Margaret Neville, thank you.

Tablelands Regional Council, Deamalgamation

Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.00 pm): I table a petition signed by 93 concerned council workers. It is addressed to the state member for Dalrymple, Shane Knuth, the state member for Cook, David Kempton, and the state member for Barron River, Michael Trout, requesting them to make representation to the government. It states—

This petition of concerned employees and wider community members of the Tablelands Regional Council draws to your attention the inadequate employment protections regulations that have recently been made by the Newman State LNP Government to facilitate the De-amalgamation of the former Mareeba Shire Council local government area from the current Tablelands Regional Council.

The Local Government (De-amalgamation Implementation) Regulation 2013 which establishes a new local government area for Mareeba fails to provide any job security or adequate employment protections to ensure that the workers and their families who are affected by these Local Government reforms are protected.

The failure by the LNP Government to ensure the regulation contains adequate employment protections immediately places both the security of local jobs and Council services to local communities at risk.

The petitioners therefore request that you as the State members for Dalrymple, Cook and Barron River immediately act in the interests of your constituents by seeking that the LNP Government make amendments to the Local Government (De-amalgamation Implementation) Regulation 2013 to adequately protect employees and services to the community.

The petitioners seek the State Government regulate to ensure that employment protections provided for workers caught up in this latest round of reforms are equitable to the protections provided by the former Queensland Local Government Workforce Framework 2008 Legislation, which protected both employees and the wider community during 2008 Local Government amalgamation process.

Tabled paper: Non-conforming petition regarding employment protections in relation to the Tablelands Regional Council deamalgamation [3161].

I recall the forced amalgamations. I believe that it was probably one of the greatest attacks on rural communities ever in Queensland's history from the previous Beattie government. It should never have happened and has caused tremendous hurt, hardship and division amongst communities. I am tabling this petition on behalf of workers. No-one here was impressed with what Beattie did, but he brought in protections so that those employees would not be sacked. They are asking that legislation be reintroduced to ensure that these workers can retain their jobs.

Queensland Plan Community Forum; Philp, Mr P

Mr STEWART (Sunnybank—LNP) (11.03 pm): I rise today to make mention of a successful Queensland Plan community forum recently held in my Sunnybank electorate as well as to inform the House of the sad passing of Mr Peter Philp, a strong advocate for our local community. Both orchestrating a Queensland Plan community forum and attending a funeral for a man who always gave of himself in the service of his family, friends and community were timely reminders for me of the enormous capacity individuals have for helping to build and shape their local communities.

On Monday, 29 July I held a Queensland Plan forum at the Sunnybank RSL. The event was a tremendous success and I was very impressed with the quality of feedback provided by the community. One of the recurring themes of the evening was the importance of education, whether it be the education of the benefits of contributing to a shared ideal such as multiculturalism, education that nurtures emotional intelligence and resilience in children or educating the community to take ownership of public places to ensure that they feel responsible for the maintenance and their future. From the evening it was clear that the Sunnybank community does not believe that education should be something that is confined to our classrooms and universities. Rather, there was a collective acknowledgement that education is a life-long process. I thank the residents and the delegates for their support and I look forward to working with them in the future.

A man who also believed in the importance of education, planning and development was Mr Peter Philp, who sadly passed away on Saturday, 29 June at the age of 72. Through my association with the community it was my privilege to work with Peter and I admired his level of commitment to his family, the community and his country. Peter had a great love of aviation and was a veritable Mr Fixit, regularly tweaking engines, gadgets and gizmos and was much admired for his handyman skills. For 20 years Peter worked as a branch manager. He and his family were pioneers in the agriculture and livestock industry. Peter Philps's life exemplified someone who was never content until they had achieved the goals that they had set for themselves. In the discussions after the funeral two things stood out about Peter. The first was that he always loved a chat and would stop to discuss current issues with anyone and the other was very simple but true—he was a true gentleman. Peter is survived by his wife of 42 years, Laurel, as well as his daughter and his grandson and my thoughts are with his family and friends during this time.

Kallangur Electorate

Mr RUTHENBERG (Kallangur—LNP) (11.05 pm): I rise to update the House on several things going on in my electorate. The Pine Rivers Show was held last weekend. It is significant in that the longstanding president of the show society, Mr Don Connolly, will not be contesting his position again after over a decade in control of that organisation. His contribution to our community as a consequence of his efforts in this endeavour have been fantastic. Mr Connolly not only contributed through that organisation but he also contributes through many other organisations. He is a true inspiration to those of us aspiring to help our communities.

I also want to encourage people to attend Cupcake Day this weekend at the RSPCA grounds at Dakabin. They will be open an hour or so before lunch and an hour or so after lunch. Come on down. There will be a sausage sizzle going on. There will be a lot of ways that you can support the organisation that does such a vital job in our community. I am glad that recently we were able to provide the RSPCA with a $30,000 grant to enable them to do veterinary surgery.

I am also very glad to be able to speak in this place and announce that Thiess contractors have been awarded the prime contract for the Petrie to Kippa-Ring railway line. With my colleague from Murrumba I attended an official declaration from the Minister for Transport of a $1.1 billion project that will inject 8,000-odd jobs into our community. We are certainly grateful for that opportunity.

Seqwater will be doing a review of their land and water use in Lake Kurwongbah and Lake Samsonvale. I would ask those who are interested to register either with my office or online. That will be happening this Saturday and also on the 31st. We will be doing a workshop to try to determine how best to manage competing interests around that.

I also would like to let people know that on 17 August we will be holding a community workshop for the Queensland Plan. We hope to have somewhere around 250 people at that forum. Right now my team of 22 are out talking to their friends and their circles of influence to bring them along and attend that workshop. Some weeks ago myself and several of the members around us held a school forum for students in and around the Moreton Bay region and that was incredibly successful.

Brisbane Inner North Sporting Community

Dr DAVIS (Stafford—LNP) (11.08 pm): I see I am listed as being the member for 'Stratford', so I will do what I can to add a Shakespearian touch. July was a great month for healthy lifestyles and sport in the Stafford electorate. Sunday, 21 July saw the inaugural running of the Stafford City Brook Run, an initiative of BINSC, the Brisbane Inner North Sporting Community. Well over 700 people participated in either the seven-kilometre individual team event or in the two-kilometre primary school challenge. It was a great good-fun family event in perfect weather that even included an event for dogs and their owners. In addition, it provided much needed fundraising support to the inner north sporting communities and the AEIOU Foundation, which plays a vital role helping children with autism. Congratulations to all those who participated and volunteered, especially to the BINSC chairman, Mr David McKellar, and the CEO, Mr Mark Forbes, as well as the sponsors, particularly the major sponsor, the Stafford City Shopping Centre, and its marketing manager, Jessica Davis.

BINSC is the umbrella for six different sports across the inner Brisbane community, including the Wilston Grange Australian Football Club, the Wilston Grange Junior Australian Football Club, the Canons Rebels Netball Club, the Wilston Grange Triathlon Club, the Wilston Grange Softball Club, the Stafford Stingers Swimming Club and the Wilston North's Junior Cricket Club. BINSC works closely with local business and explores opportunities for its member clubs to benefit from these relationships. BINSC is based at Brothers Grange Community Sports Club, at the Grange, and is continually looking at ways of improving the facilities to make it one of the most recognisable sporting hubs in the city.

Barely a week later, on Saturday, 27 July, the Stafford community celebrated the official opening of the new Gibson Park Clubhouse. Fire devastated the original in April 2012. It was a tribute to all concerned that we saw the new building built in a relatively short space of time at a total project cost of $807,202. A large contribution towards that came from the Brisbane City Council of $500,000. It was wonderful that the state government, through the National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing Get Playing program, contributed $100,000. The balance was made up from generous donors.

I pay great tribute to Lord Mayor Graham Quirk, as well as Barry Keegan, the chairman of the Gibson Park Committee, and Mr Frank Dixon, Mr John Strano and Mr Scott Munro and the contribution of Padua. It has 24 vibrant and exciting junior teams there, as well as the very successful cricket club. Congratulations and thanks to all those sports clubs in the Stafford electorate whose leaders, players and supporters do so much to enhance the quality of life for individuals in our community, especially in the healthy development of our children and adolescents.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.12 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Driscoll, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young