



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, 15 October 2013

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	3105
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 23 September 2013, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 23 September 2013.	
	3105
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3106
Loan of Documents	3106
REPORT	3106
Auditor-General	3106
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to parliament No. 2: 2013-14—Supply of specialist subject teachers in secondary schools.	
	3106
PETITIONS	3106
TABLED PAPERS	3106
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3114
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3114
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3115
Government Administrative Precinct, Redevelopment	3116
Oral Health Services, Waiting Lists	3116
National Disability Insurance Scheme	3117
Rural Firefighters	3118
Queensland Plan	3118
ABSENCE OF MINISTER	3119
NOTICE OF MOTION	3119
Workers' Rights	3119
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	3119

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 15 October 2013

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3119
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3119
Criminal Organisation Act	3120
Queensland Plan	3121
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3121
Casinos, Licences	3122
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3122
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3123
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3124
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3125
Gaming Machines, Licences.....	3125
Gold Coast, Tourism	3126
Cattle Industry, Drought Assistance	3127
Natural Disasters, Preparedness.....	3127
Rural Fire Service Day	3128
Bovine Johne's Disease.....	3128
Political Parties, Donations	3129
Information and Communication Technology	3129
Walton Construction	3130
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	3131
School Group Tours.....	3131
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.....	3131
Error in Ministerial Statement; Oral Health Services, Waiting Lists.....	3131
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	3131
Political Parties, Donations; O'Sullivan, Mr B	3131
Gommers, Mr B.....	3132
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 21 July 2012, titled 'Minister defends fast-tracked son'	3133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Weekend Bulletin</i> , dated 2-3 January 2010, titled 'A degree of pride'.....	3133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 17 July 2012, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Scott Emerson MP titled 'Ministerial statement'	3133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Current and historical company extract, dated 28 October 2012, from the Australian Securities and Investments Commission regarding Entrée Vous Pty Ltd.	3133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 23 October 2012, from Coogans Pty Ltd Chartered Accountant regarding Entrée Vous Pty Ltd.	3133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article, dated 26 September 2012, from the <i>Gold Coast Bulletin</i> titled 'Complaints over \$103,000 'job for the boy' MP's son in CMC probe'	3133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 9 September 2013, from the Crime and Misconduct Commission to Mr Peter Baston regarding Mr Ben Gommers.	3134
State Schools, Closures.....	3134
Newman Government, Sale of Public Assets	3135
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Gold Coast Bulletin</i> , dated 25 September 2013, titled 'Seeney has hit list: Promise of more job cuts, asset sales, privatisation'	3136
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 14 April 2010, from Mr Campbell Newman, former Chairman, South East Queensland Council of Mayors, to former Premier Hon. Anna Bligh regarding its state budget submission for 2010-11.....	3136
Lockyer Valley	3136
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 11 October 2013, from the Crime and Misconduct Commission to the member for Lockyer, Mr Ian Rickuss MP, regarding works at Grantham and other concerns raised on behalf of Helidon Sandstone Industries Pty Ltd.	3137
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email transmission, dated 24 November 2011, from Mahoney Lawyers to the Lockyer Regional Council regarding Paul Morrison, Kildare Pastoral Co.....	3137
Climate Change	3138
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 14 October 2013, titled 'Dire predictions in climate report'	3138
Rural Fire Service.....	3138
Criminal Motorcycle Gangs	3139
Crime Prevention.....	3140
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Multisystemic Therapy: Clinical Outcomes and Cost Savings'	3141
Gold Coast Hospital	3141
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Statistics indicating reported clinical incident summary occurring between 1 July 2012 and 31 July 2013 for the Gold Coast district.....	3141
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 25 July 2013, to the member for Gaven, Dr Alex Douglas MP, from Pindara Paediatrics regarding concerns at the Gold Coast Hospital.....	3141
Natural Disasters, Preparedness.....	3142

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 15 October 2013

LIQUOR (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3143
Introduction	3143
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Liquor (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013.....	3143
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Liquor (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes.....	3143
First Reading	3145
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	3145
WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3145
Introduction	3145
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013.....	3145
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes.....	3145
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 28—Inquiry into the operation of Queensland's workers compensation scheme, government response.....	3145
First Reading	3147
Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order	3147
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	3149
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3149
FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL	3149
Second Reading	3149
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 27 March 2013, from the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier, Hon. Glen Elmes, titled 'Cape York Welfare Reform Trial'.....	3152
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 28 March 2013, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, titled 'Cape York Welfare Reform Trial extended'.....	3152
VICIOUS LAWLESS ASSOCIATION DISESTABLISHMENT BILL	3154
Introduction	3154
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013.....	3154
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, explanatory notes.....	3154
First Reading	3155
TATTOO PARLOURS BILL	3155
Introduction	3155
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013.....	3155
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013, explanatory notes.....	3155
First Reading	3156
CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AMENDMENT BILL	3156
Introduction	3156
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013.....	3156
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes.....	3156
First Reading	3158
CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AMENDMENT BILL; TATTOO PARLOURS BILL; VICIOUS LAWLESS ASSOCIATION DISESTABLISHMENT BILL	3158
Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order; Cognate Debate	3158
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	3161
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3161
PRIVILEGE	3161
Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill	3161
FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL	3162
Second Reading	3162
Consideration in Detail	3168
Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.....	3168
Insertion of new clauses—.....	3168
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Hon. Glen Elmes's amendments.....	3168
Amendment agreed to.....	3169
Clauses 3 to 5, as read, agreed to.....	3169
Insertion of new clause—.....	3169
Amendment agreed to.....	3170
Third Reading	3170
Long Title	3170

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 15 October 2013

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT (SKILLS QUEENSLAND) AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL	3170
Second Reading	3170
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013, erratum to explanatory notes.....	3171
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 23—Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013, government response.....	3171
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.....	3186
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3186
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	3186
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	3186
MOTION	3186
Workers' Rights	3186
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 14 October 2013, titled 'The public service wanted to engage bureaucrats, it became a costly exercise in staff values'.....	3196
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Question on notice No. 617, asked on 10 September 2013 by the member for South Brisbane, Ms Jackie Trad MP, of the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman.....	3196
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	3197
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3197
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.....	3197
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3197
MOTION	3197
Order of Business	3197
CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AMENDMENT BILL; TATTOO PARLOURS BILL; VICIOUS LAWLESS ASSOCIATION DISESTABLISHMENT BILL	3198
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	3198
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 30 September 2013, by Mr Tim Mulherin MP titled 'Labor Will Host Gold Coast Crime Summit'.....	3252
Division: Question put—That the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill be now read a second time.....	3254
Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 108.....	3254
Consideration in Detail	3255
Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill	3255
Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.....	3255
Clause 4—.....	3255
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.....	3255
Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.....	3255
Clauses 5 to 10, as read, agreed to.....	3255
Clause 11, as read, agreed to.....	3255
Clauses 12 to 15, as read, agreed to.....	3255
Clause 16, as read, agreed to.....	3256
Clauses 17 to 38, as read, agreed to.....	3256
Clause 39—.....	3256
Clause 39, as amended, agreed to.....	3258
Clauses 40 and 41, as read, agreed to.....	3258
Clause 42—.....	3258
Clause 42, as amended, agreed to.....	3259
Clause 43—.....	3259
Clause 43, as amended, agreed to.....	3259
Clause 44—.....	3259
Clause 44, as amended, agreed to.....	3259
Clause 45—.....	3259
Clause 45, as amended, agreed to.....	3259
Clause 46—.....	3259
Clause, 46, as amended, agreed to.....	3259
Clause 47—.....	3259
Clause 47, as amended, agreed to.....	3259
Clauses 48 to 72, as read, agreed to.....	3259
Schedules 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.....	3259
Tattoo Parlours Bill	3260
Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.....	3260
Insertion of new clause—.....	3260
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	3260
Resolved in the negative.....	3260
Non-government amendment (Mr Judge) negatived.....	3260
Clauses 3 to 5, as read, agreed to.....	3260

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 15 October 2013

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.....	3261
Clause 7, as read, agreed to.....	3261
Clauses 8 to 10, as read, agreed to.....	3261
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Proposed fee schedule—Tattoo Parlours Regulation.....	3261
Clause 11, as read, agreed to.....	3261
Clauses 12 and 13, as read, agreed to.....	3261
Clause 14, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Clauses 15 to 35, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Clause 36, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Clauses 37 to 70, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Clause 71—.....	3262
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Ms Anastacia Palaszczuk's amendments.....	3262
Non-government amendment (Ms Palaszczuk) negatived.....	3262
Clause 71, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Clauses 72 to 85, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Schedule, as read, agreed to.....	3262
Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill.....	3263
Clause 1, as read, agreed to.....	3263
Clause 2—.....	3263
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	3264
Resolved in the negative.....	3264
Non-government amendment (Mr Judge) negatived.....	3264
Clause 2, as read, agreed to.....	3264
Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.....	3264
Clause 5—.....	3264
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, explanatory notes for Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.....	3264
Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.....	3265
Clause 6—.....	3265
Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.....	3266
Clause 7—.....	3266
Division: Question put—That clause 7, as read, stand part of the bill.....	3267
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3267
Clause 7, as read, agreed to.....	3267
Clauses 8 to 10, as read, agreed to.....	3267
Clause 11—.....	3267
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Ms Anastacia Palaszczuk's amendments.....	3267
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	3268
Resolved in the negative.....	3268
Non-government amendment (Ms Palaszczuk) negatived.....	3268
Clause 11, as read, agreed to.....	3268
Schedule, as read, agreed to.....	3268
Third Reading (Cognate Debate).....	3269
Long Title (Cognate Debate).....	3269
ADJOURNMENT.....	3269
Vietnam Veterans.....	3270
Cerebral Palsy League.....	3270
Murrumba Electorate.....	3271
Gold Coast, Bus Services.....	3272
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled '2014 Gold Coast Bus Network Changes—An Appraisal', dated 11 October 2013, by Steven Jamieson, Gold Coast Spokesperson, RAIL: Back On Track.....	3272
SeniorNet.....	3272
Kids Connect.....	3273
Walton Construction; Nambour Museum.....	3274
Pumicestone Electorate, Road Infrastructure.....	3274
North-West Queensland, Drought Assistance; Garde, Councillor E.....	3275
Pine Rivers Electorate, Emergency Services.....	3275
ATTENDANCE.....	3276

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 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 a letter in respect of assent to certain bills, the contents of which will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter 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 Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of assent: 23 September 2013

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Maritime Safety Queensland Act 2002, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994 and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995 for particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966, the Agricultural Standards Act 1994, the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008, the Forestry Act 1959, the Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002, the Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994 and the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936 for particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Electricity Act 1994, the Energy and Water Ombudsman Act 2006 and the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 for particular purposes and to repeal the Clean Energy Act 2008"

"A Bill for An Act to regulate the provision of education and care by particular services, amend this Act and the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Act 2000 for particular purposes and make consequential and minor amendments to other legislation stated in schedule 1"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, the Evidence Act 1977, the Financial Accountability Act 2009, the Industrial Relations Act 1999, the Legislative Standards Act 1992, the Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994, the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, the Queensland Competition Authority Act 1997, the Queensland Treasury Corporation Act 1988, the Reprints Act 1992, the State Financial Institutions and Metway Merger Facilitation Act 1996, the Statistical Returns Act 1896 and the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 for particular purposes, to repeal the Anzac Square Development Project Act 1982, the Commonwealth and State Statistical Agreement Act 1958, the Commonwealth Savings Bank of Australia Agreement Act 1966, the Energy Assets (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 2006, the Government Inscribed Stock Act 1920, the Government Loan Act 1986, the Government Loans Redemption and Conversion Act 1923 and the Government Stock Act 1912, and to make minor and consequential amendments of the Acts stated in schedules 1 to 4 for particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 for a particular purpose"

These Bills are 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

23 September 2013

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 23 September 2013, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 23 September 2013 [\[3648\]](#).

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Loan of Documents

 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, in 1873 concerned citizens from Roma and Maranoa lodged a petition with the Queensland parliament which we have been in possession of since that time. Following a request from the Supreme Court Library, and as per my advice to the House on 29 May 2012 and 20 March 2013, I gave leave for this petition to be removed for loan to the library's inaugural exhibition of the Sir Harry Gibbs Legal Heritage Centre, in accordance with standing order 19. A further request for extension has been approved, and the document will continue to be displayed at the heritage centre for a further six months for a new exhibition on legal dress. Members are welcome at any time to come and view the centre on the ground floor of the Queensland Queen Elizabeth II Courts of Law, which is open every day.

REPORT

Auditor-General

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General a report titled report to parliament No. 2 of 2013-14: *Supply of specialist subject teachers in secondary schools*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to parliament No. 2: 2013-14—Supply of specialist subject teachers in secondary schools [\[3649\]](#).

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, lodged by Mr Ruthenberg and the following e-petition, sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Orders 119(3) and (4)—

West Petrie Bypass

Totalling 4518 petitioners, requesting the House to reject any request by Moreton Bay Regional Council for significant majority funding for "option G" of the West Petrie Bypass [\[3650\]](#), [\[3651\]](#).

The following honourable members have lodged e-petitions which are now closed and presented—

Caloundra, Bus Service

Hon. McArdle, from 32 petitioners requesting the House to review TransLink's proposed changes to the 609 bus service route, carry-out further consultation with Caloundra residents and stakeholders, and reinstate Golden Beach Esplanade as a bus stop along this route [\[3652\]](#).

Meninga, Mr M

Ms Palaszczuk, from 189 petitioners, requesting the House to acknowledge Mal Meninga's leadership for many years as a rugby league coach, captain and player, through the dedication of a statue of Mal Meninga at Suncorp Stadium [\[3653\]](#).

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

Ferny Grove Schools, Flashing School Zone Signs

77 petitioners, requesting the House to install flashing school zone signs along McGinn and Archdale Roads, Ferny Grove at the start of the school zones for Ferny Grove State School and Ferny Grove State High School [\[3654\]](#).

Pre-Prep Year, Enrolment Age

17 petitioners, requesting the House to cause the amendment of section 15(1) of the Queensland Education (General Provisions) Regulation 2006, regarding age for enrolment in the preparatory year, by allowing a school principal to enrol a child in the preparatory year at the school if the child will be at least 5 years and 6 months on 31 December in the proposed year of attendance; or if the child will be at least 5 years and 5 months on 31 December in the proposed year of attendance and the child has attended a Queensland Government approved Kindergarten program in the year prior to the commencement of the preparatory year and the parent petitions the principal to enrol their child in the preparatory year [\[3655\]](#).

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following paper was tabled by the Clerk in accordance with section 34 of the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Act 2013—

[3647](#) Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal: Building a new remuneration structure for Members of the Queensland Parliament, Determination 1/2013, 15 October 2013

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

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

13 September 2013—

- [3458](#) Crime and Misconduct Commission: An examination of suspected official misconduct at the University of Queensland
- [3459](#) Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to an ePetition (2111-13) sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 1,034 petitioners, requesting the House to reject all calls to legalise euthanasia and physician assisted suicide; provide for sufficient palliative care services to meet existing and anticipated future demands for such services in all areas of our State; and provide additional funds for training of palliative care staff within all settings of care
- [3460](#) Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to an ePetition (2059-13) sponsored by Mrs Miller, from 1,214 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the Sunshine Coast University Hospital remains government owned and run to provide access to free public health services for residents of the Sunshine Coast area
- [3461](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Dr McVeigh) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Agricultural Standards Regulation 1997, Apiaries Regulation 1998, Diseases in Timber Regulation 1997, Exotic Diseases in Animals Regulation 1998, Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Regulation 2003, Plant Protection (Approved Sugarcane Varieties) Declaration 2003, Plant Protection Regulation 2002, Stock Regulation 1988, Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Regulation 1998, Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Regulation 1999, Food Production (Safety) Regulation 2002 and Veterinary Surgeons Regulation 2002
- [3462](#) Queensland Audit Office—Annual Report 2012-13

16 September 2013—

- [3463](#) Response from the Minister Housing and Public Works (Mr Mander) to an ePetition (2066-13) sponsored by Mrs Cunningham, from 17 petitioners, requesting the House to educate the citizens of Queensland on the nature of shallow water hypoxia including a warning regarding the dangers of extended underwater breath holding on existing compulsory CPR pool signage

17 September 2013—

- [3464](#) Response from the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Mr McVeigh) to a paper petition (2157-13) presented by Mr Knuth, from 498 petitioners, requesting the House to halt any decision to sell the old Agricultural College Facility on Tinaroo Creek Road, Mareeba and to reinvigorate the college by establishing the Mareeba Training Hub
- [3465](#) Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to an ePetition (2138-13) sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 124 petitioners, requesting the House to instruct the Local Government Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal to replace its mechanism for calculating councillor remuneration with one that delivers increases that are consistent with community expectation
- [3466](#) Australian Code for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes, 8th Edition, 2013
- [3467](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 32—Subordinate legislation tabled between 1 May 2013 and 4 June 2013

19 September 2013—

- [3468](#) Commissioner for Mine Safety and Health: Queensland Mines Inspectorate—Annual Performance Report 2012-13
- [3469](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to a paper petition (2159-13) and an ePetition (2106-13) presented by Mr Bennett, from 181 and 605 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to enact legislation that enables residents to choose, while of sound mind, the legal option of assisted suicide or euthanasia should they become unable to care for themselves and thereby lose their independence, dignity and quality of life
- [3470](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to an ePetition (2060-13) sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 312 petitioners, requesting the House to immediately provide funding to the Hard Yakka Youth Boot Camp, one of the most proven successful programs of its type in Australia
- [3471](#) Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to an ePetition (2049-13) sponsored by Mrs Miller, from 131 petitioners, requesting the House to prevent the Metro North Hospital and Health Service Board from retrenching a further 1,000 nurses and other health workers and cutting health services in northern Brisbane

20 September 2013—

- [3472](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2155-13) presented by Mrs Maddern, from 157 petitioners, requesting the House to extend the existing 80 km speed limit zone along Pialba Burrum Heads Road to just west of its intersection with Mitchell Avenue
- [3473](#) Queensland Integrity Commissioner—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3474](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2156-13) presented by Mr Holswich, from 1,100 petitioners, requesting the House to install traffic lights and U-turn facilities at the intersection of Gympie Road and Paisely Drive, Lawnton
- [3475](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2158-13) and an e-petition (2135-13), sponsored and lodged by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Orders 119(3) and (4), from 385 and 102 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to review the frequency on the Cleveland train line between Murarrie and Norman Park with the objective of increasing patronage

23 September 2013—

- [3476](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 40—Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill 2013
- [3477](#) Response from the Minister Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to an ePetition (2084-13) sponsored by Mr Trout, from 83 petitioners, requesting the House to allow a local government boundary change that will enable Kuranda District to separate from the Mareeba Shire Council

24 September 2013—

- [3478](#) Electoral Commission of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3479](#) Office of the Information Commissioner—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3480](#) Motor Accident Insurance Commission—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3481](#) QIC—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3482](#) QIC—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3483](#) QIC—Employee and Industrial Relations Plan 2012-13
- [3484](#) QIC Limited—Annual Financial Statements and Directors' Report 2012-13
- [3485](#) QIC Private Capital Pty Ltd—Annual Financial Statements and Directors' Report 2012-13
- [3486](#) QIC Properties Pty Ltd—Annual Financial Statements and Directors' Report 2012-13
- [3487](#) Queensland Competition Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3488](#) Queensland Future Growth Corporations—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3489](#) QSuper—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3490](#) Queensland Treasury and Trade Corporation—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3491](#) Queensland Treasury and Trade—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3492](#) Queensland Police Service—Annual Report 2012-13

25 September 2013—

- [3493](#) Crime and Misconduct Commission: Fraud, financial management and accountability in the Queensland public sector—An examination of how a \$16.69 million fraud was committed on Queensland Health

26 September 2013—

- [3494](#) Department of Environment and Heritage Protection—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3495](#) Department of Environment and Heritage Protection—Annual Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3496](#) Board of Trustees of Newstead House—Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3497](#) Review of the Crime and Misconduct Act and Related Matters: Report of the Independent Advisory Panel—Pages 151 to 155 of the report (Callinan and Aroney Report)
- [3498](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 29—Public Health (Exclusion of Unvaccinated Children from Child Care) Amendment Bill 2013
- [3499](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 29—Public Health (Exclusion of Unvaccinated Children from Child Care) Amendment Bill 2013: Submissions received in relation to the inquiry
- [3500](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 30—Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013
- [3501](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 30—Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013—Submission received in relation to the inquiry
- [3502](#) Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services—Annual Report 2012-13

27 September 2013—

- [3503](#) Department of Community Safety—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3504](#) Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3505](#) Surveyors Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3506](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3507](#) Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3508](#) Board of Examiners—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3509](#) Valuers Registration Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3510](#) Department of Education, Training and Employment—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3511](#) Skills Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3512](#) Non-State Schools Accreditation Board—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3513](#) Queensland Studies Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3514](#) Southbank Institute of Technology—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3515](#) Gold Coast Institute of TAFE—Annual Report 2012-13

- [3516](#) Office of the Training Ombudsman—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3517](#) Contract Cleaning Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3518](#) QLeave—Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3519](#) Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3520](#) Crime and Misconduct Commission—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3521](#) Legal Aid Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3522](#) Legal Practitioners Admissions Board—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3523](#) Queensland Ombudsman—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3524](#) Public Trustee of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3525](#) Q-Comp: Workers' Compensation Regulatory Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3526](#) Department of Premier and Cabinet—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3527](#) Department of Premier and Cabinet—Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3528](#) Public Service Commission—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3529](#) Energy and Water Ombudsman—Annual Report 2013-13
- [3530](#) Unitywater: Northern South East Queensland Distributor-Retailer Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3531](#) Gladstone Area Water Board—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3532](#) Mount Isa Water Board—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3533](#) SEQwater: Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3534](#) Queensland Urban Utilities—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3535](#) CS Energy—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3536](#) CS Energy—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3537](#) Powerlink Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3538](#) Powerlink Queensland—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3539](#) Energex Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3540](#) Energex Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3541](#) Prostitution Licensing Authority—Annual Report 2012-13

30 September 2013—

- [3542](#) Department of Energy and Water Supply—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3543](#) Board of Architects of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3544](#) Board of Professional Engineers—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3545](#) Department of Housing and Public Works—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3546](#) Building Services Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3547](#) Building and Construction Industry Payments Agency—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3548](#) Residential Tenancies Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3549](#) Stanwell Corporation Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3550](#) Stanwell Corporation Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3551](#) Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games Corporation—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3552](#) Tourism and Events Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3553](#) Department of Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3554](#) Library Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3555](#) Queensland Performing Arts Trust—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3556](#) The Board of Queensland Museum—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3557](#) Queensland Art Gallery—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3558](#) Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3559](#) National Trust of Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3560](#) Department of Natural Resources and Mines—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3561](#) Queensland Parliamentary Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3562](#) Office of the Governor—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3563](#) Queensland Law Society—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3564](#) Department of Health—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3565](#) Queensland Institute of Medical Research—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3566](#) Health Quality and Complaints Commission—Annual Report 2012-13

- [3567](#) Commission for Children and Young People—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3568](#) Department of Transport and Main Roads—Annual Report 2012-13: Volume 1 of 2
- [3569](#) Department of Transport and Main Roads—Annual Report 2012-13: Volume 2 of 2
- [3570](#) Transmax Pty Ltd—General Purpose Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3571](#) Ports North: Far North Queensland Ports Corporation Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3572](#) Ports North: Far North Queensland Ports Corporation Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3573](#) Gladstone Ports Corporation Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3574](#) Gladstone Ports Corporation Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3575](#) North Queensland Bulk Ports Corporation Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3576](#) North Queensland Bulk Ports Corporation Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3577](#) Port of Townsville Corporation Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3578](#) Port of Townsville Corporation Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3579](#) SunWater Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3580](#) SunWater Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3581](#) Parklands Gold Coast Trust—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3582](#) Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3583](#) Mt Gravatt Showground Trust—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3584](#) Department of National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3585](#) Department of National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing—Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3586](#) Stadiums Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3587](#) Gold Coast Waterways Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3588](#) Department of Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3589](#) Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3590](#) Ergon Energy Corporation Limited—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3591](#) Ergon Energy Corporation Limited—Statement of Corporate Intent 2012-13
- [3592](#) Ergon Energy Corporation Limited—Subsidiary Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3593](#) Ergon Energy Corporation Limited—Annual Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3594](#) SPARQ Solutions Pty Ltd—Annual Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3595](#) Queensland Reconstruction Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3596](#) Department of Justice and Attorney-General—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3597](#) Department of Justice and Attorney-General—Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3598](#) Anzac Day Trust—Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3599](#) South Bank Corporation—Annual Report 2012-13

1 October 2013—

- [3600](#) Response from the Minister Natural Resources and Mines (Mr Cripps) to an ePetition (2085-13) sponsored by The Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 507 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that no mining applications are granted on any part of the Steve Irwin Wildlife Reserve
- [3601](#) Response from the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines (Mr Cripps) to a paper petition (2167-13) presented by Mr Bennett, from 1,529 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
- [3602](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Regulation 2001, Education (Overseas Students) Regulation 1998, Education (Queensland Studies Authority) Regulation 2002 and the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Regulation 2000

2 October 2013—

- [3603](#) Metro North Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3604](#) Metro South Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3605](#) Cape York Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3606](#) Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13

3 October 2013—

- [3607](#) Townsville Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13

4 October 2013—

- [3608](#) Response from the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Dr McVeigh) to an ePetition (2122-13) sponsored by Hon Dickson, from 1,535 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure cats and dogs over the age of 6 months are desexed unless you are a registered breeder or registered rescue group

- [3609](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to an ePetition (2133-13) sponsored by Hon Crisafulli, from 3,701 petitioners, requesting the House to place a "Street Curfew" on all juveniles between the ages of 10 and 16 between the times of 11pm and 5am unless accompanied by an adult/parent/guardian
- [3610](#) Professional Standards Councils—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3611](#) Professional Standards Councils—Financial Statements 2012-13
- [3612](#) Mackay Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3613](#) Mackay Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13: Erratum
- [3614](#) Sunshine Coast Hospital Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3615](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 23—Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013
- [3616](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 23—Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013—Submissions received in relation to the inquiry

8 October 2013—

- [3617](#) Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3618](#) West Moreton Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3619](#) South West Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3620](#) Central West Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3621](#) North West Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13

9 October 2013—

- [3622](#) Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3623](#) Children's Health Queensland Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3624](#) Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to a paper petition (2168-13) presented by Mr Knuth, from 153 petitioners, requesting the House to not accept the Atherton State High School into the 2014 Independent Public Schools program until the true community attitude has been adequately gauged
- [3625](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 33—Local Government and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013
- [3626](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 31—Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2013
- [3627](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 31—Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2013—Submissions received in relation to the inquiry
- [3628](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 24—Education (Strengthening Discipline in State Schools) Amendment Bill 2013
- [3629](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 24—Education (Strengthening Discipline in State Schools) Amendment Bill 2013—Submissions received in relation to the inquiry

10 October 2013—

- [3630](#) Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013: Erratum to explanatory notes
- [3631](#) Darling Downs Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3632](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to an ePetition (2065-13) sponsored by Mr Byrne, from 164 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate all bus services in the Rockhampton region, especially the dedicated school services, that existed prior to the timetable changes in January 2013; reinstate proper funding for school and urban bus services; and undertake consultation with residents about changes to bus services
- [3633](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2163-13) presented by Mr Holswich, from 546 petitioners, requesting the House to install flashing school zone signs along Sparkes Road and Kensington Way Bray Park, at the start of the school zone in each direction for Bray Park State School and Holy Spirit Primary School
- [3634](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2164-13) presented by The Clerk under the provisions of 119(3), from 122 petitioners, requesting the House to reject any request by the Moreton Bay Regional Council for significant majority funding to construct "option G" of the West Petrie Bypass
- [3635](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2165-13) presented by the Clerk under the provisions of 119(3), from 2,389 petitioners, requesting the House to install traffic lights at the intersection of Drayton Street (Warrego Highway) and Owen Street, Dalby

11 October 2013—

- [3636](#) Response from the Minister Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to an ePetition (2123-13) sponsored by Ms Palaszczuk, from 483 petitioners, requesting the House to reverse the proposed decision to close and sell the historic Fortitude Valley State School and redirect focus to the rapid continued growth of the school, its surrounding community and the educational needs of inner-city children
- [3637](#) Wide Bay Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2012-13
- [3638](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2169-13) presented by Mr Gibson, from 296 petitioners, requesting the House to call upon the Department of Transport and Main Roads to provide at least one additional bus service per day from Cooloola Cove and Tin Can Bay into Gympie

[3639](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to Taiwan, 7-13 September 2013

14 October 2013—

[3640](#) Wet Tropics Management Authority—Annual Report 2012-13

[3641](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Plants) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013: Erratum to explanatory notes

[3642](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to an ePetition (2154-13) sponsored by Mr Crandon, from 137 petitioners, requesting the House to provide at least three additional train services on the Gold Coast line for each of the morning and afternoon peak periods

[3643](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 25—The assessment methods used in senior mathematics, chemistry and physics in Queensland schools

[3644](#) WorkCover Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13

[3645](#) Letter, dated 12 September 2013, from WorkCover Queensland to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Hon Bleijie) requesting an extension of time for tabling the WorkCover Queensland Annual Report

[3646](#) Letter, dated 30 September 2013, from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Hon Bleijie) to WorkCover Queensland approving an extension of time to table the WorkCover Queensland Annual Report

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Local Government Act 2009—

[3656](#) Local Government (De-amalgamation Implementation) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 177

[3657](#) Local Government (De-amalgamation Implementation) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 177, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

[3658](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 178

[3659](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 178, explanatory notes

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990—

[3660](#) Superannuation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 179

[3661](#) Superannuation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 179, explanatory notes

Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, Education (Overseas Students) Act 1996, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, Education (Queensland Studies Authority) Act 2002, Higher Education (General Provisions) Act 2008, Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000—

[3662](#) Education and Training Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 180

[3663](#) Education and Training Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 180, explanatory notes

Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

[3664](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provision, No. 181

[3665](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provision, No. 181, explanatory notes

Environmental Protection Act 1994, Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011—

[3666](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 182

[3667](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 182, explanatory notes

Forestry Act 1959, Marine Parks Act 2004, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Racing Act 2002, Recreation Areas Management Act 2006—

[3668](#) National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 183

[3669](#) National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 183, explanatory notes

Trade and Investment Queensland Act 2013—

[3670](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 184

[3671](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 184, explanatory notes

Food Act 2006, Health Act 1937, Pest Management Act 2001, Private Health Facilities Act 1999, Radiation Safety Act 1999—

[3672](#) Health Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 185

[3673](#) Health Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 185, explanatory notes

Youth Justice Act 1992—

[3674](#) Youth Justice Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 186

[3675](#) Youth Justice Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 186, explanatory notes

Criminal Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

- [3676](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 187
[3677](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 187, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

- [3678](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 188
[3679](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 188, explanatory notes

Land, Water and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

- [3680](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 189
[3681](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 189, explanatory notes

Sustainable Planning Act 2009, Water Act 2000—

- [3682](#) Water and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 190
[3683](#) Water and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 190, explanatory notes

Economic Development Act 2012—

- [3684](#) Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 191
[3685](#) Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2013, No. 191, explanatory notes

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

- [3686](#) Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 192
[3687](#) Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2013, No. 192, explanatory notes

Plant Protection Act 1989—

- [3688](#) Plant Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2013, No. 193
[3689](#) Plant Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2013, No. 193, explanatory notes

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

- [3690](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2013, No. 194
[3691](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2013, No. 194, explanatory notes

Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004—

- [3692](#) Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 195
[3693](#) Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 195, explanatory notes
[3694](#) Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 195, Regulatory Impact Statement

Professional Standards Act 2004—

- [3695](#) Professional Standards (Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia (Qld Scheme) Notice 2013, No. 196
[3696](#) Professional Standards (Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia (Qld Scheme) Notice 2013, No. 196, explanatory notes
[3697](#) Professional Standards (Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia (Qld Scheme) Notice 2013—The Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia (Qld) Scheme for No. 196

Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

- [3698](#) Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2013, No. 197
[3699](#) Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2013, No. 197, explanatory notes

Police Powers and Responsibilities (Motor Vehicle Impoundment) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

- [3700](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 198
[3701](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 198, Explanatory Notes

Food Production (Safety) Act 2000—

- [3702](#) Food Production (Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 199
[3703](#) Food Production (Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, No. 199, explanatory notes

MINISTERIAL PAPERS TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney)—

- [3704](#) Guragunbah State Planning Regulatory Provision 2013, September 2013
[3705](#) Queensland Government Gazette Notice No. 20, 27 September 2013
[3706](#) Report by the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney) pursuant to section 432 of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009, in relation to the Ministerial call in of a development application at Goodsell Road, Cape Cleveland

[3707](#) 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 349 Flaggy Road, Cooktown

[3708](#) Report by the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney) pursuant to section 432 of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009, in relation to the Ministerial call in of a development application at Currumbin Creek Road and Piggabeern Road, Currumbin Valley

Minister for Police and Community Safety (Mr Dempsey)—

[3709](#) Controlled Operations Committee—2012-13 Annual Report

[3710](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Police and Community Safety (Mr Dempsey) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Police Service Administration Regulation 1990, Police Service Administration (Review of Decisions) Regulation 1990, Police Service (Discipline) Regulations 1990, Police Service (Ranks) Regulation 1991, Prostitution Regulation 2000 and Weapons Regulation 1996

MEMBERS' PAPERS TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Mackay (Mr Mulherin)—

[3711](#) Letter, dated 12 September 2013 from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Mulherin) to the Integrity Commission (Dr Solomon)

Member for Cleveland (Dr Robinson)—

[3712](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Deputy Speaker (Dr Robinson) to Johannesburg, South Africa, 29 August 2013 to 7 September 2013

Member for Inala (Ms Palaszczuk)—

[3713](#) Letter dated 14 October 2013, from the Leader of Opposition (Ms Palaszczuk) to the Integrity Commissioner (Dr Solomon)

[3714](#) Opposition Diary—Leader of the Opposition, 1 August 2013-31 August 2013

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.35 am): Over the past 18 months my government has worked hard to ensure that our streets are safe from the scourge of criminal motorcycle gangs. We have already increased police numbers, introduced mandatory minimum sentences for gun offences and toughened up laws on murdering and assaulting police, drug trafficking and unexplained wealth. But these criminal thugs clearly have not got the message. They have continued to intimidate the public, put people in danger and, most recently, openly, brazenly and publicly challenged our police.

This government and the people of Queensland have had enough. In the past two weeks we have dramatically increased police numbers targeting these gangs. If these criminals think this was a short-term blitz, they are badly mistaken. Today we will introduce to this parliament the toughest laws against these thugs this state has ever seen. Indeed, they are amongst the toughest in the world. They are not designed to just contain or manage the gangs; they are designed to destroy them.

New antiracketeering laws and mandatory minimum sentences will see gang members put into prison, where they belong. We will also take away their ill-gotten gains: their money, their assets, their bikes, their vehicles, their guns and their drugs. We will stop them gathering in groups and going to, or wearing their colours in, certain places. They will no longer be able to promote or recruit for their gangs and we will shut them out of tattoo parlours. Commonwealth cooperation will leave criminals with nowhere to hide. We will use every available avenue to track these gangs, their activities and where the money goes.

Law-abiding motorcyclists have nothing to fear, but we do ask for their patience and cooperation with police officers who may wish to check their credentials. These laws will undergo a statutory review in three years time to make sure they remain properly focused on reaching the goals we have set. We cannot have scenes like we saw in Sydney airport four years ago, in Melbourne and on the Gold Coast recently, or in Robina last year where an innocent woman was shot while out shopping.

This effort will not be quick; nor will it be easy. But I assure Queenslanders that this government is in this for the long haul. We wish to shut down these gangs and drive them out of our state.

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.38 am): Recent incidents on the Gold Coast have highlighted the threat criminal motorcycle gangs pose to public safety. In response, this government has promised to act quickly to enact new laws aimed at removing criminal motorcycle gangs and organised crime from Queensland. We are drawing the line on criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland.

To this end I propose to introduce three bills today: the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, the Tattoo Parlours Bill and the Criminal Law (Criminal Gangs Disruption) Amendment Bill. The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill is designed to severely punish members of criminal organisations that commit serious offences. The bill is intended to deter individuals from participating in these criminal organisations, encourage persons involved in such organisations to cooperate with law enforcement to avoid severe penalties, and break the morale of members in criminal motorcycle gangs.

The new punishment regime will apply to people who participate in the affairs of criminal organisations and commit offences or for the purpose of participating in the affairs of the organisation. Such offenders will be vicious lawless associates and subject to extra punishment beyond that which would apply for the commission of the declared offence. A vicious lawless associate will be sentenced for the declared offence but will also receive a further 15 years mandatory imprisonment cumulative to any imprisonment imposed for the declared offence and a further 10 years cumulative imprisonment if they are also an office bearer. The bill makes clear that extra punishment is mandatory and cannot be reduced by the sentencing court. Further, parole does not apply to the extra punishment unless the associate cooperates with the law enforcement authorities.

Secondly, the Tattoo Parlours Bill introduces a licensing regime for body art tattoo parlours and tattooists. The first phase of this legislation will ban members of criminal organisations from owning, operating or working in body art tattoo parlours. The Tattoo Parlours Bill provides for the Commissioner of Police to conduct investigations into licensed applicants and licensees and their associates to ensure that only fit and proper persons are granted and able to hold licences and that granting a licence would not be contrary to the public interest. Unlicensed trading will result in penalties of up to 18 months imprisonment. The bill will also amend legislation to prohibit members from criminal motorcycle gangs from wearing colours inside licensed premises and within areas prescribed by regulation. Phase 2 will include other acts which will be amended so that licences are refused to individuals who Queensland police advise are members of criminal motorcycle gangs.

The Criminal Law (Criminal Gangs Disruption) Amendment Bill will amend the Criminal Code through the insertion of new offences and circumstances of aggravation for existing offences that target the members of criminal organisations. An additional limb will be added to the Criminal Code definition to include criminal organisations that are prescribed by regulation.

The bill will create three new offences aimed at preventing members of criminal motorcycle groups from gathering in groups or at prescribed locations and promoting or recruiting for their organisation. The current maximum penalty for affray will be increased from one year to seven years where the offence is committed by a member of a criminal motorcycle gang. These offences will be punishable by a mandatory six-month imprisonment and any vehicle used before, during or after the commission of the offence will be confiscated and crushed.

Criminal motorcycle gang members will face a mandatory one-year imprisonment for serious assaults on police and their driver's licence will be disqualified for a mandatory period of three months upon conviction for a criminal motorcycle gang offence. The Bail Act will be amended so that there is a presumption against bail for criminal motorcycle gang members and they will be forced to surrender their passport if in the unlikely chance they get bail. The bill will double the penalty for criminal motorcycle gang members who evade police and will provide for mandatory confiscation and crushing of the vehicle used in the offence.

The bill will also give additional powers to the CMC. It will expand its powers to allow for intelligence gathering and emergent hearings in relation to criminal motorcycle gangs; allow for the use of any information gained in CMC hearings for unexplained wealth prosecutions; clarify that fear or retribution is no longer a reasonable excuse for refusing to give evidence to the CMC if you are a member of a criminal motorcycle gang; mandate imprisonment for a first contempt offence, 2½ years for a second and five years for a third offence; and allow the QPS to detain individuals pending contempt charges. A review of the provisions of all three bills will occur after three years.

The members of criminal motorcycle gangs are cowardly bullies who get together for mutual support to carry out crimes for personal satisfaction. The members are deliberately cruel, violent and dangerous. This legislation will ensure that it is no longer beneficial to be part of a criminal motorcycle gang or other organised crime group. Any group that persists should be prepared to feel the full weight of the law brought down upon them from today.

Government Administrative Precinct, Redevelopment

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.43 am): Our government has consulted widely on the redevelopment of the government precinct bounded by George Street, Alice Street and William Street. Significant input has been received from the Brisbane City Council, from industry development groups, from community based groups and from individual Queenslanders. Our government believes that the development of this precinct provides a once in a generation opportunity for a significant section of Brisbane's CBD to be redeveloped in a way that gives the city and the state a landmark, world-class and world recognised development that puts us on the world stage as an international tourist destination.

The project definition stage is now completed and, after the public consultation and market soundings, our government has decided to proceed with a whole-of-site integrated development which will include entertainment facilities, international hotels and new and unique public spaces. The redevelopment will protect the existing heritage buildings spread across the site while providing first-class facilities that our capital city needs and deserves.

Integrated resort developments are a product of a maturing globalised market that has adapted beyond traditional gambling and gaming activities in order to appeal to as broad a demographic as possible by incorporating significant auxiliary activities and tourism infrastructure, along with gaming opportunities. By the end of the year we will have initiated an expressions of interest process for the redevelopment, with the expressions of interest to close around the end of the first quarter of next year. This should enable the government to move to a request for detailed proposals by mid-2014 and to ensure the successful developer is in place and ready to commence work on the wider precinct revitalisation once the William Street tower, which is now well underway, is completed in 2016. On that time frame, the wider redevelopment should be reaching completion and ready to open its doors to the various facilities late in the decade—around 2019.

The William Street tower and the wider redevelopment to follow will provide a significant boost to two pillars of our economy—to construction and to tourism. There will be more and more construction jobs on this major project as it occurs for years to come and, once completed, there will be new jobs in retail, hospitality and other tourism based activities. The flow-on benefits to the Queensland economy as a whole will be considerable. The integrated development that we foresee is part of a new generation of tourism product on offer around the world, and Queensland cannot be left behind. We must compete. These integrated developments, which include casinos, have proven their ability to boost the tourism sector in other parts of the world. We expect that not only will there be considerable Australian interest in creating this new development in Brisbane but that international operators could also be expected to show interest. It is not often that a sizeable portion of a major city's central business district is available as one parcel for a whole-of-site redevelopment. Our government is working in a determined fashion to revitalise our state and to revitalise our economy. The redevelopment of the government precinct will provide considerable investment that is needed to create the jobs and provide a bright future for Queenslanders.

Oral Health Services, Waiting Lists

 **Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (9.46 am): I am pleased to advise the House of the Newman government's progress to date in addressing lengthy dental waiting lists across Queensland. On 27 February this year the Newman government signed the national partnership agreement on treating more dental patients, despite concerns that tight time frames and high targets would make results difficult to achieve. After an initial \$13.5 million was contributed by the federal government, Queensland committed an additional \$39 million this financial year to ensure continued funding to support the agreement. When our blitz on this intractable problem began just six months ago, there were 112,000 people waiting for a check-up on public dental waiting lists across Queensland. Some 62,000 had been waiting for longer than two years. By the end of last month, the number of people waiting for a check-up was less than 60,000, with about 14,000 waiting for longer than two years.

There is still a way to go to reduce waiting times and the number of people waiting to an acceptable level, but we are on track for further reductions. Given the optimistic goals established under the agreement, it was necessary to quickly ramp up services to provide treatment for public dental patients. Hospital and health services used their funding to meet the demand through private dental practices, and that is why those opposite would never have achieved it. Since February, more than 57,000 people received vouchers for private treatment. Of these, 24,000 required a simple check-up and 31,000 required urgent care. Some 15,000 dentures were also supplied. So far, 83 per cent of voucher recipients have completed their treatment to the value of about \$20 million. Since February, 17 per cent of publicly funded dental treatment has been delivered in partnership with the private sector compared to less than two per cent in recent years. This excellent work has delivered for our dental patients, no matter where they live. In the Cairns region a waiting list of more than 8,000 has been reduced to 5,128 and in Cape York we are down from 61 to just 11.

In Central Queensland, from more than 8,600 we are down to just over 6,000 and on the Gold Coast a waitlist of 9,244 is now just 3,174. In Metro North, a total of more than 20,000 has become 6,692 and in Metro South, 19,000 is now 9,233. On the Sunshine Coast, 8,800 is now 4,668 and in Townsville, from 4,500 there are fewer than 2,400 now waiting.

I will publish the full details, but I can close by reporting that in West Moreton a dental waiting list of 5,500 is now just 766. I congratulate all involved in this program and look forward to the results that lie ahead. This is a real example of the proof of benefits to patients from engaging with the private sector and real outsourcing.

National Disability Insurance Scheme

 **Hon. TE DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (9.50 am): I am pleased to inform the House that Queensland has commenced the first phase of the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. Since signing the heads of agreement on 8 May this year to roll out the NDIS in Queensland, we have already made significant progress. I have spoken many times in this House about the terrific opportunities that the NDIS will bring to approximately 97,000 Queenslanders with a disability, their families and carers who will for the first time have choice and control over the support they receive and who provides it.

I have also spoken in this House and in the media about the opportunities for Queenslanders wishing to work in the disability sector. It is estimated that the NDIS will create an additional 13,000 jobs in Queensland. I know my colleague Minister Langbroek has prioritised certificate III training in disability so that we have the staff to provide services for the NDIS.

The NDIS will be rolled out in Queensland from July 2016 and we have begun the first phase of this transition. As outlined in the heads of agreement, which has bipartisan support, the Queensland government will no longer provide specialist disability services or basic community care services to those people whose needs are intended to be met by the NDIS. As part of the first phase of the move towards an NDIS, Queensland will transition government-run accommodation support and respite services to the non-government sector. As both the Premier and I have outlined on several occasions, the non-government sector already successfully delivers 90 per cent of Queensland's disability accommodation and respite services. Those organisations currently support clients with a range of disabilities, including people with multiple disabilities and complex needs. Importantly, the non-government sector has experience in tailoring support to the needs, requirements and preferences of an individual.

This government will undertake the transition of ASRS to the non-government sector in a carefully managed way with our No. 1 priority being to ensure that clients continue to receive the level of support they need. The transition of ASRS services to the non-government sector will mean that when the NDIS commences people will be best placed, because they will already be receiving services from a non-government provider and, most importantly, they will be supported by services similar to those that will be available under a NDIS. Of course, in the meantime the current service arrangements will not change until the transition occurs.

As well as the reforms that I have outlined already, one of the next challenges to be addressed will be around unstitching block funding of disability accommodation delivered by the non-government sector. Discussions with the sector as part of the first phase of the NDIS transition will assist in the block funding challenge as we prepare Queenslanders with a disability to have choice, control and individualised funding packages. This is a great state with great opportunity and I look forward to continuing to update the House about future progress as we move towards an NDIS.

Rural Firefighters

 **Hon. JM DEMPSEY** (Bundaberg—LNP) (Minister for Police and Community Safety) (9.53 am): It gives me great pleasure to tell the House today about the important work undertaken by volunteer rural firefighters across this great state. Across the state we have more than 35,000 rural firefighter volunteers who are an incredible resource not only to their community but to the entire state. Every summer these volunteer firefighters face some of the most trying conditions, including heat and wind, to spend days battling bushfires in regions across the state. Volunteer rural firefighters battle these atrocious conditions not for a pay cheque but just to help out, often risking their own lives to help protect the property of a complete stranger.

The more than 35,000-strong yellow army are not after the limelight, instead they prefer to go about doing their incredible work in silence. That is why I did not hesitate to support the very first Yellow Ribbon Day, which was instigated by the Rural Fire Brigades Association of Queensland. Throughout Yellow Ribbon Day, all Queenslanders are asked to wear a yellow ribbon to show support and to create awareness of the vital work done by rural fire brigades across the state.

Over the past few days we have seen some fine examples of the work done by our rural firefighters who have fought bushfires across the state. Over the weekend, we had about 20 crews from the Gin Gin region fighting a blaze at Horse Camp. On Monday at Bauple, between Maryborough and Gympie, 16 crews worked together to battle a grassfire. In both of those instances, the crews managed to work together to contain the blaze, ensuring that no lives or homes were put at risk. That is just a taste of some of the work that rural firefighters are regularly called out to do.

This government is committed to supporting the Rural Fire Service, with more than \$35 million allocated for its operations in the 2013-14 budget. Of that amount, \$6.5 million will enable the purchase of 40 rural fire appliances to replace 10 light and 30 medium attack fire appliances. There are also 1,438 brigades, including 419 brigades with fire stations and, as at 27 September 2013, there are 986 vehicles and 2,957 slip-on units. I thank all members here today for joining with the government in showing support for our volunteer rural firefighters and the important work that they do. I would also encourage and urge all members to take the time to thank these incredible volunteer rural firefighters, who give their time to protect Queensland communities.

Queensland Plan

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (9.56 am): There is a post-it note stuck on the wall of my electorate office that reads—

Reduce the 'headmaster' approach of government and give people ownership and responsibility of their community.

This simple note is one of the many responses that I have received about the Queensland Plan from people in my local area and it goes to the heart of what the plan is all about. It is about giving people a say in the future of our state, encouraging everyone to take ownership of the plan and delivering a vision together over the next 30 years. We are writing history at the moment and I am excited to be a part of it.

Last week, leaders from across the state sat with delegates, both young and old, as they entered into the spirit of producing enduring outcomes based on the 78,251 responses that were collected since that first summit in Mackay in May. That is right: 78,251 voluntary responses from Queenslanders the length and breadth of the state. This was an unprecedented engagement process. Queenslanders have come out in droves to support the Queensland Plan and add their voice to planning for our state's future.

Let us look at what we have seen to date: 78,251 Queenslanders who spoke up from May through to August about their hopes, dreams and aspirations for our future; advertising and media messaging reached at least 90 per cent of the population and online there were 42 million impressions, reaching more than 11 million unique browsers. Last week more than 600 Queenslanders volunteered their time over two days in Brisbane to take apart and reassemble the analysis of this feedback. Over the past few days there has been countless commentary in the media, including from the *Courier-Mail's* Steven Wardill, who said that the Queensland Plan has.

... involved people in the process, making them part of it ... it has honed their attention on long-range issues that have statewide ramifications rather than individual and isolated problems within areas.

The *Townsville Bulletin* reported—

The highlight for me so far has been to learn that a majority of Queenslanders want to achieve regionalisation, a surprising result given 70 per cent of respondents were from the South East corner.

Graham Engeman from the Gympie region said—

There is a huge need to plan ahead and perhaps we will avoid some of the fiascos of the past. It is a great step forward.

Ipswich State High School student Belle Fisher said—

I'm very excited for Ipswich and how our school and community will benefit from the 30 year vision.

In opening the Brisbane summit the Premier said—

One person can make a difference but collectively we can make history.

We are writing history at the moment. I would like to thank every member of parliament who participated and who will continue to contribute to the Queensland Plan, ensuring that this is a great state with great opportunity.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.00 am): I wish to advise the House that the Treasurer and Minister for Trade will be absent from the House today. Minister Nicholls is opening the Kestrel mine extension near Emerald. This extension will add 20 years to the life of the mine and as such is very important for the Queensland economy.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Workers' Rights

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (10.00 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House recognises the fundamental rights of workers, including a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, job security and safe working conditions, and condemns the LNP government for its sustained attack on Queensland workers that has resulted in a massive erosion of rights and conditions during the past 18 months.

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (10.00 am): I give notice that I will move—

That the Community Safety Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2013, Subordinate Legislation No. 110 of 2013, tabled in the House on 6 August 2013, be disallowed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.00 am): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that on 24 April 2012, in response to calls for banning outlaw motorcycle gang colours, he said, 'The team that I lead believe that you shouldn't be sort of penalised for wearing your footy team uniform or jersey.'

Mr NEWMAN: What an opposition we have in this state. They are massively resourced—22 staff when I last checked—and they cannot even keep track of what I have actually said in any press conference. I have acknowledged that I have made these comments, but what I say today is I have also explained why we need to move and move hard against these criminal gangs. The criminal gangs on the Gold Coast and elsewhere in this state, indeed in this nation, are people that we need to deal with and we will deal with. The Labor Party might want to explain to people how it was that they flourished. I know the Leader of the House has, in speech after speech after speech that he has made in this place in the last few years, warned of the dangers of these gangs and the government is now taking strong and decisive action to deal with them.

I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition would ask such a question when she should be hanging her head in shame for being part of a government that would not allow phone intercepts for many years. That is right. Year after year the CMC and the police in this state tried to get the right to undertake phone intercepts in this state. Other interstate and federal law enforcement agencies were able to listen to these gangs but the sad truth of the matter is that the Labor Party would not let the Queensland Police Service listen in to these criminals as they built their criminal empires. We are dealing with it today. We will see whether the Labor Party have the stomach and, indeed, the ticker

for this. It has been quite fascinating to see the various comments from the Leader of the Opposition. One minute we are not doing enough and we need to do more. Next we need to hold hands and talk about it. The next thing somehow Queensland is turning into a police state. I wonder what those opposite will do today. This mob are all over the shop. They haven't got a clue. Can you imagine the member for South Brisbane? She will be there in the background saying, 'No, we can't support this.' Other more right wing members of the Labor Party will be saying, 'Well, we have to. We have no choice.' Then we will be challenging the things that the Leader of the Opposition said.

Today we will make the necessary changes to crush these gangs. As I said in my ministerial statement, our objective is to destroy these gangs, to eradicate them from Queensland and to make sure that they are behind bars or in some other part of the world.

Criminal Organisation Act

Ms PALASZCZUK: My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General confirm that on 12 April 2012 he indicated his intention to wind back the Criminal Organisation Act that was introduced by Labor to counter organised crime and disrupt outlaw motorcycle gangs?

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Before I call the Attorney-General, I started to hear interjections towards the end of that question. I cannot identify who was interjecting, but I am warning members we will hear the question in silence. I call the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice.

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. On any given day I welcome questions from the opposition but today in particular because they are essentially government questions. Maybe we do not have any need for the ones that we have prepared because we have the amigos opposite asking us the questions. The opposition leader raises a very good point about the Criminal Organisation Act. This really contrasts how we deal with criminal gangs and how the Labor Party deals with criminal gangs and law and order in Queensland. We know that the Labor Party are opposed to all forms of mandatory sentencing. We have countless articles after countless speeches they have made in this place. The test will come this afternoon when they have the ability to support these tough reforms; whether they back it up, whether they back Queenslanders on these reforms.

But let us talk about the Criminal Organisation Act 2009 that they say is the panacea for disrupting gangs in Queensland. How many gangs in Queensland have been declared a criminal organisation?

Mr Stevens: Zero!

Mr BLEIJIE: Zero! When was the legislation introduced? 2009. No gangs in Queensland have been declared a criminal organisation. It is okay for those opposite to introduce legislation, but if it is not effective, if it does not do anything, then what is the point? What is the point of the legislation if you cannot use it and you do not do anything with it? The reason they cannot do anything with it, which I suspect they knew at the time, is that this is how it operates: in order to have a criminal gang declared a criminal organisation first the Police Commissioner has to go to the Supreme Court and convince the Supreme Court they can use criminal intelligence; once they have done that then the Police Commissioner has to make an application to the Supreme Court to have the organisation a declared organisation; not only that, after achieving that—because that is not really effective—then the Police Commissioner has to go back to the Supreme Court and say, 'Well, now they are a criminal organisation can we have some control orders'—that is, association control orders or whatever other control orders the Supreme Court sees fit. Not only that, there are no penalties unless they breach the control orders. So there is no attack, there is no punishment for criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland. That is the Labor way. That is why we were concerned all along with these laws. We knew that they would never be used. We have had one application in the Supreme Court in three to four years for a motorcycle gang to be declared a criminal motorcycle gang.

I contrast this with the way we are going to deal with these thugs and criminals and vicious lawless associates in Queensland: our laws will have an immediate impact. We will not be sitting here in four years debating laws that have had no impact. If we have people whingeing and bleating that these laws are too tough, that is a sign of the success of these laws because it means they are working. They can write all they want on their laws, the fact is they have never been used, no gang has been declared a criminal organisation and they are a failure—as is the Labor Party.

Queensland Plan

Mr SYMES: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the House on how the Queensland Plan will be brought to life following the highly successful Brisbane summit last week?

Mr NEWMAN: Last week the Brisbane summit brought together more than 600 Queenslanders from every background and location to shape our common goals in response to future challenges and opportunities. There were many highlights over the two days. I thought, for example, the panel discussion was fantastic, with Wesley Enoch from the Queensland Theatre Company; Professor Ian Fraser from the Translational Research Institute; Geoff Garrett, the Queensland Chief Scientist; Kathy MacDermott from the Property Council; and Jim Minifie from the Grattan Institute. I thought their inspiring commentary gave many delegates food for thought. That is what it was all about. I really thank those panel members for their participation.

A second highlight for me was the vision of delegates boldly and proudly presenting their case to their fellow Queenslanders about what they thought the priorities should be. I have always said that creating a 30-year vision for this state would not be an easy task. Over two days delegates took apart and reassembled the analysis and the feedback from 78,251 Queenslanders. We certainly do believe that this is the largest ever voluntary response to an engagement process in Queensland. It has been a very challenging task. The delegates were asked to be courageous in outlining what they thought was important. We are seeing a clear consensus emerge, which is terrific.

These are the things that I have taken particularly out of last week: firstly, the need to grow and strengthen our regions. We are going to be bold about this, reflecting what people said to us at the summit. Strengthening Queensland's economic direction: that came through loud and clear. Again, it is reassuring that Queenslanders understand that if you do not have a strong economy there is so much that you cannot do for all members of the community. Also fostering community health and wellbeing, balancing economic prosperity and the natural environment, community cohesion and—the big one that just kept coming up in everything—our need to focus on education, particularly fit-for-purpose education. Fit-for-purpose governance also came through, and the need for targeted infrastructure solutions and targeted people solutions.

I am really pleased with what happened. We have a series of goals, outcomes and priorities that will shape the structure of the draft Queensland Plan. As I said at the summit, by the end of November we will have created a working draft. Nothing is going to be lost. There are piles of paper and mounds of information from the summit that will be drawn together to create the draft that will go out for a further level of consultation. In the new year we will finally hand down the Queensland Plan itself. We will bring it into this parliament and formally adopt it. I thank all concerned for their efforts.

(Time expired)

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

Mr MULHERIN: My question is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. Will the police minister advise when he first became aware of escalating bikie crime on the Gold Coast? What immediate action did he take?

Mr DEMPSEY: That is a great question, because even prior to getting into politics—indeed, for me one of the motivating factors for getting into politics—I wanted to make sure that community expectations were met in relation to catching offenders. From my 20 years in the Police Service I could see what the Labor government had done to entrench criminal gangs in the Queensland community in terms of the rise in drug labs and the rise in the vicious violence that those particular perpetrators engage in.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr DEMPSEY: They do not want to listen, Madam Speaker. What did this government do when we first came to office? We made a commitment to provide 1,100 new police officers. The opposition did not want to go in that direction. They fought against a police helicopter for the Gold Coast. It is to the credit of the council of the day that it put money towards that and we made a commitment to providing two police helicopters. Another police helicopter will be facilitated in the coming 12 months.

We changed the laws in relation to firearm offences. We now have the toughest firearm offence laws in Australia. We made sure that we can protect our police officers by taking the penalty for a serious assault on a police officer from seven years to 14 years. That was not supported by the shadow minister for police, who spoke against it. He spoke against increasing penalties in relation to drug offences and he spoke against increased penalties in relation to sex offenders. One has to wonder at the mindset of the Queensland Labor Party and its soft stance on crime, not just now but also in the previous 20 years, which allowed criminal gangs to become entrenched in Queensland.

We are not going to just talk about it; we are going to act and we started when we first came to government. To start with, we put 137 police officers in the Gold Coast region. We saw that, obviously, we had to catch up on the past 20 years. Now we have in place a state-wide task force, Task Force Maxima, as well as Task Force Takeback. We have appointed Brett Pointing as the leader. He will hand pick a team to ensure that community expectations are met in relation to criminal organisations and those thugs who know that for 20 years Labor turned its back and looked to the side in the hope that this would disappear. Now we have in place a government that is actually going to send those criminal gangs outside Queensland. We are working with our federal counterparts and our interstate counterparts to send the message that they are not wanted in this state or in this nation.

Casinos, Licences

Mr KING: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. Can the Deputy Premier inform the House what impact yesterday's announcement regarding casino licences will have on projects proposed in North Queensland?

Mr SEENEY: I thank the member for Cairns for the question because it is a very important issue, not just for North Queensland but also for the Queensland economy generally. I begin by saying that I would have thought that today the opposition might well have asked me a question about this. This issue was a major announcement yesterday. It was covered in every media outlet in the state, up and down the coast. Yet this morning opposition members come in here and continue to ask my colleagues Dorothy Dixers, rather than ask questions about an issue that has major significance for Queensland's future.

I say to the member for Cairns that while this has major significance for Queensland's future, that is no more so than for North Queensland's future. Since coming to government a range of proponents has come to us as a government suggesting major projects that they believe can be competitive on the world tourism market. There has been a range of them. I will not mention any one in particular, but I know of one that is particularly close to the people of Cairns and the member for Cairns. There is a range of such projects that proponents have said to us are the emerging product in the world tourism market.

Integrated casino resort developments provide a range of entertainment experiences and a range of accommodation experiences, and are collocated with some of the world's greatest natural tourism attractions. That is what is attracting investors in the tourism industry and the attention of people looking for that sort of tourism experience. I would suggest to honourable members that nowhere in the world is better placed to take advantage of that emerging tourism market than North Queensland. The natural attractions in North Queensland—the Great Barrier Reef, the rainforest, the climate and all the things that have attracted people to North Queensland for many years—remain a major part of the attraction. If they can be complemented with an integrated casino-resort type development, such as has been so successful in other parts of the world, North Queensland can become one of the great tourist destinations of the world.

That is what our government is about and it is why we made the announcement that we made yesterday. The three licences are not stand-alone casino licences. They would not permit the building of the type of casinos that we have in Queensland now. They will enable the construction of integrated resort casinos; megadevelopments that can compete in the world market. One has been reserved for William Street. I would dearly like to see another one in North Queensland.

(Time expired)

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

Mr PITT: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police. I note that the only application that has been made so far under the Criminal Organisation Act commenced under the previous Labor government. Now that the Newman government has been in power for more than 18 months, will the minister explain why the LNP has failed to make any further applications to have outlaw motorcycle gangs declared as criminal organisations?

Mr DEMPSEY: We have seen other Labor governments, such as that of South Australia at the time, have their laws taken to and smashed in the courts. This government is about making sure we get it right. This government will ensure that it will do whatever it takes with the available legislation. When we came to government, even though the previous Labor government left us insufficient and less superior legislation, we committed to using the available resources and the legislation that we had to hand. A matter is still before the courts at the present time so I will not go into the exact detail of that, other than to say that we will use whatever it takes to make sure that criminal gangs know that they have no place in Queensland. We will ensure that we will use the full extent of the legislation that we have to hand.

The Attorney-General will present three pieces of legislation to this House so we will have the strongest laws in the whole world, let alone in Australia. It will send a clear message to these gangs that they have nowhere to hide and no rabbit holes to run down. There will be no changing their colours or their uniforms. They are criminal gangs and thugs. Their days of intimidation on the streets of Queensland will no longer be accepted.

We said at the beginning that we would obviously give them the opportunity to change, but they did not. We put police resources and police officers in place. We changed the legislation. What happened at the Robina shopping centre was a disgrace so we brought in the toughest firearm laws in Australia. We also ensured that the police had the resources they needed. Only last week we indicated that an extra \$20 million will go to the eradication of criminal organised gangs and thugs in Queensland.

What did those in the Labor Party do? They turned their faces to the side and thought this would disappear. We saw their inaction such as sitting on their hands for 10 years in terms of telephone interception and the government wireless network. This government has put forward nearly half a billion dollars for the network so that police can talk in a secure environment. The Labor Party turn their heads to the side. The emergency services will actually be able to talk to each other in the future. We have introduced more mobile data capability in the last 12 months than the previous government did in 20 years.

It is not just about throwing money at the Police Service; it is about making the service efficient and meeting modern standards in relation to communications and ICT and having borderless policing initiatives to make sure we are where the crime is happening and we are stopping the crime. This is proactive policing and not reactive policing. We are not sticking our heads in the sand as those in the Labor Party did over the last 20 years. That is why they lost the last election by such a margin.

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

Mr MOLHOEK: My question without notice is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. Will the Attorney-General advise the House what tough new measures the Newman government will implement to tackle the issue of criminal motorcycle gangs and advise whether he is aware of any alternative approaches to dealing with this criminal scourge?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Southport for the question. This is the type of question we would expect from a government member, but I think he conspired with the opposition because we are getting similar questions from them about these great law reforms that the Newman government is introducing.

I can answer the member for Southport's question, particularly with respect to any alternatives available. When we look at the alternatives available, of course we look to none other than the opposition. Before I get to that, may I remind members what this is all about. This is about ridding the state of Queensland of criminal motorcycle gangs. We do not want them in Queensland. If they choose to stay in Queensland they will be in jail.

We have announced today that we are going to be setting up a major, ultrasecurity facility at Woodford where we anticipate criminal motorcycle gang members will be housed. Not only will they be housed there; they will also have restricted hours out of their cells each day. They will have increased drug testing. They will have frequent proactive cell searches. They will have only one hour non-contact visits with family members per week. There will be no TVs. No exceptions—there will be no TVs in these cells. There will be no access to gymnasium facilities. All phone calls, other than to legal representatives, will be monitored by intelligence staff. Mail will be opened, searched and censored.

If we look at the opposition—and the Premier said earlier today that they are all over the place with this—we see that their ideology about mandatory sentences is really getting in the way of their ability to entertain this debate. Let us look at what the opposition said. The opposition leader said

yesterday that not only does she want to see the legislation, 'She demands that it goes through the committee process.' The opposition leader is whingeing that nothing is happening soon enough, but then says that it should all be held up in the committee process so that the laws are not in place. The opposition leader is not on the side of Queenslanders. She has to tell people which side she is on. Is she on the side of the criminal motorcycle gangs or on the side of Queenslanders? We are on the side of Queenslanders.

The opposition made two announcements recently indicating that they are going to deal with bikies. They are going to have a summit at the Gold Coast. They are going to have a talkfest. So they do not want new laws. They do not want tough laws. They want to get people together to talk about it. The time for talking is over. The time for legislative reform is upon us now. That is what we are doing.

The opposition leader said in the *Brisbane Times* some time ago in relation to our perceived attacks on the CMC, 'They should leave the CMC alone.' Not only are they going to have a talkfest; the opposition leader has come up with a great proposal to split the CMC. The Labor Party merged the CJC and the Crime Commission to create the CMC. Now their next panacea for this is to split the CMC and not give it additional resources like we have. They have no idea. They have to make a stand. Are they on the side of the criminal motorcycle gangs or Queenslanders? We choose Queenslanders.

(Time expired)

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

Mr BYRNE: My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General guarantee that no members or associates of outlaw motorcycle gangs have been hired as deputy bailiffs and are now collecting debts on behalf of the state government?

Mr BLEIJIE: If the member for Rockhampton has information with respect to any illegal activity, then I remind him that it is actually an offence under the Criminal Code to withhold that information and that intelligence. If the member for Rockhampton has information with respect to deputy bailiffs or any accusation or allegation, then I would suggest he run out of parliament and get on the phone to the police—000 if it is an emergency—and make that allegation and put the report in. It is basically put up or shut up. If there are allegations out there and if there is someone he knows of in terms of the allegation he has made this morning, then he should get onto the authorities.

We will find anyone conducting criminal activities in Queensland or members of criminal motorcycle gangs under our new legislation. They will be held accountable just like other criminal motorcycle gang members. We are unapologetic with respect to our determination and our resolve to rid Queensland of criminal motorcycle gangs, its members and its associates. Again, if the member has allegations he ought to put them to the appropriate authorities.

In the meantime can I also talk about another government initiative in respect of criminal motorcycle gang members? I refer to the reward system through Crime Stoppers. We want Queenslanders to come forward with information. Perhaps the member for Rockhampton should make a call to Crime Stoppers. He might make \$1,000 in reward payment if has information about criminal motorcycle gang members. If the member for the Rockhampton has information that leads to a successful prosecution he might get \$20,000. We are all part of the solution. We are calling on all Queenslanders to join with the government. If Queenslanders have any information about criminal motorcycle gangs and their operations in Queensland, they should phone Crime Stoppers once it is set up in the next couple of weeks. We are making up to \$5 million available to track them down wherever these people are.

We know that criminal motorcycle gang members are in hiding. We know that they have been told not to wear their patches or colours in public. But the minute we find out and the minute they come out from their burrows the police will be there. That is why it is important that we resource the police sufficiently—up to \$20 million as announced—and we give the CMC resources and unprecedented powers—up to \$7 million. We have a very good working relationship with Dr Ken Levy from the CMC with respect to making sure the CMC, the police and all law enforcement agencies can track down criminal motorcycle gang members and make sure they go to court and if convicted they go to jail. Of course we have also announced that criminal motorcycle gang members should be in jail and not get bail. That is what Queenslanders are calling for. Queenslanders are sick and tired of seeing these people walk the streets and sick of the threats and intimidation. We will stop it.

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

Mr HART: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. Minister, would you provide the House with an update on the LNP government's crackdown to eliminate criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland?

Mr DEMPSEY: It is great to get a question from the member for Burleigh. He obviously works hard to ensure that his community is kept safe. He is in constant communication with me and my office about other ways we can enhance safety within his community. I thank him for that representation.

In relation to the question, criminal gangs and thugs and their violent behaviour have no place in Queensland. The LNP government has acted quickly to crack down on these criminals and their activities. The Queensland Police Service has ramped up measures to eliminate these gangs from Queensland, and it will have whatever resources needed to complete this task. We have committed \$20 million to the QPS and up to \$5 million to Crime Stoppers for information. We recently welcomed Deputy Commissioner Brett Pointing as Queensland's No. 1 gang buster as head of Operation Resolve. He will also lead a group of hand-picked experienced officers to oversee two task forces—Task Force Takeback and Task Force Maxima—to rid the state of these thugs.

We welcome the federal justice minister's announcement of Australian Crime Commission officers to be permanently based on the Gold Coast. What did the former federal Labor government do? They took them away. And we also welcome the announcement of the AFP anticrime task force to work with Queensland police. Last week I wrote to the federal immigration minister to request legislative changes to ensure the immediate deportation of any non-Australian criminal gang member found guilty of an indictable offence. This will ensure that these thugs are out of Queensland and, as I said previously, out of this country.

The Newman government is also bolstering the CMC's coercive powers with a \$7 million funding boost. Finally, as the Attorney-General has just said, in the coming days this week he will be introducing tough new laws to tackle these criminal gangs. These laws will restrict their movement and operation and ensure that the community is protected by preventing these groups from operating their criminal enterprises.

Since I have announced this state-wide crackdown we have seen 109 criminal gang members arrested on 197 charges. Police have executed search warrants, conducted 1,761 street checks and issued 43 traffic infringement notices to criminal gang members. Crime Stoppers is fielding more than 708 calls a week solely in relation to criminal gang members. These are real results and they will continue as police saturate the streets to ensure they are safe for Queenslanders and visitors.

Never before have we seen such a crackdown on violent criminals throughout Queensland. The former colleagues of those opposite sat on their hands for more than 20 years and let these criminals entrench themselves in our society. Our message to criminal gangs is clear: the full force of the law will rain down upon you until you are off our streets and out of Queensland.

Gaming Machines, Licences

Dr DOUGLAS: My question is to the Premier. As Queensland casinos are exempt from the poker machine cap, how many new poker machine licences is the government planning to issue with each of the three new casino licences announced?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the question, and I say to him that clearly he has completely, totally and utterly missed the point, but that is hardly surprising because when it comes to criminal motorcycle gangs he has been all over the shop as well recently. One minute he is calling for action saying not enough is being done and then suddenly he is talking about civil liberties and that now it is all too tough. In relation to the details of poker machines licences, they will be sorted out down the track. There has been no decision made there.

Mr Pitt: Don't you worry about that.

Mr NEWMAN: Let us be very clear about what we are trying to achieve here. I take the interjection from the member for Mulgrave, who already has been very negative about this. The people of Cairns and surrounding regions will listen with horror to the member for Mulgrave, who clearly does not get it. He is anti jobs. He is anti investment. He has no vision. In fact his comments

about the Queensland Plan in the last three or four days have been totally disgraceful. It shows that he is down in the forest. He is right down in the forest amongst the blackberries and the lantana, because he does not get it. He cannot see the big picture, which is why I confidently predict he will be sitting over there for a long time to come.

Let me talk about what we are trying to achieve. If you look at the competition for tourism destinations across the globe—and we are in a global competition—you will see five- and six-star resorts and hotels that blow away anything that is in Queensland today. We are not in the game. So what we are saying here is that there will be opportunities for new integrated resource developments to have within them casino components.

I am not surprised to get a question like this from the member for Gaven because he has no vision and he has no idea about what it takes to create jobs. He has lived his whole life in this funny sort of cocoon, this little bubble—‘Alex world’ we could call it—and he clearly cannot see that we need to get this state going.

Mr Wellington: Answer the question.

Mr NEWMAN: I am hearing interjections. I have answered the question. The point is that we are going to take tourism in this state forward. We are going to get more visitors here. We are going to double overnight stays, as we promised during the election campaign. While people like the member for Gaven flip and flop and abandon the team and the electorate they made commitments to, the rest of us in this team are true to our promise and we will be true to creating jobs and getting investment in Queensland. The announcement made by me and the Deputy Premier after cabinet yesterday is a key part to revolutionising tourism in Queensland over the next 30 years.

Gold Coast, Tourism

Mr CRANDON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games. Can the minister please inform the House how the Newman government is supporting tourism on the Gold Coast?

Mrs STUCKEY: It is a delight to be able to inform the House how this government is further supporting tourism. My question today refers to the Gold Coast, and what a strong advocate we have in the member for Coomera, who understands too well the importance of tourism. After all, Coomera is home to many small businesses that support the V8 industry and, of course, Queensland’s love affair with boating.

Last week I joined the Premier and the Treasurer on the Gold Coast to launch a multimillion dollar marketing campaign that will stake our claim once and for all that the Gold Coast is the theme park capital of Australia and that it is a family friendly safe destination to boot. The Gold Coast’s five theme parks—Dreamworld, Sea World, Movie World, Wet’n’Wild, WhiteWater World—rank among the very best in the world. Honourable members, they are a must-do experience for any holiday on the Gold Coast for the young and for the young at heart as well. I invite honourable members to come to Sea World and meet Henry, Australia’s only baby polar bear. He is an absolute delight.

This government has brought together Village Roadshow and Ardent Leisure in a \$15 million partnership to boost visitor numbers to the Gold Coast and its famous theme parks with the ‘Theme park capital of Australia’ campaign. This landmark advertising blitz shows how government and the private sector can work together not only in funding such projects but also in terms of leveraging those funds for maximum advantage.

Never before has the government joined forces with the theme parks to undertake such a significant tourism promotion. This campaign will see the Gold Coast and our theme parks promoted to southern markets and New Zealand starting on 27 October through until Christmas. It is an unprecedented campaign that sends a strong message that the Gold Coast is indeed the place to be in the next few months. And of course we have something on offer through our ‘Gold Coast, Famous for fun’ and ‘And Action’ campaign, which Gold Coast Tourism has reactivated into phase 2 just recently.

With Gold Coast Tourism support, the theme park campaign will benefit the region’s wider economy through accommodation and retail spending. It will cement the Gold Coast’s reputation as a premier Australian tourism destination, a family friendly safe destination, and supercharge visitor numbers to Queensland and take us a step closer to our commitment to double overnight visitor expenditure from \$15 billion to \$30 billion by the year 2020. After all, honourable members, this is a great state with great opportunity and none more than in tourism.

Cattle Industry, Drought Assistance

Mr KATTER: My question without notice is to the Premier. Given that in the last budget \$13.7 million was allocated for bike paths and the current drought assistance package for the cattle industry in Queensland is slightly above \$11 million, does the Premier believe that this is an adequate safety net for an industry worth \$4 billion that is currently on its knees?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for Mount Isa for the question, and I say to him that since the election of the Abbott government a few weeks ago I know that Minister McVeigh has been working with his federal counterparts to look at what other levels of assistance can be provided to people on the land. It is of great concern to me and the cabinet that the impact of this drought continues to bite and bite hard and that the area that is affected has greatly expanded.

We will do everything we can with our federal colleagues to assist people on the land, and there is much that we have already done. I have to sadly reflect again today on the opportunistic position adopted by Katter's Australian Party. These are the people who sat by—I know this is history now—and supported a federal Labor government which shut down the live cattle export industry. That is why a few weeks ago in September during the federal election the person whom Katter's Australian Party was named after was punished so very strongly at the polls. He was hammered. I have had reports that he has not been showing his face much anymore; that he is too scared, battered and emotionally scarred—and quite rightly. Because people in the electorate of Kennedy saw him for what he is, and that is a hollow man, a shyster, a snake oil salesman. He is somebody who tells people problems but never delivers solutions. Clearly, Katter's Australian Party is no different. The rest of them are the same. They can tell you the problem but they cannot tell you the solution. We are about solutions. I assure the House and, more importantly, I assure people on the land that this government and Tony Abbott's federal government will find solutions.

The final point I make is: isn't it a delight that our new Prime Minister has gone to Indonesia and, by sitting down and talking to the Indonesians, he has been able to get the commitment to reopen this live cattle export trade? That is exactly what we needed. It is a pity, though, that conditions have deteriorated so much and there has been so much hardship for people on the land in regional Queensland over the past two years. I hope that gives the honourable member a feeling for what the government's position is. We hope to work with the federal government in the future to assist people on the land.

Natural Disasters, Preparedness

Mr HATHAWAY: My question without notice is to the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience. When natural disasters strike, every minute counts. Can the minister advise the House what the Newman government is doing to help Queenslanders prepare for natural disasters?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the House for the opportunity to answer the member for Townsville's question. I start by acknowledging his hard work in this area. He is no stranger to North Queensland and the challenges it can throw up. I was with the member for Townsville when we started talking about this initiative. There is no doubt that regional Queensland has been traditionally well placed to handle disasters, but more can be done not just in regional Queensland—in centres like Townsville—but across the state. That is why I am so passionate about this initiative, the Get Ready Week which we are embarking on at the moment.

I ask all Queenslanders to take the time now to prepare ahead of the imminent disaster season. I know we all live busy lives, but a few minutes now can save so much heartache in the future. It is too late to look at an evacuation plan when water is licking at your floorboards or when fire is touching your roof. Now is the time to make those decisions and think clearly when you have the opportunity to make those assessments with a clear head. We say to people: what are the things you need in your house? It is things like an adequate water supply, tinned food and batteries. But also take the time to look around your house and remove items that can become loose during a high-wind event. Clear the gutters. Do all of the things that must be done now ahead of the disaster season.

I pay tribute to the role corporate Australia has played in Get Ready Week. We have had excellent support. This is only the first year and this will grow bigger and better, but so far the support and acceptance across-the-board has been excellent. I want to talk about something which we often do not speak enough about, and that is individual responsibility. We are asking people who are able bodied to put the things you need in place now. We do not want the SES to have to be doing things in a disaster that could be done now by people who are capable and able bodied and can do it

themselves. Of course the SES is there for everybody whenever the chips are down, but I would rather see those orange uniforms help the frail, the disabled and people who cannot help themselves than somebody who is able bodied and who should be doing this right now.

Governments have a role to play, by all means. We will be focusing our efforts on mitigation, levees and retention basins. I have been criticised by those opposite for talking about it, but I will continue to do so because it is something governments have ignored for too long. We will continue to look at betterment solutions to safeguard our infrastructure, but my message today is for people to please get ready. We often hear that time is money. In a disaster, time is more than that: it is life and death. That is why today we are asking Queensland to get ready.

Rural Fire Service Day

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. On this Rural Fire Service Day, can the minister assure these wonderful volunteers that they will be well resourced for the coming season including a review of the allocation of funds from the recent rural levy to ensure at least a percentage is allocated to the rural firefighters and their service?

Mr DEMPSEY: I thank the member for Gladstone for her passion and commitment to Rural Fire Service volunteers right across Queensland. When we were elected to government we implemented the Malone review. We appointed an Assistant Minister for Emergency Volunteers to highlight the importance of not just the Rural Fire Service but also the SES, the Australian Volunteer Coast Guard and all the other organisations that help out Queenslanders across the state.

The Malone review focused on four issues: the function, structure, leadership and financial situation of the Rural Fire Service. Once the Malone report was completed, we started work on the Keelty review in relation to the overall portfolio structure of emergency services and police right across the state. The Keelty review looked particularly at the area of structure and made a number of recommendations. I say to the member and to other members of the House that what we are doing is empowering our Rural Fire Service. We are giving them the resources that they vitally need. I met with the Rural Fire Brigades Association of Queensland only a week ago. We had a productive meeting that lasted over four hours which highlighted that both the Queensland government and the Rural Fire Brigades Association of Queensland are 110 per cent committed to Rural Fire Service volunteers across the whole state.

As I said in my ministerial statement this morning, we are funding trucks. As we roll out the implementation of the Malone review, we will be looking at simple matters that have been cast aside for many years: red and blue lights, fuel, tyres and the capacity for better funding towards their main structures. We will be going through those meticulously and ensuring that we have financial capacity not just for this year but for the many years ahead, because these hardworking rural firefighters deserve a commitment from their community and the state government to know that we support them 110 per cent. I look forward to answering a number of their questions in the coming weeks. I also look forward to having the financial capacity to ensure they have more control at the ground level in their local communities than ever before. Gone are the days when departments worked in silos in relation to who looks after fire management on the road, the railway, the national parks and the state forests. We are bringing everybody together to manage the threat of fire. I look forward to the cooperation of all members here and the Rural Fire Service.

(Time expired)

Bovine Johne's Disease

Mr JOHNSON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. Will the minister provide an update to the House on how his department is handling the latest detection of Bovine Johne's Disease on a cattle property in Central Queensland?

Dr McVEIGH: I thank the honourable member for his question, his ongoing passion and leadership in regional Queensland, particularly the beef industry. As part of our ongoing Bovine Johne's Disease response, we have identified another cattle herd in Central Queensland infected with BJD. My officers are in the process of contacting 43 trace-forward properties to assess their risk of infection and to put any necessary movement restrictions in place.

This latest detection was found as part of our ongoing testing of properties that received cattle from a stud outside Rockhampton that was confirmed with BJD in November 2012. As part of our standard procedures for all positive BJD results, samples have been submitted to the National

Reference Laboratory in Victoria for strain typing to determine the source of this latest infection, and I await that information. As this latest property is a commercial herd and not a stud, we do not expect the number of potentially affected trace-forward properties to be as extensive as the previous detection. We believe the majority of cattle affected in this case would already have been sent to slaughter, so this will again reduce impacts. Biosecurity Queensland is now well prepared and equipped to deal with the situation with refined BJD processes and procedures and all laboratory testing is now being conducted within the state.

Queensland leads the way in managing this disease, especially the property disease investigation plan process we have developed over the last 12 months. We have 50 staff working in the field and in our state-of-the-art laboratory at Coopers Plains. We have, in fact, received over 14,000 samples from a total of 10½ thousand animals from 108 properties. So far only five properties have received a positive test result for BJD. That highlights the fact that Queensland has a very low prevalence of cattle wasting disease such as BJD. In terms of financial support, the government is continuing to provide assistance packages to producers affected, with a total of up to now \$5 million available to support the industry. The Newman government remains committed to working with the state's industry to maintain our protected status for BJD.

This is an ongoing process within our biosecurity efforts at large, and I am working with industry organisations, including meetings just this morning, in rolling out this particular response. There is significant work that can be done in the future as Queensland continues to lead the charge in managing BJD impacts, particularly in our hotter and dryer environments compared to those in the southern states in relation to the dairy industry experience. Overall, our maintenance of protected status is so very important for our beef industry as confirmed in recent international feedback.

(Time expired)

Political Parties, Donations

Mrs SCOTT: My question without notice is to the Premier. Would the Premier inform the House if there are any current members of the LNP government being investigated by the Crime and Misconduct Commission in relation to electoral donations?

Mr NEWMAN: I wish I could thank the honourable member for the question, but I am not going to. It is an outrageous question and I have made it very clear in the past that I totally reject and repudiate the way that the Australian Labor Party have continued their track record of using the acronym 'CMC' as a tool of innuendo and smear.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr NEWMAN: Two years ago we saw the dirtiest election campaign in Queensland's history arcing up with one of the key architects sitting across the way, the member for South Brisbane. She was down there at Labor Party headquarters and the current Leader of the Opposition sat there while the Premier of the day threw around innuendo and smear. The current Leader of the Opposition sat there and said nothing. All of it was baseless. All of it was outrageous. All of it ultimately was condemned by Queenslanders. For the member to come in here today and ask a question like that shows that they have learnt absolutely nothing. I condemn members of the Australian Labor Party in this place today for saying such a thing. The CMC is an independent organisation that has continued to do its job without fear or favour. Let it do its job without fear or favour. Let it get on without these political attacks and slurs from the Australian Labor Party, who should hang their heads in shame.

Information and Communication Technology

Mr KAYE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Science, IT, Innovation and the Arts. I ask: what has the Newman government done to reduce the Labor legacy of waste and duplication in ICT?

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, member! I warn the member for Chatsworth under 253A. I call the Minister for Science, IT and Innovation.

Mr WALKER: I thank my good friend and neighbouring electorate representative the member for Greenslopes for that question. It certainly gives me great pleasure to update the House on ICT savings that the Newman government has delivered to the people of Queensland. We have been working hard to reduce the waste and duplication that was allowed to flourish under those opposite.

When you drill down into the detail it is really remarkable to see the extent and the level of reckless financial mismanagement that the previous Labor government left us. It is an astounding legacy. We are not talking about small change.

In the 2012-13 financial year the Newman government has achieved ICT expenditure savings of \$17.6 million. This has been achieved through the simplest of measures: cutting waste on telecommunications, improving printing practices by setting printers to double sided and black and white, and other things like vendor management of our contracts. Let me remind the House of some of the findings of the ICT audit which we conducted in 2012, the largest audit of IT in Queensland government history. Among the legacy that we inherited were 16,661 fixed telephone lines that were unused across government. It begs the question: why did this happen? Why were Queensland taxpayers treated with so little regard that their hard-earned money could be wasted in such a way? It does not end there. There were 6,587 mobile phone services that were also being paid for as those phones sat idle, not being used by anybody.

I am pleased to report that this flagrant waste has now come to an end. All departments have been working hard to find savings and to cut the duplication. We are ensuring that Queenslanders are getting best value for their tax dollars, and the results are already speaking for themselves. The Queensland Police Service can be commended on its efforts, achieving the greatest savings to date, with reductions of \$6.1 million. Of that, \$5 million relates directly to printing services. An amount of \$3.6 million has also been slashed from Queensland Health's ICT expenditure, mainly through telecommunications efficiencies. Additionally, the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services and the Integrated Transport Planning Division collectively reduced their ICT costs by \$2.9 million. Those success stories just go on and on and the savings are going to be used to pay down the debt and deficit left by those opposite. We will continue to identify further opportunities to reduce ICT costs and waste. In the 2013-14 financial year it is projected that the Newman government could save an additional \$15.7 million in ICT expenditure. We will compare vendor pricing, we will reduce underlying ICT waste and we will continue to work hard to get best value for Queensland taxpayers' money.

(Time expired)

Walton Construction

Mr WELLINGTON: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. Many businesspeople on the Sunshine Coast are in the process of being destroyed by the failure of Walton Construction Pty Ltd, which was recently involved in the construction of the Coles shopping centre in Nambour, and I ask: what action is the state government taking to get to the bottom of where all the money has gone?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for his question. This government is concerned about the security of payment for subcontractors right across the state. It is very important that we do have that security in place so that subcontractors have confidence that they will receive their money. I am aware of the Walton incident that the member has mentioned, and that is of some concern to us. However, there is only so much that government can do in these instances.

The member would be aware that we have the BCIP Act, the Building and Construction Industry Payments Act, which ensures that subcontractors receive payment on a regular basis. At the moment my department is currently reviewing the act. We realise that there are some things that need to be addressed. Some unintended consequences have occurred through that act over the years that need to be addressed. We have conducted a thorough review of that act and are continuing to do that. We hope that in the next few months we will be able to make some announcements about that.

We have been looking at some of the ambush claims that have been made. We have been looking at some of the response times, and there has simply not been enough time to respond to some of those claims. We have been looking at the appointment of adjudicators to ensure that there is no perceived conflict of interest whatsoever, and it is very, very important that we get this balance right. As you know, we have been reviewing the BSA and matters associated thereto which have caused frustration for many years. The Queensland Building and Construction Commission is about to come into play in the next few weeks with new leadership and governance structure, and they will be able to look more deeply into some of the issues that the member has mentioned to see what other processes can be put into place to protect subbies from these types of arrangements. Our investigations and inquiries into the particular issues that you have mentioned are ongoing as we try

subcontractors, who play a very important part in the Queensland economy. It is very important that we protect their rights and payments and ensure that they are paid for the work they have undertaken, and those investigations will continue.

Madam SPEAKER: The time for questions has expired.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before calling the next order of the day I want to acknowledge schools visiting from: Calliope State School in the electorate of Gladstone, Lutheran Ormeau Rivers District School in the electorate of Coomera and Thangool State School in the electorate of Callide.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Error in Ministerial Statement; Oral Health Services, Waiting Lists

 **Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (11.00 am), by leave: I rise to clarify a figure. Earlier on in my ministerial statement I used the figure 15,000 to describe the number of dentures provided. It is 1,500. It was in the ministerial statement. I misread it, Madam Speaker, so I just clarify.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Political Parties, Donations; O'Sullivan, Mr B

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.01 am): At the 2012 state election the Premier promised to make his government more open and accountable than any of its predecessors. Like a string of other promises, that one has clearly been broken. But worse, when it comes to political fundraising it is fair to say the promise of openness and accountability has been smashed, not just broken. The LNP never promised Queenslanders before the election that it would actively water down the former Labor government's tough rules on political donations. It has flagged changes to raise the threshold for reporting donations so that anything less than \$12,400 will go unreported. It wants to scrap the \$5,000 and \$2,000 caps Labor put in place for donations to parties and candidates. The Newman government wants less scrutiny, not more, when it comes to political fundraising; less transparency, not more; less accountability. It is this failure of the LNP that I wish to focus on today.

We all remember that the Attorney-General had an argument at the 2012 estimates hearing with the former chair of the Crime and Misconduct Commission on the issue of political donations and fundraising. The last thing that this government wants is the state's anticorruption watchdog sniffing around LNP donations. This government does not want the CMC examining the LNP's pay-per-view activities. It does not want scrutiny of the \$11,000 charge for its regional round tables which give access to ministers. It does not want scrutiny of its QForum fundraising events. It does not want scrutiny of its use of taxpayer resources such as the health blueprint developed by Queensland Health but used as the centrepiece of an LNP fundraising lunch.

Today I can outline to the House yet another instance of why this government is so keen to block scrutiny of donations and fundraising. The opposition has been informed about a series of shabby events that prove why we need to maintain strong Labor values and not weak LNP values. We have been told of a matter that shows just how untrustworthy the LNP is when it comes to fundraising, campaign expenses and the public funding that goes with it.

What we know is that one LNP member tried to milk taxpayers out of \$2,200 to which the member was not entitled. I have been advised that after the 2012 state election this member lodged a return with the Electoral Commission of Queensland showing that \$2,200 had been spent by their campaign on telephone polling. This is an expense that, under current rules, can be claimed back by a member as a publicly funded expense. The member in question did just that and claimed back \$2,200 from taxpayers which was supposedly for telephone polling expenses. The opposition has been told that the \$2,200 was never spent on telephone polling, but it was actually payment of a commission for fundraising. Such a commission payment is legitimate. Anyone who raises substantial funds, as was done for this member, is entitled to be paid for their efforts.

In this case, I understand well over \$50,000 was raised for the member's 2012 local electorate campaign. It is perfectly acceptable for a fundraiser to lodge an invoice for commission with the member provided that it is paid from the member's campaign funds. It is not acceptable for a member to misrepresent that expense—to which they were never entitled—for the sole purpose of clawing \$2,200 out of the public purse. The opposition has been advised that an invoice clearly marked as being commission of \$2,200 for fundraising was sent to the member, but a written instruction was given to the fundraiser by the member's electorate office that the invoice must be changed. The new invoice was not to mention commission, but it was to be for phone polling. The invoice was paid, and some months later the member claimed back \$2,200 from the ECQ; in other words, from taxpayers. If the member tries to argue now that it was some sort of mistake, why did she not question it then?

If that is not bad enough, the sordid saga gets worse. The opposition has been told that early this year the LNP heard about what had happened. The party set up its own internal inquiry to investigate the matter. It found that the member in question, the member for Mudgeeraba, had indeed knowingly put in a dodgy claim to the ECQ. It found that the member deliberately changed the invoice from 'commission' to 'telephone polling' in order to claim \$2,200 back from taxpayers. In other words, it was a dodgy and fraudulent claim which was deliberately lodged by the member for her own benefit.

But what did the internal LNP inquiry recommend? I am told it ran for 12 weeks but did not even speak to all concerned and it did not follow up with a key witness; in other words, it soft-pedaled and covered up. It told the member to withdraw the claim, repay the \$2,200 and forget all about it. That is exactly what the ECQ records show the member did.

This is what we know: an LNP member makes a dodgy claim for \$2,200 in taxpayer funds, the LNP sets up its own inquiry and finds deliberate wrongdoing in connection with those taxpayer funds, but those on the LNP inquiry panel then choose to sweep it under the carpet. As was reported in the *Australian* last month, the ECQ thought that this was so serious that the matter should be sent to the Crime and Misconduct Commission.

I still want answers. What exactly did the Premier or any of his senior ministers know about this dodgy claim and the LNP's dodgy inquiry? What did they know and when were they told? Do they support the actions of their own member? Will any action be taken against this member or, as internal LNP mutterings suggest, will the Premier leave it until preselection time for others to clean up? Will he sit on his hands just as he did with the member for Redcliffe? Will he again fail to show a shred of leadership? Will he continue to accept the vote of this member? Does the Premier believe that the member has acted in accordance with the higher standards he promised Queenslanders at the last election?

In addition, does the Premier have confidence in those in the LNP who conducted the 12-week inquiry, one of whom, I am advised, was Gold Coast based LNP official Bernard Ponting? Does the Premier believe that the other person who conducted the LNP inquiry, LNP heavyweight Barry O'Sullivan, acted properly? Does the Premier believe that he is a fit and proper person after being involved in the alleged cover-up of a dodgy claim for taxpayer funds? These are important questions about the person, and we demand answers from the Premier. Barry O'Sullivan is the Premier's nominee for the current Senate vacancy. Is the Premier going to persist with this nominee? Queenslanders deserve to have all of their representatives sitting in the Senate when it resumes. It is well past the time this Premier found someone else—

Madam SPEAKER: Order, member! I will advise the House that we are not pre-empting debate on other motions before the House.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you.

Gommers, Mr B

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.10 am): I rise today to right a wrong. I will read to the House a letter. It states—

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Ben Gommers.

After long and careful consideration, I have decided, through this letter, to outline the pain, both physical and emotional, that I have experienced over the past 18 months due to a sustained attack on my character by three journalists from the Courier Mail.

I feel now, that is important to correct the record in relation to countless defamatory reports published about a range of issues including my qualifications, my previous work history and CMC and Ethics investigations.

I feel that it is equally, if not more important, for these three journalists, Robyn Ironside, Steven Wardill and Alison Sandy to understand the impact their reporting has had on my health, both physically and mentally.

For months, following my commencement at the Department of Transport and Main Roads, they perpetuated a sustained attack on my character, particularly in relation to my tertiary qualifications and previous work history.

I would note from the outset that not one of these three journalists ever attempted to contact ... me.

For months it was reported that my only qualifications had been 'a stint at Toys R Us and at the lobbying company Entrée Vous'. A particularly hurtful and untruthful article written by Steven Wardill attempted to further this myth, writing that I had gone from, 'He's gone from selling toy trains to advising about real ones.'

I table the article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 21 July 2012, titled 'Minister defends fast-tracked son' [\[3715\]](#).

The letter continues—

For the benefit of all, I would like to outline my previous experiences, which the Courier Mail failed to report for a number of months:

1. I studied for five years full time, from 2005 to 2009, a Bachelor of Laws and a Bachelor of Business, Majoring in Management.
2. I was awarded Griffith University's Top Student Award for Commercial Law.
3. In my final year of study, 2009, I applied for, and was successful in obtaining a position within the Roads and Traffic Authority of New South Wales in Public Policy, commencing in Sydney in January 2010.
4. Within the RTA I worked in public policy in Driver and Vehicle Policy.
5. Following this, I was offered a placement at Transport Certification Australia, based in Melbourne, as a Legal Project Officer.
6. In January 2011, I returned to Sydney and Transport for NSW to work in Business Strategy and Performance, which was based within the Office of the Director General.

What is particularly damning about the Courier Mail's reporting of my qualifications, is that News Limited, through the Gold Coast Bulletin, published an article on the 2 January 2010 explicitly stating that I had graduated with a Bachelor of Laws and a Bachelor of Business and had taken up a position with the Roads and Traffic Authority in NSW.

I table the article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Weekend Bulletin*, dated 2-3 January 2010, titled 'A degree of pride' [\[3716\]](#).

The letter continues—

Further, a media statement released by the Office of the Minister for Transport and Main Roads on 17 July 2012, which I was not consulted about, nor was my permission given specifically mentioned that immediately prior to commencing my position at the Department of Transport and Main Roads, I had worked at Transport for NSW.

I table the document.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 17 July 2012, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Scott Emerson MP titled 'Ministerial statement' [\[3717\]](#).

In relation to Entrée Vous the letter continues—

I now turn my attention to the claims that I founded, owned and worked at the company Entrée Vous Pty Ltd.

I put on the record that I did not found the company, I did not set up the company and I was never an owner or shareholder of the company. A simple check of the ASIC Company Register confirms this.

I table a copy of the register.

Tabled paper: Current and historical company extract, dated 28 October 2012, from the Australian Securities and Investments Commission regarding Entrée Vous Pty Ltd [\[3719\]](#).

The letter continues—

Further, I was never employed, nor did I work or lobby in or for Entrée Vous. I received no salary, no wages, no director's fees, nor any other form of remuneration. In fact, during this time I was supposed to be working at Entrée Vous, I was studying full time, five days a week, and working at Toys R Us on weeknights and on weekends.

I table a redacted document which proves that.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 23 October 2012, from Coogans Pty Ltd Chartered Accountant regarding Entrée Vous Pty Ltd [\[3720\]](#).

In relation to the CMC investigation the letter states—

I now turn to perhaps the most inaccurate and untruthful part of the Courier Mail's reporting. For months, Robyn Ironside and Alison Sandy in particular, reported that I was under investigation by the Crime and Misconduct Commission, as evidenced by the front page of the Gold Coast Bulletin which says, 'The son of a Gold Coast State Minister is under investigation by the Crime and Misconduct Commission over claims his appointment was dubious.'

I table the article.

Tabled paper: Article, dated 26 September 2012, from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* titled 'Complaints over \$103,000 'job for the boy' MP's son in CMC probe' [\[3721\]](#).

The letter continues—

I can confirm that at no stage have I ever been the subject of a Crime and Misconduct Commission investigation as confirmed by the CMC by letter.

I table the letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 September 2013, from the Crime and Misconduct Commission to Mr Peter Baston regarding Mr Ben Gommers [3718].

The letter continues—

I would also like to place on the record that at no stage did my mother employ me, nor did she ask anyone to give me a job.

Impact the above had on my health

As a result of the Courier Mail's failure to report any of the above accurately or fairly, on 22 October 2012, after reading yet another hurtful and defamatory article written by Robyn Ironside, I was hospitalized and treated for depression.

The night before my hospitalization I wrote in my diary:

'It seems the Courier Mail and Robyn Ironside won't rest until I am lying dead in a gutter somewhere. I don't know how much more I can take.'

On the day of my discharge from hospital, television crews turned up and camped outside my mother's home, following yet another defamatory article by Robyn Ironside.

All my mother tried to do was protect me, and to ensure I did not end up back in hospital but the stalking by the media did not let up, even after my mother stepped down as a Minister.

You tried and convicted me in the court of public opinion, in effect—

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.15 am): I move—

That the member be further heard.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.15 am): The letter continues—

You tried and convicted me in the court of public opinion, in effect telling your readers I was a criminal under investigation by the Crime and Misconduct Commission and the Ethics Committee. Again I repeat, at no stage during this time did anyone of you attempt to contact me or my family for comment.

I feel it is important that these journalists, Robyn Ironside, Steven Wardill and Alison Sandy, who have already been made aware of the consequences of their actions, realize and understand that inaccurate and untruthful reporting can and did lead to severe and potentially fatal consequences.

In relation to the Courier Mail, those journalist mentioned, and the faceless people on Twitter and Blogs I reserve my rights in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Gommers

State Schools, Closures

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (11.16 am): I rise today to highlight how the Newman government is being economically responsible by managing existing school infrastructure and continuing to invest in the future education needs of Queensland school students. As the previous Labor ministers were unwilling to address the issue of school viability, the education department asked the current minister, John-Paul Langbroek, to look at the viability of 55 schools because of their very low enrolment levels compared to capacity. The minister carefully considered enrolments, accessibility, curriculum, the cost of educating each student and the submissions received before making his very tough decisions.

Six schools have been earmarked for closure at the end of this year. One of those schools—Stuart State School—is located in the electorate of Burdekin, near my electorate of Townsville. Stuart State School had 88 enrolments against a capacity of 357. Over all of the closed schools across the state about 100 staff and 500 students will be impacted. That gives some idea of the ratio of inefficiency with which these schools were maintained.

Affected students will have the option to move to one of several larger schools within a few kilometres. This will provide broader streaming options and synergies for them as they will be part of a larger school and have greater options. As a parent, and having been involved with P&Cs and P&Fs

over the years, I empathise with students and parents faced with having to move schools. I know first-hand the emotional attachment people have to their school and I know of the efforts invested by school communities.

Of course, Labor has been quick to slam the government, particularly opposition member Jo-Ann Miller. She was in Townsville last month to attend the Queensland Miners Memorial Day Service. However, she used the day to seize a media opportunity and jump on the hysteria bandwagon to complain about the closure of Stuart State School. For purely political purposes she was playing and preying on the hearts, minds and emotions of the Stuart State School and the Townsville community. Although she holds a number of shadow portfolios, I do not believe education is one of them. And the last time I looked, her electorate of Bundamba is at the other end of the state to Stuart State School. But that did not stop her putting her two cents in. I find it quite hypocritical of the member for Bundamba to slam this government when Labor closed 139 schools over 20 years—an average of seven closures a year. During the Wayne Goss government 46 schools were closed. Peter Beattie closed 66 schools. And even during Anna Bligh's term 27 schools were closed.

I ask the honourable member for Bundamba whether any of these places ring a bell: Chancellor, Emu Vale, Hawkins Creek, Rocky Crossing, Welcome Creek, Cooranga, Banyo, Kalkadoon, Mingela State School, Mount Isa State High, Nudgee, Tent Hill. I will not go on, but that is suffice to get the picture. That is a list of 25 schools that were closed between 30 March 2001 and December 2003.

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr HATHAWAY: I would hope that the member for Bundamba does recognise the names of these schools, because they are the 25 schools that were closed by the Labor government while on her watch as the parliamentary secretary to the then minister for education. The Newman government is also providing \$500 to \$750 to those students who are affected to assist them with the move to a new school. Did Labor offer anything to the students of the schools it closed?

The member for Bundamba has also made false accusations in the media that closures announced by the Newman government are about selling off property for profit. Again, this is another attempt to grab media headlines. We have stated publicly that any funds will be reinvested to improve school infrastructure.

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr HATHAWAY: The Newman government increased education spending in this year's budget by 6.5 per cent. Read about it, member for Bundamba! The Newman government also delivered on its election commitment to establish the Schools Planning Commission, which has delivered a 20-year demand map. This is the first time the state, Catholic and independent sectors have worked together with local government, parents and organisations to identify future school locations and upgrades. As a result of this collaboration, we have announced plans to deliver 11 new schools in Queensland hot spots, with the first of these expected to open its doors by 2015. The Newman government remains committed to ensuring that all students receive the best education in the best state in the best facilities.

Newman Government, Sale of Public Assets

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.21 am): This week has not been a good week for the government. Just when it thought its distractions and diversions would work, old wounds have been reopened thanks to the Treasurer. It is clear that he is still nursing a bruised ego after being rolled in the party room over asset sales in April this year. Once again the Treasurer has this week exposed the fact that the Newman government is still deeply divided over asset sales. That division goes right to the top. The Premier and the Treasurer are on opposite sides of an argument that has been simmering away within the LNP since it came to office.

As the *Australian Financial Review* headline said in April, the Treasurer was 'rolled' on the sale of power assets. Instead of falling into line over asset sales after he was rolled, the Treasurer yesterday could not contain his ambition or the unshakeable belief that he was—and still is—right. He issued a media release trumpeting a report that was released by Infrastructure Partnerships Australia. The report, titled *Powering Queensland: why competitive, private electricity markets offer lower prices and better infrastructure*, suggests the sale of all electricity assets in public hands, not just generators, in order to reap the windfall. The report estimated that the sale of those assets would fetch approximately \$48 billion.

The Treasurer's media release is a masterful contortion. Hot on the heels of his so-called 'stretch target' on reaching the LNP's four per cent jobs target over six years, the media release is an incredible stretching of logic and rational argument. He starts by claiming that the report endorses the government's position and approach to asset sales despite the fact that the report recommends the sale of all electricity assets, not just the generators, which is—for the time being at least—the government's position. The Treasurer goes on to pay lip-service to that position. But he then just cannot contain himself and he spruiks the arguments made in the report for the sale of all electricity assets, including network assets. Checking which way the political wind was blowing, the Premier last year made his position clear that—

... the poles and wires transmissions stuff, I believe, should be owned by the people because they are natural monopolies.

But we know that the Treasurer has the Deputy Premier on his side. In an article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* last month, the Deputy Premier said that the government had a 'long list' of targets for privatisation, and I table a copy of that article for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, dated 25 September 2013, titled 'Seeney has hit list: Promise of more job cuts, asset sales, privatisation' [3722].

The Deputy Premier said—

When it comes to asset sales we have identified the electricity industry and port assets ... and that nothing was off the table.

So the Premier says the poles and wires are not for sale, the Deputy Premier says they are for sale because nothing is off the table, and the Treasurer is thinking out loud but cannot yet bring himself to say it, like he famously did last term when he said to sell off 'the poles, the wires, the lot'. The government is hopelessly divided over asset sales, but the Treasurer could perhaps be forgiven for not listening to the Premier on fiscal management. The Premier said in June this year—

Western Australia is a head and shoulders above Queensland ... and yet they're the smallest state government, so that says something.

The Premier was reported as indicating that he would move to harmonise Queensland with Western Australia's 'small state songbook' as the best in the nation. Let us put aside for one moment here that the Premier completely disregarded his own Costello Commission of Audit report's finding that Labor had in fact left Queensland with a lower ratio of public servants to the workforce than Western Australia. We all know the Premier struggles with basic facts. The Premier's WA songbook is all the more remarkable when we consider that Western Australia had its credit rating downgraded to a AA rating just three months after the Premier established Colin Barnett's government as the archetype for his fiscal management. And what was Premier Colin Barnett's reason for forgoing the AAA rating? Premier Barnett said that he would not apologise for investing in infrastructure. Does that sound familiar? The now Premier, Campbell Newman, when he was Lord Mayor of Brisbane wrote to the former Labor government imploring it to borrow more money for infrastructure and to disregard the credit rating. The Premier's letter, which I table, argued that—

... there is a strong case that ... revenue gains (or at least a portion of them) should be allowed to flow through to additional spending, rather than speeding the path to a AAA rating.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 14 April 2010, from Mr Campbell Newman, former Chairman, South East Queensland Council of Mayors, to former Premier Hon. Anna Bligh regarding its state budget submission for 2010-11 [3723].

I am sure the Premier is saying much the same behind closed doors today when all the while the Treasurer was last week telling us that we would effectively have to give something up, or perhaps even sell it, to deliver on people's hopes and aspirations from the Queensland Plan.

Yesterday I said that the LNP's announcement to flood Queensland with casinos had more in common with a cargo cult than sound economic planning. Queenslanders are still waiting for some sort of a growth strategy that is based on logic and reasonable argument. But why would we talk about cargo cults? It is said that cargo cults develop during a combination of crises or social stress and such a movement may form under a leader who may have a vision, sometimes called a myth-dream, of the future. Good luck with your tilt for the leadership, Treasurer. Maybe this time you can find that one vote you could not find last time!

Lockyer Valley

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (11.25 am): I rise to congratulate Minister Crisafulli, the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience. It is great to see what the state government is doing to improve the resilience of the shires around the state. It is working wonderfully

in that we are not just rebuilding infrastructure that was damaged in previous floods; we are improving in the rebuilding of the bridges and that infrastructure. It really is about improving infrastructure and being aware of flood heights from 2011 and 2013 and, where possible, managing diversion.

Millions of dollars from the state has been poured into this improved infrastructure in the Lockyer Valley and it really will help the people of the Lockyer Valley. Unfortunately, most people in the Lockyer Valley are riparian dwellers and therefore subject to some form of flooding. It is virtually a big flood plain, but that is what makes it a great agricultural area. In some places, there is a depth of 60 and 70 feet of beautiful loamy soil.

However, I am struggling with the Lockyer Valley Regional Council, which has not put effort into these matters, particularly at the executive level. The actual workforce itself does a great job, but the executive level does appear to be struggling with basic mistakes. For example, before the 2011 flood disaster there was virtually no disaster management planning in place and the disaster management committee had not met for months. This cost ratepayers, unfortunately. Murphys Creek was an area that was virtually abandoned. Without people like Cam Macdonald, Peter Souter, Murray Imms, Simon Warner and the department of communities, it would have been virtually abandoned by the Lockyer Valley Regional Council for the first 10 days or fortnight.

Then of course there were the dodgy dealings with a bloke named Paul Morrison. He was a con man who had a history of fraudulent activity. I will table some information shortly, but Mahoney Lawyers had written to the Lockyer Valley Regional Council because some of its clients had raised issues with Mr Morrison being the chief subcontractor in that they were not getting paid. The LVRC was not concerned with Morrison's apparent fraudulent activities. It did not put a stop payment on invoices from Morrison. There was no real intention to ensure that contractors were being paid, no intention to pay its clients directly and no contact with police. The executive level of the council really did let some of the contractors down badly. They have recently been paid by some insurance and Mr Morrison has been put up on charges of fraud, but it has taken a long time and generated a lot of angst. Of course, the insurance liabilities will come back to the ratepayers. That is just the way of the world.

There was also a referral to the CMC about some dodgy issues at Grantham. The statement from the CMC says that this allegation, if proved, amounts to official misconduct but that the CMC notes concerns. It goes on to say—

The council recently provided the CMC with a final report concerning the matter. The CMC is satisfied that council has implemented improved ongoings.

I table the CMC letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 11 October 2013, from the Crime and Misconduct Commission to the member for Lockyer, Mr Ian Rickuss MP, regarding works at Grantham and other concerns raised on behalf of Helidon Sandstone Industries Pty Ltd [\[3724\]](#).

This is two years, though, after the Morrison issue. So they are learning very slowly, that is for sure. Two years have passed and they still have some real issues with the way things are being managed at the executive level of the council. It is disappointing. I table a relevant document.

Tabled paper: Email transmission, dated 24 November 2011, from Mahoney Lawyers to the Lockyer Regional Council regarding Paul Morrison, Kildare Pastoral Co [\[3725\]](#).

More recently, the Lockyer Valley Regional Council has been very slow with some levee work around the villages of Forest Hill. Funding was supplied over 12 months ago and they are just now starting to have some consultation with the community. Unfortunately, it is a very, very slow process. They have decided not to talk to the people outside the levee area, which I find a bit frustrating. Those people are still part of the community. The mayor has made statements that he does not want to share the SKM report with Queensland Rail. Queensland Rail is a major landholder in the Lockyer Valley. It has large areas of easement land through that area. The design of this levee was funded by the state government as well as Lockyer ratepayers. This is just silly.

More recently, the council has gone on a trip to Ageo City—a city of 250,000 people. I do not know why they are going over there. Are they going to try to amalgamate with the Ipswich City Council or the Toowoomba Regional Council? That would be the only reason I could see they would be going on a trip to see a city of that size when most of the villages in their area have populations of between 2,000 and 4,000 people.

(Time expired)

Climate Change

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (11.30 am): In yesterday's *Courier-Mail* there was a report that detailed the dire predictions contained in the draft second report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I have a copy of that article that was in the *Courier-Mail* and I table it for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 14 October 2013, titled 'Dire predictions in climate report' [\[3726\]](#).

Some of the predictions that are contained in the draft second report of the intergovernmental panel include \$2.2 billion worth of assets damage in Australia alone, including up to a quarter of a million residential and 8,000 commercial buildings damaged; a tripling in the number of heatwave deaths over the next 70 years; a 100 per cent increase in the very high to extreme fire danger by 2050—something that is occupying the minds of many Queenslanders today; a 20 per cent increase in the 50-year and 100-year flood peaks for rivers in many parts of the country by 2050; and an estimated 800,000 more Australians falling ill with stomach bugs every year from eating or drinking contaminated food or water.

I do not need to say that Queensland has much to lose in a world where we see global temperatures increasing anywhere from two degrees to four degrees. But we have very much to lose. Queensland has the longest coastline on Australia's eastern seaboard, with more than 80 per cent of Queenslanders living on the coast. As we all know, Queensland, particularly in recent years, is subject to extreme weather events—droughts followed by flooding and cyclones—and we have the most biodiversity of any state in Australia, with five World Heritage areas.

The intergovernmental panel report also criticises both the Queensland and New South Wales conservative governments for revoking and downgrading planning rules that would help communities adapt to changing conditions and prevent damage. We know that, under the LNP, the changes to planning laws were made primarily to satisfy big developers, many of whom are probably members of the LNP's big-dollar fundraising arm, QForum. But we on this side of the House believe that planning laws are there for a different purpose. We believe that they are there to protect our environment. We believe that they are there to pursue sustainable development, not rampant development, not development at any cost.

We also know that the LNP has been downgrading and revoking important planning and environmental protections in Queensland mostly for ideological reasons. After all, the environment minister is a self-confessed climate change science sceptic. The LNP has presided over a very long list of environmental vandalism. I will refrain from listing all of them, but some of the key ones include—and I have made mention of this—repealing coastal protection laws, taking an axe to tree-clearing protections, repealing the waste levy and doing nothing in terms of advancing a waste strategy in this state so that New South Wales waste producers can come up here and dump in Queensland. It has axed every single renewable energy project in Queensland—something that it is undoubtedly extremely proud of. It has dismantled the ClimateSmart Home initiative. It has slashed the solar feed-in tariff and demonised solar users. It has sacked hundreds of public servants responsible for environmental policy and monitoring.

It was Tim Flannery, a former Australian of the Year, who said—

We stand at a crossroads, where comprehension of our place in nature—of our true abilities and of our history—is supremely important. We have formed a global civilisation of unprecedented might, driven forward by the power of our minds—a civilisation which is transforming our Earth. We are masters of technology, and of comprehension, but it's what we believe that may, from now on, determine our fate.

Those opposite do not believe and, because they do not believe, when future generations look back they will see a government that took a special place like Queensland and trashed it.

Rural Fire Service

 **Mr MALONE** (Mirani—LNP) (11.35 am): It is with great pleasure that I rise to commend all of those members who today are wearing the yellow ribbon for the rural fire brigades across Queensland. Today in this parliament I would like to commend all of those volunteers who work so tirelessly not only during the fire season but also when there are other disasters throughout our communities, such as floods and cyclones, to support their communities.

We have about 34,000 volunteers who wear the yellow overalls and drive the yellow trucks and, further out in the rural communities, supply their own equipment to fight fires—a group of people who fight fires on their neighbour's property, who look after their neighbour's property and, quite

frankly, selflessly give of their time. So I believe that today in this parliament it is very important that we recognise those 34,000 people who do that on behalf of their communities to create resilient communities right across our great state.

I have to say, though, that over many years—going back over the years that I had been a shadow minister for emergency services—we saw pretty much an outright attack on the volunteers of the Rural Fire Service. There have been many reports done over many years about change within the Rural Fire Service. Fortunately, we are on the cusp of implementing those recommendations that the Rural Fire Service has for so long called for.

Today, I also think it is pertinent to recognise that there were over 50,000 volunteers in the Rural Fire Service but that volunteer numbers are now down to 34,000. Many of those people who have withdrawn their services as volunteers from the Rural Fire Service are those very people who have the knowledge—the farmers, the graziers and people living close to the city who have a very close connection to the land. They have been so frustrated with the regulation, the bureaucracy and the nonsensical decisions of people who really do not understand the backbone and the core issues of rural firefighting.

I refer to the elimination of risk by cool burns during winter. The theory is that it is better to have a bit of smoke in winter than a raging fire in summer. It is better to light a fire than fight a fire. These very simple slogans really emphasise what the Rural Fire Service is all about—making sure that there are no wildfires, making sure that we do not have millions of dollars worth of aircraft tied up in water bombing, as we see occurring in New South Wales, which has a budget of over \$400 million and over 100 aircraft on stand-by. Very little preburn goes on in New South Wales and we see houses and other infrastructure being burnt. That could be eliminated, and we attempt to do that in Queensland. It is a very important issue, for me in particular, to support those volunteers and make sure that they have the support of the Queensland government.

Secondly, I would like to highlight one particular issue that brings to mind the very essence of the spirit of rural firefighting. On 21 September I had the very great pleasure to go to The Caves, which is just north of Rockhampton in the electorate of Keppel, to open their fire brigade shed. They had had all sorts of trouble: the company they had contracted to buy the shed from went broke and they lost 25 per cent of their funding; they had a difficult block on which to build; and they had an asbestos ridden shed to get rid of. It was a nightmare. They pulled together and I was very fortunate to be there at the opening. I believe that the shed that they built is probably worth more than a million dollars. If the Queensland government had built it, it would probably be worth about a million and a half. The donations and support they received for their shed were unbelievable. One elderly gentleman donated \$40,000 towards the building of the shed. People donated excavators and concrete and laid concrete. They did whatever was necessary to build that shed. That happens right across Queensland and saves the Queensland government millions and millions of dollars. I commend every one of those guys out there, in particular Jeff Farrell, the first officer at The Caves. His example and the example of The Caves is emulated right across Queensland every day of the week. Let us celebrate the great volunteers in rural firefighting.

Criminal Motorcycle Gangs

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (11.41 am): I rise in the House today as the member for Mermaid Beach, whose parliamentary office is in the middle of Broadbeach not 200 metres from the scene of one of the most disgusting displays of bikie arrogance and disregard for the laws of our state and country one could ever imagine. The siege that took place between the Bandidos bikies and the police is horribly reminiscent of a B-grade *Mad Max* movie and would be the stuff of a cheap American gangster novel if it were not for the sad fact that it was real. Men, women and children cowering in the dining and entertainment precinct of one of the most popular family destinations of Australia's favourite playground, the Gold Coast, is not the stuff for tourism promotional advertising.

I have risen in this House on nine occasions previously to highlight the proliferation of these criminal bikie gang rogue elements on the Gold Coast and the proof was brazenly there for all to see nationally on the night of Friday, 27 September. Police outnumbered and screaming for assistance as threatening criminals circled their prey trying to ride roughshod over our only form of defence against these murderous, emboldened thugs is a picture I sadly recount. This scenario is the culmination of criminal bikie gang wars over money, drugs and lucrative business territory on the Gold Coast that must be brought to an immediate halt.

Premier Campbell Newman has defiantly drawn the line in the Gold Coast sand to kill off this outlandish criminal behaviour once and for all. His personal commitment to me and the eight other Gold Coast members of the LNP is that he will not stop his dedication to this essential primary law-and-order task until this criminal network and behaviour is eradicated. So bikies beware and be on your bikes out of Queensland while you still have the money to cut and run.

This government is serious about protecting its people and its reputation. Our mission is totally juxtaposed to the intent of the criminal bikie gangs. There can only be one winner in this war and the Newman government has the legislative power, taxpayers' money and the will of the Queensland people behind it to rid Queensland of this bikie scourge. So let the message be very clear to the infamous 'one percenters' of Mermaid Beach and Broadbeach: 'Get out now while you can. Sell your dodgy business fronts, forget your lucrative drug distribution outlets and flog off your ill-gotten real estate through unexplained wealth, because in a very short while when necessary legislation is passed you will not be able to. If there is half a brain in those beefed-up, steroid bloated, tattooed bodies, you should take your money and run now from Queensland back to whichever state you came from.'

The Gold Coast may be a wonderful place to work, play and relax in, but it does not want bikies as part of the social scene. And it does not matter what highly-paid-by-drug-money lawyers and barristers posing as civil libertarians might say about the so-called rights of criminal bikie club members, the other 99 per cent of the community do not want them carrying out their intimidating crime-centric behaviour in our communities and this Newman government is committed to restoring law and order to the expectation of Queenslanders.

I congratulate the police minister, Jack Dempsey, and our forthright Attorney-General, Jarrod Bleijie, on their immediate and forceful response to the unprecedented mob display by bikies in Broadbeach. Actions speak louder than words and it is the actions of these men, along with the Premier, that will bring an end to this violent, outrageous behaviour displayed by these bikies in complete disregard for the people of the Gold Coast and Queensland.

I welcome the commitment by the Australian Federal Police under the new Tony Abbott led coalition government to join the fight against these tattooed, bike-riding criminal organisations. I would suggest that in any review of the Crime and Misconduct Commission charter of operations strong emphasis of investigation by that body with its wide-ranging investigative powers should be co-opted to join the fight against these outlaws of society. Its focus should be on the money channels of the bikie organisations as that is the root cause of all of the violence and intimidation that is the hallmark of these unsavoury groups.

I would suggest also that a regular night-time patrol of sniffer dogs across the Gold Coast entertainment precincts would cut down the illegal drug trade and reduce the cash flow of these bikie gangs. And driver's licence cancellation at any and every opportunity would deprive them of their bikie gang duty to take part in compulsory patch rides to demonstrate their allegiance. These bikie gangs have brought this determination for their eradication on themselves by their disgraceful behaviour and disregard for the peaceful rights of the Gold Coast community and there should be no misplaced sympathy for their plight by self-serving bikie acolytes and associates.

Crime Prevention

 **Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—UAP) (11.45 am): The Newman government's one-size-fits-all and largely populist tough-on-crime approach just does not make the grade in all classes of crime. We no longer live in an era where a six-foot police sergeant with a size 10 boot and a bat is an effective approach to addressing offending in our communities. The complexities of crime, from juvenile offending right up to sophisticated syndicates dealing with lucrative illicit drug markets, money laundering and racketeering type offences, require intelligent, targeted, multifaceted and often multidisciplinary approaches. Organised crime is not constrained by jurisdictions, not even by our country's borders. It is time for the Newman government to get smart and listen to the experts, especially in relation to juvenile crime.

I will say it again for the benefit of those who struggle with alternative approaches: the causation of criminal and antisocial behaviour is a complex issue requiring sophisticated and often multifaceted responses, something that the Newman government just has not grasped. Leaving criminal motorcycle gangs aside for now, the Attorney-General more so than anyone else is prone to

announcing uninformed and simply populist initiatives, especially in responding to criminal and antisocial behaviour by juveniles. This is a challenging area that requires informed and targeted approaches such as multisystemic therapy—MST.

MST is offering new hope for young people with serious behavioural disorders, as well as their families and the broader community. Too often traditional mental health approaches for serious violent and chronic juvenile offenders and programs for treating adolescent substance abusers have failed. I strongly suspect the Attorney-General's boot camps and his latest thought bubble of naming and shaming juveniles will follow this trend. MST, on the other hand, is a proven program offering effective family and home based treatment. It focuses on changing how youth function in their natural settings—at home, at school and in their neighbourhoods, for example—in ways that promote positive social behaviour while decreasing antisocial behaviour. It is a model which views youth as living in a network of interconnected systems that encompass individual, family, peer, school, neighbourhood and other aspects.

MST interventions address those systems that are linked with criminal and antisocial behaviour on a case-by-case basis with the primary goals to reduce youth criminal activity and to reduce other types of antisocial behaviour such as drug abuse. MST achieves these outcomes at a cost saving by decreasing rates of incarceration and out-of-home placement. MST typically uses a home based model of service delivery and MST therapists focus on collaborating with and empowering parents. They use identified strengths to develop natural support systems and remove barriers to improve capacity for people to function as effective parents. Research confirms that, following treatment, youths who receive MST report significantly less aggression with peers and less involvement in criminal activity than youths receiving usual services. Moreover, families receiving MST report significantly more cohesion than non-MST families.

MST is equally effective with youth and families with divergent socioeconomic and racial backgrounds. Follow-up studies with children and families, at both two and four years after referral, support the long-term effectiveness of MST. Despite its intensity, MST is relatively inexpensive as an intervention, with costs per client being about one-fifth the average cost of an institutional placement. For the benefit of the Attorney-General and the Newman government, including the member for Ipswich West, I table a publication about MST addressing clinical outcomes and cost savings.

Tabled paper: Document titled 'Multisystemic Therapy: Clinical Outcomes and Cost Savings' [3727].

Gold Coast Hospital



Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—UAP) (11.50 am): It has come time for the health minister to be fully frank and honest with this parliament regarding what is going on at the Gold Coast Hospital presently and has been going on for at least the past nine months. He would have the House and the public believe everything is terrific, that the hospital transition is going well and that nothing untoward has occurred other than 23 cases of potential misadventure in the oddly named MOU, the medical observation unit.

Today I am tabling the evidence the minister did not want people to hear. These are the victims' stories about the Gold Coast Hospital and the massive internal reorganisation and destructure of clinical governance at the hospital, delivered in statistical form. The minister has been silent to their demand, which is for a review of what has been going on as a result of those systems. I also table the incident report which effectively shows that the mortality and morbidity statistics for 2012 and 2013 got worse during this change, in spite of a massive reduction in elective joint replacement surgery, which under normal circumstances generally provides many of the complications.

Tabled paper: Statistics indicating reported clinical incident summary occurring between 1 July 2012 and 31 July 2013 for the Gold Coast district [3728].

In other words, what we are seeing is averages above what should have been. When there should have been a minimum 20 per cent decline in death and non-lethal complications, there was a 10 per cent rise initially in the first two months. One cannot argue with these statistics. They are compelling. I put it to the House that there are significant concerns about management changes at the hospital, and they are lethal. This was reported to the minister on multiple occasions. I table a letter from one of the specialists at the hospital that was originally sent to him four months ago, after they had been reporting these things since February of this year.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 25 July 2013, to the member for Gaven, Dr Alex Douglas MP, from Pindara Paediatrics regarding concerns at the Gold Coast Hospital [3729].

Basically, when you compare it, rolling year on year and going backwards, with the statistics now, there is a 10 per cent increase over and above what should have been, even allowing for the reduction in elective surgery. In England, the recent Francis inquiry discovered that what happened when 1,500 people were found to have been killed by similar systems at the Old Stafford Hospital was that they did not know that they did not know. It is compelling evidence and the people at the Gold Coast Hospital, that is, the CEO and his management executive, are using the same strategy of targets to deliver the same outcomes in the hospital. Not knowing that you are causing problems is not a defence, especially when people become disabled or are destroyed by the systems that are supposed to prevent such disasters. The board chair has effectively endorsed what has occurred at the hospital and has ignored the requests of senior medical staff to do something about it. There has been lots of talk but no action.

Today I call on the health minister to immediately commission an inquiry into all serious matters of health care and safety at the Gold Coast Hospital. Furthermore, the board, the board chair and the CEO should stand down to restore some confidence not only to the staff but also to all the patients of the Gold Coast Hospital and the Gold Coast community. The evidence I have tabled today has been available to the minister and his staff for many months now and they have done nothing. There has been no department-by-department review and there has been no corresponding review of the deaths and significant morbidities, that is complications, occurring over and above what should have occurred under normal circumstances had the normal amount of elective surgery, including joint replacements, been going on.

Regarding the issue of collating such evidence, I am very concerned that the CEO, Mr Ron Calvert, completely fails to understand how the integrity of the system is maintained. It is called the PRIME system of reporting clinical incidents in the hospital. On 8 August this year on ABC Radio, Mr Calvert claimed that the former director of surgery, Dr Teresa Withers, had not reported any issues of patient safety. The PRIME reporting system is supposedly anonymous and is managed that way to reduce a culture of blame. Therefore, Mr Calvert has either circumvented the system to access the names of those submitting or he has made it up. Either way, this has shown a total contempt for and ignorance of the system. It could also imply that there is an attempt to manage the results of the outcomes being reported.

The problems have not gone away. The management principles that they are currently using remain in place. Joint replacements and other types of elective surgery have now restarted. There is a problem that may well be developing on the basis of what they already have. At what point do you say enough is enough? I am very concerned that they are using the same systems that they used when the problems were occurring. Something has to be done and the minister has to take action. A commission of inquiry is a priority.

(Time expired)

Natural Disasters, Preparedness

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (11.55 am): Today I rise to speak on a topic that is vital for every community across Queensland. From the hinterland to the tablelands, Queensland's vast geography encompasses some of the most serene yet harsh terrain known to man. Atypical of the unique nature of the Australian landscape, Queensland communities are often afflicted with devastating natural disasters. Just over two years ago, South-East Queensland and regional areas such as Bundaberg were overwhelmingly inundated as rising water levels flooded towns and cities. Each time we face natural disasters, the effect will change. As dynamic as these events are, it is in our power to appropriately and adequately prepare for any eventuality. We cannot control the event, but we are in control of how we handle the situation.

In January of this year, areas in the south-east that were isolated saw how crucial prior preparation is to the survivability and sustainability of a community during a disaster. This week marks the inaugural Get Ready Week. During this week, both the state government and local councils will come together to assist residents develop a greater awareness of the rigours when dealing with natural disasters. Queenslanders continually battle against the environment and our resolve is always tested, but our resilience always shines through. To continue this, it is essential that we prepare ourselves. Procrastination is not the answer. The old military adage 'let no man's ghost return to say his training let him down' can be applied here. We cannot let Queenslanders say, 'If only we had prepared.'

During the January 2013 flooding disaster, once again my electorate of Logan, like so many across Queensland, was faced with challenging times. It was only through community cohesion and the true-blue Aussie spirit that our community was able to pick itself up so quickly. However, communities change every day. We say goodbye to some and welcome others. Whether they are moving up the road or are new Australians settling in our country for the first time, I know from personal experience that learning about what natural challenges we face and how to prepare our households can be quite daunting. Get Ready encourages the community to work together. Once again it unifies us as we prepare for what might lie ahead. I encourage all residents to work with their neighbours and local councils to ensure we are all best placed to deal with any situation.

Our preparation in times of emergency will relieve the burden that our emergency services face. Being prepared and knowing how to manage situations reduces the reliance on emergency services, allowing them to tend to the most urgent of calls. The campaign carries this message: if you do a little, we all accomplish a lot. It is vital that all Queenslanders prepare properly for all natural disasters to minimise their effects and to ensure they can get their lives back to normal as quickly as possible after a disaster. The campaign encourages you to know our local risk and how a disaster can affect your suburb and your life. Have a plan to deal with, prepare for and take action to be more self-reliant after an event. This will allow disaster management authorities to focus on the most vulnerable Queenslanders. Work with family, friends, neighbours and your local networks to help each other through extreme events.

I am proud that our government has allocated \$2 million for local councils to hold community events promoting the Get Ready message. I encourage everyone to get involved in making Queensland Australia's most resilient state. People should check the website—www.disaster.qld.gov.au/getready. I also commend our Rural Fire Service volunteers and all those who keep us safe and put themselves in harm's way. That is why I am wearing a yellow ribbon today. I say to everybody: together we can make it happen.

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

LIQUOR (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.00 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Casino Control Act 1982, the Criminal Law (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Act 1986, the Gaming Machine Act 1991, the Liquor Act 1992, the Roman Catholic Church (Incorporation of Church Entities) Act 1994, the Roman Catholic Church Lands Act 1985, the Security Providers Act 1993 and the Wagering Act 1998 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Liquor (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 [\[3730\]](#).

Tabled paper: Liquor (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [\[3731\]](#).

I am particularly pleased to introduce the Liquor (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 into the parliament today. Following the 2012 state election the Newman government has consulted extensively with industry and the community, appointing a red-tape reduction expert panel to review liquor licensing and gaming regulation in this state. This was established following the 2012 DestinationQ conference in Cairns as part of our commitment to revitalise the tourism industry in Queensland. The expert panel has provided a range of recommendations to reduce regulatory burden to support the tourism and hospitality industries. This government is committed to implementing practical and sensible red-tape reduction initiatives in the liquor and gaming industries, and this bill meets that commitment.

This bill's primary purpose is to reduce red tape to ensure that the state's liquor and gaming industries can operate more freely and be competitive both nationally and internationally. The government has already taken steps to reduce red tape for the regulation of liquor and gaming, with many significant amendments already having been implemented earlier this year. The bill introduced

today focuses on removing impediments to low-risk areas of licensed premises and gambling operations and addressing those areas that have been overregulated for years beyond the necessity warranted.

This bill will decrease the level of regulatory burden imposed on certain low-risk premises, such as small community clubs, by exempting these venues from the requirement to have an approved manager present or reasonably available when they are not trading beyond midnight. To ensure good order is maintained and the risk of alcohol related harm is minimised at these venues, an approved manager will continue to be required or available from 10 pm until close if the premises does trade beyond midnight. Licensed vessels, due to their low-risk and controlled nature, will also be exempted from the approved manager requirements, regardless of operating hours.

The bill also removes the administrative requirement for liquor licensees to keep a responsible service of alcohol training register. Training certificates will still be required to be kept on site and be available for inspection. However, the administrative requirement to maintain a register, which duplicates information available on the certificate, will be removed. Additionally, approved managers and individual licensees will further benefit from this bill as it removes the requirement for these persons to hold a current RSA certificate if they hold a current RMLV certificate, therefore reducing unnecessary duplication and regulatory burden. The bill also fosters the tourist industry by allowing tourist operators to supply limited amounts of liquor to their clients as part of a tour, without a licence or permit. Liquor licensees will also be allowed to pay their annual fees by instalment where they experience not just personal but also financial hardship.

Other measures in this bill relating to adult entertainment permits will extend the term of a permit from one to three years and allow for the approval of adult entertainment controllers to be transferable to multiple venues, providing licensees with greater certainty and considerable monetary and time savings, while providing adult entertainment controllers greater flexibility to work across multiple venues. However, the strict probity requirements on these applications and controllers will be maintained.

Given technological advancements within and the maturity of Queensland's gaming industry, it is no longer considered necessary for government to track individual gaming machines. As such, the bill will allow licensees, licensed monitoring operators, approved financiers and gaming trainers to destroy their gaming machines without the commissioner's prior written approval, reducing unnecessary red tape. In line with creating more flexible legislation, the bill also removes a number of gaming machine licence application requirements from the Gaming Machine Act and provides for these within an approved form, reducing duplication of requirements in the legislation and allowing for a more flexible regulatory model. Overall, the bill reduces a broad range of legislative requirements and represents another significant step in the ongoing process to reduce the regulatory burden across the liquor and gaming industries.

The bill also contains a number of other minor miscellaneous amendments to liquor, gaming and fair trading legislation to ensure clarity and consistency. These include amendments to the Wagering Act to give direct legislative authority under that act for the minister to extend the term of a sports wagering licence.

Amendments to the Roman Catholic Church (Incorporation of Church Entities) Act provide for legislative recognition of existing legal entities and arrangements established under canon law, with the aim of enabling the church to operate more simply by reducing red tape. The amendments are mainly technical in nature and pertain to three separate facets of church property: civil law recognition of the creation of canon law trusts; extending consent provisions to include certain juridical persons, the canon law equivalent of legal persons; and pooling of investments. The bill also makes a minor amendment to the Roman Catholic Church Lands Act in order to correct the inadvertent omission of a block of land upon which St Michael's Church at Pine Ridge is located and has been vested to the trustees of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane.

The bill also makes amendments to confirm the intent of the Security Providers Act to clarify that unrecorded convictions do not result in automatic disqualification from holding a licence but must be considered by the chief executive in determining whether a person is an appropriate person to hold a licence. This bill demonstrates the government's ongoing commitment to a common-sense approach to regulation in Queensland to ensure regulation should only be applied where necessary and low-risk liquor and gaming enterprises are free to develop without unnecessary government interference. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.06 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 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

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

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.07 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 2003, the Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994, the Personal Injuries Proceedings Act 2002, the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 and the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Regulation 2003 for particular purposes and to make minor or consequential amendments of legislation as stated in schedules 1 and 2. I table the bill and the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 [\[3732\]](#).

Tabled paper: Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [\[3733\]](#).

I present a bill for an act to amend the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 and other legislation. I have tabled the bill and the explanatory notes. The Finance and Administration Committee tabled the report of its inquiry into the operation of the Queensland workers compensation scheme on 23 May 2013. This inquiry represented a break in the pattern of previous inquiries and reviews that have occurred reactively in response to external developments or pressures on the scheme's funding and stability. The Finance and Administration Committee's report made 32 recommendations. Of those, 12 recommendations are of a legislative character while 20 recommendations involve administrative and structural arrangements. The Queensland government proposes to respond to the committee's report by supporting 18 recommendations, supporting two with amendment and not supporting 12 recommendations. I now table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 28—Inquiry into the operation of Queensland's workers compensation scheme, government response [\[3734\]](#).

The government's response to the committee's report is the result of careful analysis of both the recommendations contained in the report and the 246 submissions made to the inquiry. I would like to thank those people who took the time to make submissions to the inquiry. This government is committed to delivering Australia's best performing workers compensation scheme—a scheme that remains the envy of other Australian states and territories.

Over the last 10 years we have had the lowest average premium rate in Australia, and the Newman government wants to keep it that way. Since 2009, the average premium rate has increased by around 20 per cent, and Queensland is quickly slipping back into the pack when comparing our scheme with interstate counterparts.

There has been a lot of scaremongering in the media over recent weeks in relation to journey claims. I would like to assure the House that the bill does not include any changes to journey claims because every Queenslanders deserves to be protected when travelling to and from work. That is vitally important for a state as large and decentralised as Queensland and also recognising the transient nature of our workforce.

To that end, this bill introduces amendments that will ensure the ongoing success and viability of Queensland's workers compensation scheme by reducing duplication, simplifying regulatory processes and ensuring that compensation is available and accessible to help injured workers get back on their feet. The changes aim to strike a better balance between providing appropriate benefits for injured workers and ensuring the costs incurred by employers are reasonable.

The bill maintains access to common law damages, except for minor injuries. For injuries occurring from today, a worker will be required to have a permanent impairment of greater than five per cent, using nationally agreed assessment guidelines based on the AMA 5th edition, in order to lodge a common law damages claim. Every injured worker who has their claim for compensation accepted by WorkCover Queensland will continue—to be covered under the statutory no-fault workers compensation system, including access to weekly compensation for lost earnings until a worker's injury is stable and stationary; payment of approved medical treatment; access to rehabilitation and return-to-work services and lump sum compensation for permanent impairment.

In 2009-10 the board of WorkCover Queensland, under former chairman Ian Brusasco, recommended that the government introduce a 10 per cent to 15 per cent threshold on common law claims. Under our proposed changes, we believe we have the balance right in implementing a five per cent common law threshold. Since 2010, the number of lower-end common law claims has remained constant or increased in certain work related impairment bands, which is of significant concern to the government. These claims accounted for around half the common law payouts in the scheme in 2011-12. Left unchecked, this would increase pressure in the long term on the ongoing viability of the scheme.

The government believes these claims are more appropriately dealt with through the statutory no fault system instead of through the courts. This will ensure the focus of injured workers and their employers is on rehabilitation and getting injured workers back to work as soon as it is safe for them to do so. This will also be strengthened as a result of the requirement to mandatorily refer injured workers to an accredited return-to-work program to facilitate improved return-to-work outcomes and minimise the injured worker's future economic loss. It should be noted that the statutory claim process is far more efficient than that of a common law claim.

The structure of Queensland's Workers Compensation Scheme is currently the most complex in Australia. The scheme operates under three separate agencies which increases duplication, ambiguity of roles and, ultimately, scheme costs. To simplify the scheme, the bill proposes to merge the Workers Compensation Regulatory Authority, Q-Comp, into the Office of Fair and Safe Work Queensland in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. This will be a seamless transition that by no means illustrates any concerns with the performance of Q-Comp but rather signifies the government's intention to reduce confusion in the community and simplify the structure of the current system.

The merging of the workers compensation scheme regulator with the electrical safety and work health and safety regulator will provide economies of scale and go towards developing a more integrated corporate identity regulating injury prevention, injury management, claims management and return-to-work services. Under the new structure, regulatory independence from WorkCover will be maintained and WorkCover will continue to act as the sole provider of workers compensation insurance to Queensland employers. The Q-Comp board will continue to operate and provide policy advice for the regulator until the term of the current board expires on 30 June 2014. This will help oversee the structural transition.

The bill will increase the onus on workers to prove psychiatric and psychological disorders are work related. Workers will have to satisfy insurers that their employment was 'the most' significant contributing factor to the injury or aggravation in order to be compensated.

The bill will also empower employers to further reduce workplace injuries by tailoring work health and safety procedures for individual workers. This will be achieved by allowing employers to request potential workers to disclose pre-existing injuries that could reasonably be aggravated by performing the duties of employment and to allow access to a prospective worker's claims history—no different to other insurance schemes across Australia.

The government also listened to the concerns of business over the potential for fraudulent claims. It is proposed to further increase the penalties for defrauding or attempting to defraud insurers under the scheme and will bring them in line with penalties in other jurisdictions. The bill also closes a potential loophole caused by *Foster & Anor v Cameron* by ensuring that a court cannot award damages for domestic services that are provided gratuitously to a worker by his or her family or household and to prevent a worker converting gratuitous services received prior to trial into paid services after trial.

Workers compensation is not about workplace entitlements; it is an insurance scheme paid by employers to compensate injured workers and help them get back to work. To that end, I want to see WorkCover and self-insurers in the Queensland scheme have a stronger focus on return-to-work outcomes. Getting injured workers back to work is good for the worker and good for the employer.

Having a competitive premium will encourage more investment into our great state of Queensland, which means more jobs for Queenslanders. It is not good enough for us to simply settle for second best. We want to maintain the Queensland scheme as the best performing scheme in Australia and to be the envy of every other state and territory. The changes I have outlined in the bill will ensure that we will once again lead the nation by having the best scheme that focuses on injury management, rehabilitation and return-to-work outcomes for injured workers and a reduction in premium for employers. We believe we have the balance right. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.15 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; Allocation of Time Limit Order

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.15 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 137 the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill to enable the bill to be passed through its remaining stages at this week's sitting.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (12.16 pm): I rise to oppose the motion put forward by the Attorney-General. This is another example of this government's callous approach to attempt to govern this state. We know that they have run roughshod over the committee system time and time again, but never has there been a more blatant example of it than going over the top of a committee which was given a task to look at the workers compensation scheme here in Queensland and which, quite frankly, has been ignored.

Every one of recommendations that were put forward were put forward on the basis of submissions that had come before the committee—more than 240 submissions and more than 13 public hearings. Again and again this Attorney-General suggests that he knows better than all of those people who submitted. He thinks he knows better than people who have been involved in this field for decades. He thinks he knows better than everyone else in the entire world it seems.

This is completely disappointing. Introducing legislation to strip workers of their rights to workers compensation is a slap in the face to this parliament. It is a slap in the face to the MPs of both sides of politics who gave very clear instructions as to what they thought the changes should be. It is a slap in the face, as we said, to the committee and to all of those people who have put forward recommendations and suggestions.

The member for Coomera did a stellar job of chairing this committee, and it is very important to note that this committee presented a report that was unanimous. There was no dissenting report and no statement of reservations. It was a report that was talked through at length carefully. It was very carefully looked at to ensure that we as a committee got the balance right. This again is another approach by this government to destroy any semblance of an independent committee system here in this state.

Let us just recap for a moment. We have the best workers compensation scheme in the country for now. But unfortunately what is now fair and sustainable—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Manager of Opposition Business ought not be prosecuting the issue. The issue at hand is the urgent debate. That is what he should be debating, not the issue of debate but the actual urgency of the debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! I ask the Manager of Opposition Business to address his comments to the urgency of the debate.

Mr PITT: Yet again, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Attorney-General shows that he does not want anyone having an alternative point of view so I will confine my comments to the urgency motion.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk: You had your go.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Manager of Opposition Business has the call.

Mr PITT: It is very clear that Queenslanders have a concern about this particular minister—this Attorney-General's approach to the committee system and his so-called urgency motions on plenty of bills. If anyone deserves more scrutiny, if anyone deserves the fine detail of what is being proposed to be gone through in greater detail, it is this Attorney-General. This is all about making sure that this is not a rushed job. We know what is coming. There are going to be other bills introduced today which will not only be rushed through this sitting of parliament but we understand will be rushed through today.

This response is all about this government's agenda and no correspondence will be entered into. No wonder it is becoming known as the know-it-all Newman government. The reason there is a committee system and why we should not be pushing urgency motions through all the time is quite simply because scrutiny of legislation is important. Alternative points of view are important. The urgency motion before the House is about this Attorney-General's ability to slip through the cracks, to try to pretend that he should not be held up to the same level of accountability as other people. Quite frankly, he is a disgrace. He should hang his head in shame. This legislation should be given more airing, as should the other legislation which we expect will be introduced today. Quite frankly, this Attorney-General is not listening. He has not listened to what ReachTEL polls have said about the number of people who support—

Mr Bleijie: Ha, ha!

Mr PITT: He has not listened to what people have said in this state about making sure we have a fair and equitable workers compensation scheme. Let me be very clear: in terms of this legislation we will not be debating what is contained in it because we want a chance to have a look at it. Mind you, we will not have the opportunity to dissect it as much as we would otherwise do if this was not being pushed through as an urgency motion. I will say this: any future Labor government will reverse any of the changes being proposed by this absolutely disgraceful Attorney-General. People should be left in no uncertain terms that this opposition will be opposing this every single step of the way.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.22 pm): I take note of the objections raised by the Manager of Opposition Business. The Manager of Opposition Business talks a lot about the committee process. This was one of the first issues that went to a parliamentary committee, and the parliamentary committee had nine months to deliberate. It then had an extension. This House gave it an extension of three months so it had a 12-month inquiry. We had nearly 300 submissions. The reason this government wants it dealt with this week is we believe there has been sufficient time for debate and scrutiny. We are simply now responding to the committee report. The parliamentary committee did a 12-month investigation and inquiry. The Manager of Opposition Business, in his own words, said there were 13 public hearings. We think there has been sufficient time for debate over the last 12 months. The government has not rushed its response. We have had the report for a few months and we have looked at it very carefully. We have taken into account the views of all sides and all issues, and we think we have the balance right. That is why we believe the government is in a position to be able to legislate now having formed the opinion—

Mr Pitt interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Attorney-General.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. If the Labor Party had its way, a government would never achieve anything in a three-year term because it would introduce legislation and everything would get bumped off to committees. We need to recognise that there have been 12 months of deliberations on this very issue by a parliamentary committee, 300 submissions and a committee report which we are now responding to. The legislative response that I tabled today is, in fact—surprise, surprise—in line with the government's response to the committee. It is no surprise. If members saw the press that I did this morning, the government's position is quite clear. We believe we have the balance right. That is why we think the processes should be in place.

The Manager of Opposition Business raised the criminal motorcycle gang legislation being introduced today. Wake up; it is no surprise. I announced two weeks ago that we would be introducing legislation. It will not be going to a committee process because we want to deal with the issue today. That is why for this particular bill it is urgent. We are going to have these laws reformed this week because we believe there has been sufficient time for all interested parties to have their say on this very important issue.

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

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

NOES, 13—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Hopper, Judge, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Debate, on motion of Mr Pitt, adjourned.

FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 6 August (see p. 2298).

Second Reading

 **Hon. GW ELMES** (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (12.33 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Health and Community Services Committee for its consideration of the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013. I note that the committee has recommended that the bill be passed. The bill seeks to amend the provisions of the Family Responsibilities Commission Act so that the FRC can continue to operate until 1 January 2015. The Family Responsibilities Commission is an independent statutory authority established under the act. It constitutes a commissioner, a deputy commissioner and local commissioners. The act is currently due to expire on 1 January 2014.

The FRC is the centrepiece of the Cape York Welfare Reform, which operates in the four communities of Aurukun, Hope Vale, Coen and Mossman Gorge. The state government has previously extended Cape York Welfare Reform to 31 January 2014. Cape York Welfare Reform was introduced in 2008 to address high levels of entrenched welfare dependency, economic exclusion and social dysfunction. It aims to restore local authority and social norms and move people from unemployment into jobs and from social housing into homeownership. Operating as a tripartite arrangement between the Queensland and Australian governments and the Cape York institute, the Cape York Welfare Reform provides services and opportunities to residents in the four communities. The act enables the FRC to make case plans and order that community residents who have been subject to a notification attend support services. Where community members do not comply with an order to attend a service or a direction of the FRC, the FRC can order that 60 or 75 per cent of a person's welfare payments are managed.

The act enables the FRC to hold conferences with community residents who are in receipt of welfare payments and who have been the subject of an agency notice. After the conference the FRC can make a number of decisions including to enter into a family responsibilities agreement and require community residents to attend community support services. The FRC is able to enter into an agreement with the community resident so that their welfare payments are income managed as part of a family responsibilities agreement. The FRC can also order that the client's welfare payments are income managed without their agreement.

Community members have advised independent evaluators that income management helped people to manage their money and meet the needs of their family as well as reducing the amount of money spent on alcohol and drugs. Where a community member does not comply with a case plan to attend community support services, the FRC can issue a show-cause notice. As a result of the show-cause process, the FRC can order an increase in the period of time that a person's income is managed or an increase in the proportion of welfare to be managed.

The Queensland government is working with our federal counterparts to ensure that the Commonwealth Social Security (Administration) Act 1999 is updated to enable the commission to continue using income management as a key initiative. Extensive consultations were conducted with the four Cape York Welfare Reform communities and other key stakeholders before the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill was introduced into the parliament. There is widespread support for extending the Cape York Welfare Reform and the FRC for an additional year. Support came from all quarters, including this year the Hope Vale Aboriginal Shire Council, which had previously opposed Cape York Welfare Reform and the FRC. During consultations, community members indicated that their communities have become quieter and that things are better. The FRC has been instrumental in the progress made in the welfare reform communities and restoring local authority. The FRC local commissioners have been at the forefront of this change. As respected members and elders of their communities, local commissioners have supported community members to take responsibility for their families and children.

The independent evaluation of Cape York Welfare Reform found that the local commissioners have been instrumental in tackling antisocial behaviour and rebuilding Indigenous authority. As noted in the evaluation, their role in listening, guiding and supporting community members before ordering income management appears to have had a positive impact on changing behaviours and restoring social norms.

As I noted previously, one of the aims of Cape York welfare is to restore local authority, and a key part of this was through appointing local commissioners. When the FRC commenced, decisions could only be made at a conference constituted by the FRC commissioner and two local commissioners. Over time, the FRC local commissioners have built their skills and experience in conferencing and decision making. In 2010 the act was changed to enable three local commissioners to convene a conference with a community member in the absence of the commissioner where income management is unlikely to be ordered. The three local commissioners are able to enter into a family responsibilities agreement and make other decisions including to direct a person to attend community support services through a case plan.

In 2011-12 local commissioners independently conducted 67 conferences in the absence of FRC commissioner David Glasgow. Mr Glasgow has indicated that some local commissioners have significantly developed and should now be able to convene a conference and propose an income management decision. An amendment to the bill today will enable the commissioner to appoint three local commissioners to convene a conference in his absence with the authority to propose that the client's welfare payments are income managed. The commissioner will review the proposal and approve the additional income management order. The amendment will strengthen the leadership role played by local commissioners within their communities and represents a further step forward towards restoring local authority.

The Newman government is committed to alleviating the disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders across so many aspects of life. We are committed to doing that in conjunction with Indigenous people and their elected representatives at all levels of government through responsible programs, services and actions. Welfare payments and other government services such as social housing are not the answer to alleviate Indigenous disadvantage. The Newman government's Indigenous agenda is focused on ensuring that state government programs and funding are directed towards improving the stability and sustainability of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

Since the beginning of the trial in 2008 to 31 December 2013, the Australian and Queensland governments have invested more than \$100 million in Cape York welfare reform. While there is no clear agreement on outcomes, there are indications that Cape York welfare reform has been responsible for a number of improvements in communities. This government wants to see that sort of improvement continue in all discrete Indigenous communities. The aim of the welfare reform trial was always, as the name suggests, to trial options for increasing sustainability in communities and reducing their reliance on welfare.

The Newman government is looking to find practical support mechanisms for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to improve the lives of individuals and families. My department and I have been meeting with welfare reform trial partners throughout this year to identify what form the program should take during the 12-month extension. The challenge is to establish the next phase by creating further genuine economic opportunities to maintain the momentum of change in the welfare

reform communities and spread benefits to other communities. In the many conversations that I have had with Noel Pearson and the Cape York institute, we agree that everything about Cape York welfare must be directed towards the creation of jobs and economic opportunities in discrete communities.

I want to ensure that we take the best from the trial and extend those elements to other discrete Indigenous communities over time as far as possible. I have also spoken with all the mayors to involve them in the process of devising longer term initiatives coming out of the welfare reform trial. Many Cape York councils have publicly expressed the wish for all communities to have the opportunity to share in the benefits of such initiatives. It was always the intention that what has been learned from the trial should be applied to benefit all Indigenous communities, and that remains the intention of this government.

I stated earlier this year that Cape York Welfare Reform could not continue in the same state as it was in 2013. That is why, in recommitting a further \$5.65 million to continue the trial in 2014, we are implementing key changes to the program. These changes respond to outcomes from the trial to date and involve service delivery efficiency. Economic participation, homeownership and initiatives to support disengaged young people have been identified as areas requiring further attention. These priorities are now the focus of work with the Cape York institute and the federal government to improve welfare reform in 2014. In addition, the following efficiencies will be delivered: a reduction in the annual program operation costs from \$2.5 million to \$800,000; and a reduction in the number of public servants supporting Cape York Welfare Reform from 16 in early 2012 to six in the 2013-14 financial year.

I am also keen to see how Cape York Welfare Reform will fit in with the empowered communities proposal led by Mr Noel Pearson and supported by the federal government. If there are two things that I have learned in my time as Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs, they are that community improvement can only occur with community support and self-belief; and there are no easy answers. As we continue to learn what works and what does not, this government is keen to explore future options for expanding aspects of welfare reform into other communities. During the next 12 months I am looking forward to making real progress in identifying how we can best help Indigenous communities help themselves. As I travel around the communities I detect the positive desire to see improvement not only in the four trial communities, but in other communities as well and the determination of community leaders to see it materialise. However, that optimism is tempered by the realisation that in many cases isolation and historic disadvantage mitigate against quick change. No-one underestimates the size of the challenge.

My expectation is that this bill will facilitate continued improvement in the four communities where the Family Responsibilities Commission operates. In doing so we will continue to gain valuable information about how we can work with Indigenous communities to adapt the benefits which have come out of Cape York Welfare Reform for the betterment of Indigenous people right across the state. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (12.45 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013. The bill which we debate today was introduced by the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs on Tuesday, 6 August 2013 and was promptly referred to the Queensland Parliament's Health and Community Services Committee for scrutiny and public consultation. I would like to take this opportunity to thank members of the Health and Community Services Committee for their deliberations on the bill and recommending that the bill be passed without amendment. I also would like to thank the committee's hardworking secretariat, led by research director Ms Sue Cawcutt, who worked tirelessly behind the scenes to ensure that the legislation that comes before this House has been properly scrutinised in an appropriate manner.

This bill is similar to a previous bill that we have already debated in this session of parliament, namely, the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2012, which was introduced into this House on 12 September 2012 and passed on 1 November 2012. That bill, like this bill, extends the conclusion date of the Family Responsibilities Commission by one year. As the minister has already stated, this bill will officially extend the expiry date of the Family Responsibilities Commission to 1 January 2015 and makes consequential amendments to the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 by aligning the cessation of the office of commissioner and/or board members to be deemed vacant on the new expiration date of 1 January 2015 and aligns the ceasing of Family Responsibilities Commission orders to 1 January 2015.

This is an important piece of legislation, just like the piece of legislation introduced over 12 months ago, as it allows the commission to continue its important and vital work in our remote Queensland communities. I will not traverse the grounds of the purpose and structure of the commission as I previously have in this place. Having overseen this area when I was a minister in the former government, I know that this is a very important area which needs to continue to have the support of both sides of politics to ensure that we can get the best learnings out of this and continue to build stronger, more resilient communities, particularly the trial communities.

I would, however, like to spend some time talking about the successes of the commission, which is the reason for the extension. At the recent Queensland Parliament Estimates Committee on 24 July 2013, the Family Responsibilities Commissioner, Mr David Glasgow, spoke of the successes of his commission and in particular the recent survey that was undertaken. Mr Glasgow stated—

Of those people surveyed, 77 per cent felt that things were better because people were willing to put effort into making their community better; 54 per cent of the people felt that their lives were on the way up; 51 per cent felt the FRC had made leadership in the community stronger; 65 per cent of the community members surveyed felt people should go to the FRC if they were not sending their children to school; and 69 per cent of those surveyed felt that if people did not spend their money on reasonable household expenses, they should be given a BasicsCard.

The commissioner went on to state that 'school attendance has increased considerably during the period' of the commission's operation. I would just like to touch on that for a moment, because school attendance continues to be one of the key challenges, not only in the welfare reform trial communities, but certainly across a range of discrete Aboriginal communities in Queensland.

It is one of the key areas of focus of this government, I know, and certainly was for the previous government. It is one of the most important areas to make a difference and to see that generational change we are all trying to achieve in these communities. These comments by the commissioner just go to show that the commission, since its establishment in 2008, has worked and is making positive inroads in the community. That is the reason it should be continued.

As I said in this House in November last year, I believe that the commission has achieved a positive result in the four remote communities and I concur with the commissioner's statements at the recent estimates hearing, at which he stated—

There are other challenges ahead, but overall I would think, having looked at the evaluation, the charge that we were given back in 2008 has been complied with.

Whilst I support this legislation and I continue to have a strong working relationship with the minister, I cannot let this occasion pass without reminding the House of the contradiction we saw certainly during the estimates process and certainly in the media releases when we last looked at extending this particular trial. I certainly concur with the commissioner's statement and believe in the commissioner's successes as a whole, but it is questionable whether the minister does. It was only a few months ago, on 27 March, that the minister issued a media release entitled 'Cape York Welfare Reform Trial' in which he announced that funding would no longer continue. It stated—

... the Cape York Welfare Reform trial will end on 31 December 2013.

I table that media release for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 27 March 2013, from the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier, Hon. Glen Elmes, titled 'Cape York Welfare Reform Trial' [\[3735\]](#).

But less than 24 hours later there was what could only be described as a monumental, first-class backflip by this policy-on-the-run Newman LNP government, with a further media release issued not by the minister but by the Premier. This media release, issued by the Premier on 28 March, was titled 'Cape York Welfare Reform Trial Extended'. I table that media release for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 28 March 2013, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, titled 'Cape York Welfare Reform Trial extended' [\[3736\]](#).

As I read the media release I see no mention of the minister. Indeed, the Deputy Premier, the Treasurer and the Attorney-General are all listed as members of the Cabinet Budget Review Committee who made the decision to continue the trial's funding, but there is no mention at all of the minister responsible. It begs the question: was the minister involved in the decision to backflip and re-fund the trial or was he overturned by the Premier without consultation? What I would like to believe is that the minister was doing as he was told originally by the Premier and was then told to be the scapegoat for the Premier's own backflip. I will give the minister some credit and say that that may have been the way things went down. Either way, it just goes to show that this Newman LNP government is just enacting policy on the run, one day axing funding to a vital cause and the next

changing its opinion and funding it, without input or public comment by the responsible minister. But I stress that it is a positive that the government came to its senses eventually and continued funding to the Cape York Welfare Reform trial.

Finally, I turn to the erratum to the explanatory notes that was issued on Thursday, 10 October 2013. It inserts two words into the original explanatory notes tabled on 6 August 2013, when the former federal government—a Labor government—was in power. This erratum inserted the words ‘up to’ in relation to the Australian government’s contribution to the continuation of the Family Responsibilities Commission. The notes originally stated—

Of these allocations, the State Government will contribute \$1.6 million and the Australian Government \$2 million towards the FRC’s operations from 1 January 2014 to 1 January 2015.

It has been changed to—

Of these allocations, the State Government will contribute \$1.6 million and the Australian Government up to \$2 million towards the FRC’s operations from 1 January 2014 to 1 January 2015.

There may be a logical explanation for this—it may have simply been a typographical error—but one would think this error would have been picked up sooner. Or it could be the start of a wave of cuts by the federal Abbott coalition government. It is certainly a change in direction that had not been flagged. No doubt the federal government will be embarking on a range of cuts that it has already identified—vital funds from vital projects which aid and support the most marginalised members of our community. I ask the minister to provide a response to my question in his reply to the debate. I hope that he will be able to provide a response in relation to the technical wording, if indeed it was only technical wording.

It goes without saying that the Labor opposition will be supporting this important legislation because it extends the great work of the Family Responsibilities Commission, which was established by a Labor government. I take this opportunity to thank Commissioner Glasgow, who was appointed on 25 April 2008 and has discharged his duties with distinction. Of course, the commissioner cannot achieve the great results of the commission without the assistance of his deputy, Rod Curtin, and all of the local commissioners in each region and the staff of the Family Responsibilities Commission. I wish the commissioner, the deputy commissioner, local commissioners and staff all the best for the coming year as they continue to build on the successes achieved to date. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr RUTHENBERG** (Kallangur—LNP) (12.55 pm): The primary purpose of this bill is to extend the operation of the Family Responsibilities Commission for a further 12 months, to 1 January 2015. My committee recommends that this bill be passed.

Many members and Queenslanders may not be fully aware of what the FRC does or its history. The FRC is a statutory body established under the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 and has two objectives: to support the restoration of socially responsible standards of behaviour and local authority in welfare reform community areas; and to help people in welfare reform community areas to resume primary responsibility for the wellbeing of their community and the individuals and family of the community. The amendments the minister has recommended will help to support and accomplish these objectives.

The core objectives of the FRC include safeguarding and restoring child safety, school attendance, lawful behaviour and responsible tenancy. The FRC plays a key role in the Cape York Welfare Reform trial, which seeks to restore social norms and local Indigenous authority in the communities of Aurukun, Coen, Hope Vale and Mossman Gorge. Indigenous and non-Indigenous people who are living in these communities and receiving welfare or Community Development Employment Projects payments are within the responsibility of the FRC. This jurisdiction continues if the individual relocates from the community.

The Community Development Employment Projects program helps Indigenous job seekers to gain the skills, training and capabilities needed to find sustainable employment and improves the economic and social wellbeing of communities. The program provides services and projects through two streams—the work readiness stream and the community development stream.

Under the FRC Act the Family Responsibilities Commissioner can conduct conferences when a welfare recipient in one of the communities has a child who is not enrolled in school or meeting designated school attendance requirements, has come to the attention of the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services for a child safety matter, is convicted of an offence in the Magistrates Court, or is in breach of a social housing tenancy agreement.

On behalf of the committee I acknowledge the difficult task the FRC has been charged with and that, by the nature of its work, its results will vary. Our observation is that generally the FRC is doing very good work and its efforts are showing real improvement in the communities it works in. We acknowledge the pivotal role the local commissioners have played in the operation of the FRC and their efforts to try to restore socially responsible standards of behaviour and local authority within the community. I also acknowledge the leadership of the commissioner, Mr David Glasgow, and I wish to thank him for his efforts. My committee will be visiting the FRC toward the end of November, and I look forward to spending time with and listening to the commissioner and his commissioners. This is a good bill and I support it.

 **Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (12.59 pm): I rise to give support to this simple amendment, which extends the Cape York Welfare Reform trial a further year, through to 1 January 2015. The townships of Aurukun, Hope Vale, Coen and Mossman Gorge have had this trial in place since its commencement in 2008. The program aims to restore social norms, improve local authority and improve educational and economic outcomes. The planned extension will allow consolidation of effort and see the gains as reported in the report on the Cape York Welfare Reform trial in March, extended for a further year.

Programs delivered either directly or through third-party providers include: Ending Family Violence, raising awareness of domestic violence and its impacts upon families; MPower and Family Income Management, which increases financial literacy and modifies behaviour for asset growth and secure futures; a parenting program based on PPP, extending the thought 'it takes a village to raise a child'; and student case management, to increase attendance at schools, which is where we know with certainty that the framework for functional societal standards can be established, nurtured and practised to ensure they are the norms of behaviour in communities into the future.

Debate, on motion of Mr Shuttleworth, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

VICIOUS LAWLESS ASSOCIATION DISESTABLISHMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.30 pm): I present a bill for an act for the purpose of disestablishing vicious lawless associations. I table the bill and explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013 [\[3737\]](#).

Tabled paper: Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [\[3738\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013. This bill is part of a package of measures the Newman government is introducing to tackle organised crime in Queensland. The bill aims to create a new act that will:

- disestablish associations that encourage, foster or support persons who commit serious offences;
- increase public safety and security by the disestablishment of the associations; and
- deny to persons who commit serious offences the assistance and support gained from association with other persons who participate in the affairs of the association.

These aims will be achieved by:

- imposing significant terms of imprisonment for vicious lawless associates who commit declared offences;
- removing the possibility of parole for vicious lawless associates serving terms of imprisonment except in limited circumstances; and
- encouraging vicious lawless associates to cooperate with law enforcement agencies in the investigation and prosecution of serious criminal activity.

The new act will apply to people who participate in the affairs of associations and who commit declared offences for the purposes of or in the course of participating in the affairs of the relevant association. The intention is to characterise persons as vicious lawless associates who belong to

associations which encourage, support or foster the commission of offences and who are, therefore, persons who commit offences as part of their membership activities. A vicious lawless associate will be sentenced for the declared offence but will also receive a further 15 years mandatory imprisonment, cumulative to any imprisonment imposed for the declared offence. If the vicious lawless associate was, at the time of the commission of the offence, an office-bearer of the relevant association, they will receive a further 10 years imprisonment, cumulative to the 15 years and the original term of imprisonment.

The bill makes clear that the extra punishment is mandatory and cannot be reduced by the sentencing court. Further, parole will not apply to the extra punishment unless the associate cooperates with the police and other law enforcement agencies. This lever to induce informants to cooperate is a very important part of the punishment regime. An offender will only be able to mitigate his or her sentence via section 13A of the Penalties and Sentences Act where the Police Commissioner is satisfied that the cooperation will be of significant use in a proceeding about a declared offence. This will ensure that only effective cooperation is rewarded. Especially for recent recruits, where a gang member is facing an additional mandatory term of imprisonment of up to 25 years, they may well choose to become an informant. This will be an important mechanism for destroying these gangs as it will drive a wedge into the membership so that morale is broken. Codes of silence and oaths of loyalty are fractured when it becomes clear that some of those being protected by silence have sold out. The mandatory terms of imprisonment will also make it less attractive for criminals to be part of these gangs and will enhance community safety by providing for the severe punishment for serious offending.

A review of the provisions contained in the new Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Act will occur three years after commencement. It is imperative that this bill be passed as a matter of urgency to ensure the public is protected from the serious criminal activities of criminal associations. I commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.34 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.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

TATTOO PARLOURS BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.34 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for the licensing and regulation of body art tattooing businesses and body art tattooists and other related matters and to amend the Liquor Act 1992 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013 [[3739](#)].

Tabled paper: Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013, explanatory notes [[3740](#)].

I am pleased to introduce the Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013. As part of a package of measures the government is introducing to tackle organised crime in Queensland, the government has made a commitment to ban members of criminal organisations from owning, operating or working in body art tattoo parlours. The principal objective of the bill is to introduce a new occupational licensing and regulatory framework which eliminates and prevents infiltration of the Queensland tattoo industry by criminal organisations, including criminal motorcycle gangs and their associates. The act that will be created as a result of the Tattoo Parlours Bill is very similar to legislation that was recently passed in New South Wales after a number of drive-by shootings, fire bombings and violence that had occurred at tattoo parlours linked to criminal motorcycle gangs.

Under the new scheme, people will be prohibited from conducting a body art tattooing business or from performing a body art tattooing procedure, with certain limited exceptions, without the authority of a licence or permit. Licence applicants will be required to satisfy strict identification requirements and as part of the application process will be required to provide their finger and palm prints. The bill allows the Commissioner of Police to conduct investigations into licence applicants and licensees and their associates to ensure that only fit and proper persons are granted and able to hold licences and that granting a licence would not be contrary to the public interest. Unlicensed trading will result in penalties of up to 18 months imprisonment. The provisions of the bill will primarily be enforced by the Queensland Police Service. The new act will be a vital tool in ensuring that the stranglehold criminal motorcycle gangs have over the tattoo industry in Queensland is broken. The new act will commence by proclamation, with the licensing scheme commencing on 6 January 2014 and the compliance provisions to commence on 1 July 2014.

The bill also amends the Liquor Act 1992 to prohibit members of criminal motorcycle gangs from wearing or displaying material associated with criminal motorcycle gangs while in liquor licensed venues and within areas prescribed by regulation. These violent gangs use their symbols to intimidate others and without these symbols the gang members become just ordinary thugs. Preventing gang members from wearing or displaying material associated with their gang is another tool that may be used to break the gang mentality and mitigate some of the risks arising out of physical confrontations between rival gangs. The amendments to the Liquor Act 1992 will commence on assent.

A review of the provisions contained in the proposed Tattoo Parlours Act and other provisions inserted by the bill will occur three years after commencement. As part of a second phase of reforms, other acts will be amended so that licences are refused to individuals who QPS advise are members of criminal motorcycle gangs. The urgent passage of this bill is paramount to ensuring the community is protected from the activities of criminal motorcycle gangs and the streets of Queensland are once again safe for everyone. I commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.38 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.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.38 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1980, the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001, the Criminal Code, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Tow Truck Act 1973 for particular purposes, to make a regulation under the Criminal Code and to amend the Crime and Misconduct Regulation 2005 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013 [\[3741\]](#).

Tabled paper: Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [\[3742\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013. After a violent confrontation between two criminal motorcycle gangs recently occurring in Broadbeach, the government vowed that we would act swiftly and decisively to ensure the community is protected from these vicious, violent thugs.

The bill amends the Criminal Code by inserting new offences and circumstances of aggravation for existing offences that target the members of criminal organisations. An additional limb will be added to the definition of 'criminal organisation' in the Criminal Code so that criminal organisations that are prescribed by regulation are captured.

The bill will create three new offences aimed at preventing members of criminal motorcycle gangs from gathering in groups or at prescribed locations and promoting or recruiting for their organisation. The maximum penalty for these offences will be three years imprisonment but they will carry a mandatory minimum penalty of six months imprisonment. The current maximum penalty for the offence of affray will be increased from one year imprisonment to seven years where the offence is committed by a member of a criminal motorcycle gang. This offence will carry a mandatory minimum penalty of six months imprisonment. Any vehicle used before, during or after the commission of these four offences will be confiscated and then crushed on conviction. A mandatory three-year licence disqualification will also attach to these four offences. Criminal motorcycle gang members will face a mandatory penalty of one year imprisonment for serious assaults on police officers.

The bill also amends the Bail Act 1980 so that there is a presumption against bail for criminal motorcycle gang members and they will be forced to surrender their passport if bail is granted. Let us make it clear: this government believes members or associates of criminal motorcycle gangs should be in jail and not get bail. The bill will double the penalty for criminal motorcycle gang members who evade police to 100 penalty units or 100 days imprisonment and will provide for mandatory confiscation and crushing of any vehicle used before, during or after the commission of the offence.

The bill will amend the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 to enhance police powers to stop and search persons or vehicles without a warrant where the police officer suspects the person is a member of a criminal motorcycle gang. The bill will amend the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001 to give additional powers to the Crime and Misconduct Commission—the CMC—and will expand the CMC's powers to allow for intelligence gathering and immediate response hearings in relation to criminal motorcycle gangs; allow for the use of any information gained in CMC hearings for proceedings under the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002; clarify that fear of retribution is no longer a reasonable excuse for refusing to give evidence to the CMC if you are a member of a criminal motorcycle gang called to attend a hearing about a criminal motorcycle gang related matter; mandate a term of imprisonment for a first contempt, 2.5 years imprisonment for a second contempt and five years imprisonment for a third contempt where the contempt relates to a refusal to take an oath, answer a question or produce a stated thing; allow a police officer of the Queensland Police Service to detain individuals pending the contempt application being brought before the court; allow a magistrate to issue warrants where people refuse to attend CMC hearings; and provide that the CMC is not obliged to provide a defendant information from a criminal motorcycle gang related intelligence hearing to assist in the defence of a criminal charge. These amendments will enhance the CMC's function as Queensland's major crime-fighting body and will assist the CMC to investigate criminal motorcycle gang related crime in Queensland more efficiently and effectively. A review of the provisions inserted by the bill will occur three years after commencement.

The reforms contained in the bill require urgent passage as they are crucial to disrupting the activities of criminal motorcycle gangs who are a serious threat to community safety in Queensland. The incident at Broadbeach on Friday two weeks ago drew a line in the sand for criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland. We said as a government, 'Enough is enough.' When criminal motorcycle gang members are so bold as to go to a restaurant or cafe at Broadbeach in front of victims and innocent individuals, we have to act tough. That is why we fully acknowledge and appreciate that the three bills that I have introduced in the Assembly this afternoon are very tough measures, but warranted in all the circumstances.

We want to rid Queensland of criminal motorcycle gang members. We want criminal motorcycle gang members to understand that the government is serious—serious enough to tackle these issues head-on, to tackle these gangs head-on with legislation and, of course, with our police and CMC. That is why it was particularly pleasing to announce, with the police minister and the Premier, the additional \$20 million in resources for the police and an additional up to \$7 million in resources for the CMC. We fully acknowledge and appreciate that the work of these two bodies will gain momentum and will grow under our new laws. But the objective of this mission is clear: to rid criminal motorcycle gang members from the streets and communities of Queensland. The only effective way that we can do that is to have these tough new measures introduced so criminal motorcycle gang members know that this government is serious. Words are not enough. Summits are not enough. Action is required. That is why these bills are being introduced today—because Queenslanders deserve nothing less than a government that will act on these matters. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.45 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.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

TATTOO PARLOURS BILL

VICIOUS LAWLESS ASSOCIATION DISESTABLISHMENT BILL

Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order; Cognate Debate

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.45 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That, under the provisions of standing order 137, the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill, the Tattoo Parlours Bill and the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill be declared urgent bills to enable the bills to be passed through their remaining stages at this week's sitting; and
2. That, under the provisions of standing order 172, these bills be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, as follows:
 - (a) separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
 - (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
 - (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.46 pm): The opposition will be opposing this urgency motion, but let me state very clearly from the outset why we are opposing this urgency motion. We believe that these laws can be passed this week and we believe that these laws can go through the committee system. Queenslanders deserve nothing less. Here is an example of an arrogant government wanting to use its massive majority—74 seats in the Queensland parliament—to ram through these laws without any scrutiny.

I have placed on the public record my desire as Leader of the Opposition with my opposition colleagues to work constructively with this government. In an act of goodwill, I personally contacted the Deputy Premier and asked for a briefing following cabinet. He gave me an undertaking that he would take that into consideration. We still do not have a briefing and today this Queensland parliament has been presented with no fewer than three bills amounting to over 160 pages of laws that this government expects to ram through tonight—not tomorrow, not on Thursday, but tonight. How can any reasonable person be expected to get across the details of this legislation in two or three hours?

This is an arrogant government that has embarked on a committee system. There is no reason whatsoever that these bills could not be referred to the committee tomorrow morning. Tomorrow morning, the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee could meet and examine these bills. Tomorrow the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee could meet and examine these bills.

I am very concerned whether the Law Society of Queensland has been consulted. I am concerned whether the Bar Association of Queensland has been consulted on these laws. I am concerned whether the Police Union has been consulted on these proposed laws. In relation to mandatory sentencing, yes, I am concerned whether the Chief Justice has been consulted in relation to these laws. If this government was open and transparent—and we know that the Premier said that he would lead an open and transparent government—what are they hiding from? Why are they bypassing the committee system? Why can these laws not go via the committee system for the scrutiny that they deserve? All we have heard over the last couple of weeks is this drip-feed into the

media about different proposals the government is considering. I am at a loss as to what stakeholders have been consulted. I am at a loss, if we are introducing—and these are the words of the Premier—the toughest laws in the world in relation to outlaw motorcycle gangs, as to why they cannot go through the committee process and why they cannot have the scrutiny that they deserve. If these are the toughest laws, what guarantee can the Attorney-General and the Premier give to this House and to the Queensland public that they will withstand any challenge in the High Court? Where is the legal advice? Will the Attorney-General table the Crown Solicitor's legal advice that these laws will stack up? Queenslanders deserve better than an arrogant government with 74 members who cannot in all honesty say, with hands on their hearts, that they are prepared to allow these laws to go through without any scrutiny whatsoever—none! Zero! The Law Society cannot have a say in relation to these amendments, the Bar Association cannot have a say and the Chief Justice cannot have a say. It is unheard of that we would not hear from these people. It is unheard of that there is no consultation. I am surprised because I thought I lived in a democracy here in Queensland. I thought that people had a right to have their say, to voice their opinions.

In relation to this urgency motion, in my act of good faith in terms of speaking to the Deputy Premier I also asked for a security briefing. I asked for a security briefing about the problems on the Gold Coast, I asked for a security briefing about why additional security was needed in a government precinct and I asked for a security briefing about why additional security was needed here at Parliament House. I was denied that briefing. Why am I denied that briefing? This government, if it was open and transparent, would be allowed to let the Leader of the Opposition know what are the issues that are leading this government to ram through these laws.

The Queensland public has a right to know why this violence on the Gold Coast has escalated over the last 18 months of the LNP government. Who has been left in charge? This rests solely with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. This has happened on his watch. This is a government that has said that it would allow an extra 100 police in the Gold Coast region. Did the Gold Coast get those 100 police? My understanding is that most of those people went to Logan, not to the Gold Coast.

In conclusion I want to make it very clear that the member for Kawana, now the Attorney-General of this state, stood in this chamber in 2009 and talked about the civil liberties of bikies. That is what you did. You got up in this House and talked about the civil liberties of bikies.

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I ask you to address your comments through the chair and refrain from using the term 'you'.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has strayed dramatically away from the urgency motion that she should be talking to. She has actually started to debate the bills already.

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I ask you to address the motion.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Once again I reiterate that there is no reason that these laws cannot be tested through the scrutiny of the committee system tomorrow and be passed by the end of the week. We have no opposition to the passing of these laws this week, but we believe they deserve the scrutiny that Queenslanders expect. I am still at a loss as to when I am getting a briefing.

Mr Bleijie: At three o'clock.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Here we have the arrogant Attorney-General saying, 'You can have a briefing at three o'clock.'

Mr Bleijie: It has been organised. Your office has not told you.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is absolutely disgraceful. Let us go through these laws. The Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill is amending how many laws in this state? And you want to ram that through tonight? I cannot get over the name of this one: the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill. Who won the award in cabinet for coming up with that name? And the Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013, once again amending more acts and saying it is similar to New South Wales legislation. This is a disgrace when this Attorney-General talked about the civil liberties of bikies and now it is all rhetoric. This crisis has happened under your watch. It has happened under this LNP government.

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I ask you to address the motion before the House.

Ms PALASZCZUK: In conclusion, what happened on the Gold Coast in Broadbeach is completely and utterly unacceptable. All Queenslanders would agree with that. But we need to get these laws right. They should not be rushed through without proper scrutiny of the committee system and without scrutiny by the opposition. This government, with its 74-seat majority, is arrogant and out of touch. It is arrogant to the extreme and the democratic process is being subverted by this government. It is disgraceful that you want to come into this House, pass an urgency motion at 10 to three and then expect a debate to occur tonight. It is absolutely disgraceful and each and every one of you should hang your head in shame.

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I would ask you to address your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I notice the Deputy Premier smirking. They talked about the civil liberties of bikies back in 2009 and condemned the Labor government's bill at the time, the Criminal Organisation Bill. I just have one thing to ask this arrogant LNP government: what do you actually stand for? How can you be so hypocritical as to come into this chamber after you voted against the Criminal Organisation Bill in 2009?

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I ask you to address your comments through the chair and refrain from using the term 'you' and follow the normal procedures.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We will be opposing this motion because we believe that this bill needs to go through the scrutiny of the parliamentary process. That is what Queenslanders expect. That is what Queenslanders deserve. This is an arrogant government that is out of touch and using its numbers to rush through laws without the due consideration of the committee process.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (2.59 pm): I rise to speak to the urgency motion. These are very significant pieces of legislation; as the Attorney-General has said, probably equal to many in the world and at least the most stringent in Australia. Each of us in our electorates has had feedback, due to media statements, from ordinary motorbike riders concerned with how their rights and liberties may be impacted. I believe, as the previous speaker has said, that they do need to get passed as a matter of importance and definitely passed this week given the escalation of activity within the state and particularly in the south-east corner. I, however, would like to have time to get advice. The government has the numbers. Therefore, if it is going to be debated tonight it just concertinas the amount of time we have to get advice.

I would like to say on the record that to accuse the current government of arrogance and pushing through laws because of its numbers is a little bit 'glass house'. I can remember that in the past few years a number of issues were pushed through as urgent without adequate review and debate. Both major parties have been guilty of that. I put on the record my request for a little bit of extra time that would still see these bills go through the parliament this week, but would also allow us some time to get advice on what is particularly stringent new legislation.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.00 pm), in reply: The opposition leader raised a few issues. She asked: why the urgency? It is because two weeks ago 15 Bandidos bikies attended a Broadbeach cafe, threatened people and had a brawl in public. That explains the urgency for this legislation. There is no other way that we can explain clearly why this type of legislation is required urgently. Fifty Bandido bikies walked into a cafe and dragged out two people. Not only did they do that but also they intimidated police officers by attending the watch-house afterwards because a couple of the Bandidos had been taken into custody. That is why the government is acting in the way that it is. Queenslanders want action on this. Queenslanders want decisive action to deal with the criminal motorcycle gangs. Over the past two weeks we have announced a series of reforms with respect to dealing with criminal motorcycle gangs. The culmination of those announcements is in the three pieces of legislation before the House today.

The honourable opposition leader talked about not being briefed; about not having a briefing organised. I can advise her that my office has organised a briefing. The problem with the opposition leader debating this motion is that we are already two minutes into the briefing, which she is missing. We organised a briefing for three o'clock and it started a couple of minutes ago but, because of what the Leader of the Opposition has done with this motion, she is missing her briefing. We were happy to brief and we said that, in the normal course of events, once the bill is introduced into the parliament a briefing will take place. The first opportunity that we have had to brief the opposition after introducing the bill is now. I suspect the opposition leader's office is being briefed on these bills as we speak.

Let us be clear: the government has drawn a line in the sand with criminal motorcycle gangs. We are unapologetic for that. We make no apologies for our resolve to rid the state of Queensland of criminal motorcycle gangs. It is hypocrisy for the Leader of the Opposition to come in here and ask why governments rush through pieces of legislation. I can see the opposition leader smirking because she knows exactly what I am going to say. It is the smirk of guilt on the face of the opposition leader. When the Leader of the Opposition talks about rushing legislation through, I need not mention the vegetation management laws that were a dodgy deal with the Greens or the civil partnership legislation that was introduced by Andrew Fraser, the former deputy premier. I need not mention the changes to section 57 of the Criminal Code. Not only were they rushed through but also the former government recalled parliament so their corrupt mate, Gordon Nuttall, could be let off. There was a recommendation to charge and prosecute Gordon Nuttall under the Criminal Code, section 57. What the Labor Party did was to delete section 57.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order: relevance?

Madam SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I ask you to stay relevant to the motion.

Mr BLEIJIE: We are talking about urgency and the opposition leader called for examples of urgency. I am using the examples of urgency—

Mr Newman interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Premier: it was good enough for them and it is good enough now. I was talking about corrupt former minister Gordon Nuttall. Parliament was recalled and section 57 was deleted from the Criminal Code so their corrupt mate Gordon Nuttall could come back into this place as a member of parliament and not face punishment. If we are talking about urgency and debate, the opposition leader is being a bit hypocritical. Let us look at the past 20 years of Labor government rule in this state and the number of times that they brought urgent motions before the House, some of which would have been supported by the LNP in opposition and some of which were not and we were having the same debate.

This is a different issue. This is a community problem and we want the community to be part of the solution. In this state criminal motorcycle gangs are terrorising Queenslanders. They are using fear and intimidation by the bikes they ride. They are using fear and intimidation by the colours they wear and the tattoos they have. We will not stand by and allow fear and intimidation to be put into the hearts, minds and souls of Queenslanders who are the victims in the criminal motorcycle gang crime culture. We will break the culture of criminal motorcycle gangs. We will break their morale. We will crush the enterprise and we will crush the bikes. The only way we can do that effectively is to move this urgent motion to have these bills done and dusted tonight so that, by the end of this week and upon receiving Governor approval, our law enforcement agencies can go out and crush the criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland. The only question for the Leader of the Opposition is this: does she stand on the side of Queenslanders or does she stand on the stand of bikie gangs?

Mr Wellington: Why don't you introduce the bill and give us a copy?

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin, take your seat.

Mr Wellington: We haven't got a copy of the bill, Madam Speaker.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Nicklin under standing order 253A.

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

AYES, 71—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, 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.

PRIVILEGE

Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill



Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (3.13 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising.

Madam SPEAKER: I call the member for Nicklin. What is your matter of privilege?

Mr WELLINGTON: The government has just introduced three bills and had them declared urgent for debate during this sitting. I understand that there is a requirement in the standing orders that when a bill is introduced sufficient copies are made available so that members are able to peruse the bill and explanatory notes and understand the content of what is proposed. I understand that a copy of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill has not been made available to non-government members of this chamber. I ask you to please take this matter up with the Leader of the House and make sure that debate does not commence on these bills until members of the opposition and crossbenches have had a chance to get a briefing and study the bill, which has not been made available to all non-government members.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, member for the Nicklin. With regard to your matter of privilege, I am following the matter up with the Clerk. Preliminary advice is that insufficient copies of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill have been provided. We are currently following that issue up. We will resolve that as quickly as possible. Before we proceed with the next order of business, I have been advised that there are electronic copies of the bill online already.

FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3154, on motion of Mr Elmes—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (3.15 pm), continuing: Prior to the break for lunch I was discussing the programs that are available either directly or through third-party providers. I believe I was up to student case management, to increase attendance at schools, which is where we know with certainty that the framework for functional societal standards can be established, nurtured and practised to ensure they are the norms of behaviour in communities into the future. Other such programs are ones like transitional support services, which assist students with the transition into secondary boarding school. The Wellbeing Centre, which is currently operated by the Royal Flying Doctor Service, looks at the overall improvements in health and health outcomes in communities.

There is also the Cape York Welfare Reform Trial, which is undertaken in partnership with four communities to address passive dependence on welfare and re-establish social norms. Throughout the consultation process it was encouraging to note that the community of Hope Vale, which previously opposed the trial, is now supportive of the trial stating that it has had positive impacts upon their community.

As a member of the Health and Community Services Committee, with the excellent support again provided by the secretariat and the direction of the chair, the member for Kallangur, I have great pleasure in providing the House with a statement of my support for this bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge in the gallery members of the Hollywell Probus Club, who come from the great electorate of Broadwater and from the okay electorate of Southport. I call the member for Townsville.

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (3.17 pm): I rise today as a member of the Health and Community Services Committee to speak in support of the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013. The objective of the bill is to make the necessary amendments to the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 to ensure that the operations of the Family Responsibilities Commission, also known as the FRC, are extended for 12 months to 1 January 2015. The amendment bill enjoyed the unanimous support of the committee and, as we are hearing today, appears to enjoy similar support in the chamber.

Those members present about this time last year may recall me speaking to the 2012 amendment bill. My support has not shifted in the ensuing 12 months. This bill will enable continued support for the Cape York Welfare Reform Trial and it will allow further opportunity to consolidate the gains the trial has made in terms of the safety, wellbeing and welfare of the people in the trial communities, particularly the women and children.

The FRC continues to have a very positive effect on the behaviour of families, parents and wider community members, with community members seeing more children going to school. The trial has been regarded by many as a key driver for improved school attendance and school readiness in the communities and that focus on consistent school attendance and valuing education needs to continue.

We heard from the minister earlier today that the FRC has conducted some 60,000-plus conferences as it continues its good work in the Cape York region. I would also like to thank and note for the record the submission by the Family Responsibilities Commission, in particular the commissioner who is always proactive in keeping our committee updated and informed. I also thank the department and the secretariat for their work in providing the necessary research to enable the committee to so easily conduct its review.

In March this year, the Newman government approved funding of \$5.65 million to extend the trial for another 12 months through to the end of December 2014. Before extending the trial, the department undertook stakeholder and community consultations in Mossman Gorge, Coen, Hope Vale and Aurukun. All those communities have indicated their support for the trial to continue.

There are many other initiatives that the Newman government is undertaking. I would just like to point out that we have made significant progress this year in working towards removing the barriers of community residents moving from social housing to homeownership in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Residents on Palm Island, which is in my electorate, are also a step closer to owning their own home thanks to the completion of two subdivisions worth \$27.5 million. We have known for many years that there has been a severe shortage of accommodation and overcrowding in houses on Palm Island.

I was fortunate to be joined by both the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs, the Hon. Glen Elmes, and the Minister for Tourism, Jann Stuckey, on a visit to Palm Island last month where we inspected the ongoing works in those two subdivisions. The subdivisions contain 60 residential building lots and were completed as part of the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing. The joint state and Commonwealth program is about helping make homeownership a reality for our Indigenous residents. It was also good to take Minister Elmes and Minister Stuckey over to Palm Island for a visit so that they could see the potential and beauty of the island, which I am constantly singing its praises and promoting.

Every time I visit Palm Island—which is pretty frequently—with people who have not been there before, as we are flying over I like to whisper in their ear the word ‘potential’. People have a lot of well-intentioned views but a lot of them are not well-informed views. It is often good to whisper that word because once they get there they can actually see what a fantastic community Palm is. So it was good to be able to take the two ministers across to Palm.

It was also good for them to see the opportunities that exist. It is all about our government trying to generate a sustainable and independent economy. Whilst there is still some way to go—in fact, there is still a long way to go—I look forward to some positive news in the near future, with the opportunities for development of a Palm Island based tourism product or experience. This housing development will also provide those economic benefits and create employment opportunities as the houses themselves are constructed on those subdivisions.

The Family Responsibilities Commission is a key element to achieving the objectives of the Cape York Welfare Reform and it is also a principal element for maintaining momentum for betterment amongst our Indigenous communities. I look forward to visiting the Cape York region, and in particular one of the communities, with the committee in the not-too-distant future. I also note the minister’s foreshadowed amendments which will go some way to making some of the operations of the commissioner easier in order for him to do his good work. In closing, I thank the minister and the House for the opportunity to review this legislation and have no hesitation in recommending its continued passage through the House.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (3.22 pm): I rise to support the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013. While it covers a number of issues, there are just a few that I want to speak to. The Family Responsibilities Commission, the commissioner and also those who assist him have achieved some wonderful things over the last few years. I remember in briefings that we have had and also in public comments that have been made that the involvement of respected senior elders in the communities of Aurukun, Hope Vale, Coen and Mossman Gorge has been of benefit and positive achievements have been made. Those achievements have not been without cost to those elders. Sometimes their involvement is not seen, particularly by those who have been behaving in a negative way, as something that is desirable. But, in terms of the betterment of those communities, certainly the engagement—the conferencing, mentoring and mediation—that has occurred has been beneficial to the community as a whole and particularly to those who were aggrieved. They have also provided support to ensure that children more regularly attend school and they do that by addressing the familial problems, the practical day-to-day problems.

The commission also aims to rebuild social norms, to re-establish Indigenous authority, to increase engagement in the real economy, and to move individuals and families from social housing to homeownership. I listened to the previous speaker, who has direct involvement in those issues, and heard how passionate he is to see residents in his electorate achieve these wonderful not only community milestones but personal and family milestones. So, without taking up too much time, I certainly support the extension of the Family Responsibilities Commission for a further 12 months. I believe they have shown very positive involvement and improvement in these communities, and I wish them every success in their future endeavours.

 **Mr DAVIES** (Capalaba—LNP) (3.25 pm): I rise to speak today in support of the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013. The Family Responsibilities Commission is an independent body established under the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008. This act, and consequently the commission, is due to expire on 1 January 2014.

The Family Responsibilities Commission forms the centrepiece of the Cape York Welfare Reform, which aims to restore social norms and local Indigenous authority in Aurukun, Coen, Hope Vale and Mossman Gorge. Welfare reform seeks to move individuals and families from social housing to homeownership and to shift from welfare dependency to employment. Welfare reform is working to reduce levels of dysfunction by focusing on individual responsibility to engage in socially responsible behaviours. The commission is working hard in the community to practically support the restoration of socially responsible standards of behaviour and local authority. It is helping people who live in Aurukun, Hope Vale, Mossman Gorge and Coen to take primary responsibility for their behaviour and their wellbeing, as well as the wellbeing of their families and their community.

Where community members receive welfare payments, the commission receives notifications from Queensland government agencies when a child does not attend or is not enrolled at school, when a child safety report is made, when a person is convicted of an offence in the Magistrates Court, or when a social housing tenancy agreement is breached. The commission then works with these community members by undertaking conferencing and providing referrals to services, either voluntary or through an order. The types of services to which the commission may refer an individual include services to address drug and alcohol misuse—which is the big issue up there—school nonattendance, domestic violence prevention, parenting skills and money management, which are very practical services. The commission has powers to order that 60 per cent or 75 per cent of the community member's welfare payments is income managed. These orders can be made at various times in the commission's process.

The Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 establishes the membership of the commission—that is, the commissioner, the deputy commissioner and the local commissioners. These roles are critical to the functions of the commission and to restoring local authority. Madam Deputy Speaker and colleagues, you may be aware that David Glasgow is currently appointed as commissioner. Commissioner Glasgow has an extensive legal background and has influenced major Indigenous initiatives, including the Murri courts and the Indigenous Justice Network of North Queensland. The Deputy Commissioner is Rod Curtin, who possesses an extensive legal background and has had key involvement in Indigenous affairs, including the Cape York Peninsula Youth Justice Program. He is also a strong advocate for youth justice issues. There are currently 19 local commissioners—and these are the strength of the commission—who sit within each of the trial communities. The local commissioners are respected members of their community and play a vital role in hearing conferences and developing case plans.

The proposed additional amendments to the FRC Act will further enhance their role by enabling a panel of three local commissioners to convene a conference without the commissioner and propose an income management decision. I applaud the work of the commission—it is on the ground, addressing very difficult local issues.

By providing opportunities through enhanced referral and coordination of services and implementing a range of incentives which include income management of welfare payments, the commission is starting to see some very positive results for these communities. But there is more work to be done. The independent evaluation of the welfare reform notes that, although improvements in community life have been made, there is a range of issues to be addressed. These include sustainable job creation, which the member for Townsville mentioned earlier, further improvement of school attendance and education outcomes, and establishing a broader housing market—again, another very important initiative in which this government is involved—to include private rental and homeownership options.

In order for the commission to continue to do the difficult but much needed work that it does, the bill needs to be passed by the parliament. This will extend the commission for a further 12 months and enhance the role undertaken by local commissioners by enabling them to propose income management. I think this is a great bill and I recommend it to the House.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—UAP) (3.30 pm): I support the objectives of the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill and the bill itself. I note that the FRC is a key plank of the Cape York Welfare Reform Trial, which has been extended to 31 December. The stability of a home and all that goes with it is very much a strong desire of these communities as much as it is the desire of all Australians throughout the nation.

This bill represents a progressive path away from a paternalistic approach to managing the welfare of these four communities—Aurukun, Hope Vale, Coen and Mossman Gorge. In some ways the bill is handing the responsibility for their desires to these communities. These communities, like many ATSI communities throughout the nation, deserve a progressive path to self-determination to an environment where this concept does not mean that they are decoupled from the rest of the nation but that they can determine a better path for themselves, and I see it in those terms. They very much have their own unique characteristics. I have had the great privilege in my life to have been to all of these communities on at least one occasion and have seen what goes on there. I certainly know a lot about the Mossman Gorge community. I have also had a lot to do with the community of Coen.

The core of the reform is an agreement on the payment of welfare payments in return for reasonable demands primarily regarding children. It is fair, it is well documented and it has fair oversight, the details of which have been covered earlier, with Mr Glasgow being in charge of three commissioners. It has been requested by the communities. It has the capacity to unlock the best of these communities and lock down the worst of the problems that occur. ATSI communities, like our own communities, realise that the future of their communities is their children. That is what this bill is primarily about. I think it is a good bill. It is the sort of thing that these communities have asked for. It is probably not for everyone, but for these communities it is something they have strongly desired and I think it has the potential to do a lot for them.

 **Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory—LNP) (3.32 pm): It is with much pleasure that I rise to speak to the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013. Whilst there has been a trial and a 12-month extension in relation to this program, this is a very worthwhile initiative. It is one that I believe will give a lot of purpose to a lot of Indigenous communities not only in Far North Queensland but right across Queensland where our Indigenous communities are situated.

One of the issues that I believe gives Indigenous communities worth in their communities and in society generally is education. We have seen it proved time and again. I have had numerous conversations with Dr Chris Sarra in relation to education for Indigenous people. Indigenous people need an opportunity and encouragement, the same as everyone else. I believe we will see that outcome from these trials we are having in Mossman Gorge, Coen, Aurukun and Hope Vale. Let us look at Hope Vale. Hope Vale was a place which reneged for a while in relation to the trial and now it is a very purposeful part of the trial. I was at Hope Vale a few weeks ago with the transport committee, headed by Howard Hobbs, and the local member, David Kempton. I saw the worth of that community and the purpose that community has from its own operation in a freehold area and the great work it is doing with its banana operation. I saw the pride they had in their workplace. This has contributed to giving people autonomy and the right to be responsible for their own actions and to go out there and do it themselves. Regardless of their colour, they are people just like you and I.

I have travelled through Cape York on numerous occasions. Places like Hope Vale can be a clear example of what can happen on Cape York. At the same time, Coen is another place screaming out for help with education. There are still many anomalies in these communities. To keep throwing money at the problem is not going to correct it. I am very pleased to hear that the new Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, is a very confirmed advocate for trying to bridge the gap between black and white in this country. We can see the Indigenous people in those communities becoming very purposeful and having a role to play in their own areas. I think Commissioner David Glasgow and Deputy Commissioner Rod Curtin will do a wonderful job. We struck those people in Cooktown recently on their rounds. These people, with their professionalism, know full well what is happening and they know what has to be done to fix the problems.

The most important aspect is education and truancy in schools. That is a problem right across all communities, not just Indigenous communities. In my area of Woorabinda I think it is 66 per cent. Today we are talking about these four areas in Cape York. This is about going from welfare to meaningful, purposeful employment. Everybody wants that. I think homeownership is one of the most

remarkable things we can see happen for these people. I salute the minister and the government for bringing this to a reality. The template has been made and the foundations have been set. We are now going to forge ahead in making a difference to the lives of these people who for so long have been treated as second-rate citizens, having no purpose or need to forge a future for themselves.

I know that the Prime Minister has Mr Warren Mundine on board, and I know that he has had talks with and input from Noel Pearson. But I have to say that Noel Pearson is not the answer to fixing these problems in the north. A few weeks ago we travelled up there and talked to the local communities, the local elders and some of the local people who had local expertise. Yes, Mr Pearson has some good ideas, but these people have good ideas, too. It is absolutely paramount that we as a government make certain that those foundations are going to be built on so we can see a difference in Indigenous communities in North Queensland.

I say to the minister here today: he will have every support from me to see that outcome eventuate right across Indigenous Queensland. I know that the Australian government has made a contribution to date of nearly \$76 million in conjunction with \$47 million from our Queensland government. This is all very good, but what we need now is for the results to keep coming because the outcomes themselves will be advantageous to those communities not just in the short term but also in the long term.

I salute the work of David Kempton, the local member for Cook. What a marvellous member of parliament they have in North Queensland. He is a man who understands the needs of not only the Indigenous people of Cape York but all people in Cape York. He is a man who has worked with the justice issues in Cape York for well over 20 years. He has made his life there and reared his family there. This is an example of a good local member. I had the fortune to travel around part of his electorate recently with the transport committee. I have to say that Mr Kempton is well regarded and well respected. He has a great and deep knowledge of not only that part of Queensland but also far-north peninsula areas such as Bamaga, Seisia and Weipa and the great work that the town council there under Rio is doing.

If we are going to see these Indigenous communities in Cape York be successful and move forward, there is one thing that we have to get absolutely right and that is the road infrastructure. That is an absolute disgrace. The Peninsula Developmental Road reminds me of the Quilpie-Charleville road back in 1950. The Cooktown Developmental Road also needs a lot of work. However, I know my colleague the member for Warrego and the transport committee are looking at ways of forging a relationship with Queensland Transport to let them know that they are not doing it right in some of these areas. I know one thing for certain: the people who live in Cape York, the peninsula area and the area along the Jardine River, which needs a bridge over it, have purpose and they have a future. They need to be heard and they need to be reinvigorated and encouraged to pursue that future just like those people at Hope Vale, and Aurukun is no exception. Considering the isolation that the people at Aurukun experience, I believe this trial is absolutely fantastic. We have to encourage those young blokes and young ladies to go out there and be purposeful leaders and citizens in those communities. It is all very well to talk about what has happened in the past. However, I am sick and tired of talking about the past when it comes to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Paternalism has been the death of these people for far too long. That is the reason that some are still living in Third World conditions. It is because of paternalism and people have only just discovered them in the last 20 years.

I say again that we have to do everything in our power. I hope that during the remainder of my time in this parliament, no matter which side of this House I sit on, we see a difference made for the Indigenous people in not only Cape York but the whole of Queensland. This is our opportunity to make a difference. This is our opportunity to get behind this minister and drive the agenda with him. More importantly, we have to make these people feel important in their local communities, whether it be Mossman Gorge, Coen, Hope Vale, Aurukun or any other part of Cape York.

This is a very important issue that we are debating today. It is one that has the total support of all members of the House and I think that is the way forward. It is that bipartisan approach that has the true value, the true worth, of wanting to make a difference for all people in Queensland, not to have differentiation because of the isolation factor, the colour of their skin or where they live.

 **Hon. GW ELMES** (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (3.42 pm), in reply: I would like to thank all of the members of the House for their contributions to the debate on this bill and the new amendment that the bill contains. This bill seeks to extend the operation of the Family Responsibilities

Commission for a further 12 months to 1 January 2015. Currently, the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 is due to expire on 1 January 2014. This means that the FRC and its orders expire on that date. The FRC is a critical part of the Cape York Welfare Reform, which will operate until 31 December 2014.

To ensure the continued operation of the Cape York Welfare Reform, the FRC must continue to operate throughout the calendar year 2014. An additional amendment has been made to the bill to enable local commissioners to conference a client and recommend income management in the absence of the commissioner. The amendment requires that the commissioner approves the recommendations before a conditional income management order is made. This is an important amendment. It represents one more step towards giving Indigenous people a real say in their futures and restoring local authority. I would really like to thank Commissioner Glasgow, the 19 local commissioners and all of the FRC staff for their continuing work to improve the lives of people living in the four Cape York Welfare Reform communities.

As the member for Mulgrave pointed out, I stated in a media release earlier this year that the Cape York Welfare Reform trial in its current form cannot continue. I also said that in its present state the trial will end on 31 December 2013. Let me repeat: I used the terms 'in its current form' and 'in its present state'. I stand by those statements. Nothing has happened subsequently to prove them wrong. The state government has committed a further \$5.65 million to continue the trial in 2014, but it will not continue in the same form as for this year and previous years. We are planning to implement key changes to the program based on discussions with our trial partners. The trial will continue into 2014 but, as I said, it will not be the same as for 2013.

The Manager of Opposition Business also raised the question as to why the explanatory notes needed to be amended. As the member for Mulgrave surmised, this was simply due to a typographical error in the original explanatory notes. The explanatory notes were amended to reflect the fact that the Australian government has committed up to \$2 million towards the operating costs of the FRC for 2014. The Australian government's overall financial commitment to Cape York Welfare Reform has not changed.

I will also pick up a couple of other points that some of the speakers mentioned during the course of the debate. I am sorry that the member for Gladstone is not here at the moment. A couple of weeks ago I had the great opportunity to go to a number of communities in the cape. Hope Vale, being one of the reform communities, was one I visited. I also went to Wujul Wujul, up into the northern peninsula area, and also to Yarrabah. Having been through Hope Vale, I started to refer to Hope Vale as the 'Gladstone of the cape' because of the development and the pride that is occurring in that community.

The member for Capalaba talked about the banana farm that they have in Hope Vale, which has just finished giving off its first crop. As I understand it, a case of bananas is about 13½ kilos. This year there will be something like 30,000 cases of bananas delivered to market from Hope Vale. That will grow to 110,000 cases next year and at full production it will be about 200,000 cases of bananas. At the moment there are 27 full-time jobs at the banana farm. I found out about the process and so forth when I was in Hope Vale a couple of weeks ago. Combine what they are doing in the banana farm with the new town centre that is being developed at Hope Vale. Then go out to what they still call Miller's Block but, more specifically, what is now referred to as Hope Valley Estate. It is a new estate which has a couple of homes at the moment but about another 14 will either have commenced by now or are about to commence. A couple of those are being built by the Queensland government but the rest are being built for local people, and this is on freehold title.

When I came away from Hope Vale after that visit I felt supercharged. The leadership of Greg McLean, the Mayor of Hope Vale, and his council is just exceptional. The way that that community in particular is progressing is just exceptional. It is one of those communities that stands out as a shining example to all of the other Indigenous communities in our state.

The member for Townsville talked about Palm Island and how beautiful it is. He talked about its wonderful position, having untold natural beauty from the point of view of its tourism potential. As I said, the tourism minister, Jann Stuckey, and I were there about four weeks ago. Two weeks ago I was at Yarrabah, and the same thing applies there. It has absolutely pristine and beautiful countryside. There are two communities there that have a lot of opportunity for them in that particular area. I know both communities are working very hard towards that. I know that last week the council at Yarrabah was in Melbourne attracting investors for an expansion that they wanted to do in Yarrabah.

Everywhere I go, whether it is these four trial communities, other parts of the cape or areas of the state with Indigenous communities, I see mayors, councils, local justice commissioners, FRC commissioners, elders and communities that really want a better lifestyle and a better future not just for their communities, but particularly the children who are coming through in those communities.

In closing, I would like to thank my staff and the department for their work in putting all of the notes together, and I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Mr ELMES (3.50 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr ELMES: I table the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Hon. Glen Elmes's amendments [\[3743\]](#).

Mr ELMES: I move the following amendment—

1 After clause 2

Page 4, after line 7—

insert—

2A Amendment of s 50A (Constitution of commission for particular conference)

(1) Section 50A(1) and (2)—

omit, insert—

(1) If the commissioner considers it appropriate in the circumstances, the commissioner may, for a particular conference, direct the commission to be constituted by 3 local commissioners appointed for the welfare reform community area in which the commissioner considers the person the subject of the conference lives or lived.

(2) Section 50A(3), 'mentioned in subsection (2)'—

omit.

(3) Section 50A(3) to (5)—

renumber as section 50A(2) to (4).

2B Amendment of s 53A (Reconstituting of commission for particular conferences)

(1) Section 53A(3) and (4)—

omit, insert—

(3) If the commission adjourns a conference under section 64(2) and the commissioner does not endorse the proposed income management decision, after the adjournment the commission for the conference is to be constituted by—

(a) the commissioner; and

(b) the 3 local commissioners who were constituting members for the conference before the adjournment.

(4) If a constituting member mentioned in subsection (3)(b) stops being a member, or for any reason is not available for the conference after the adjournment, the commissioner may direct that the commission for the conference be constituted by—

(a) the commissioner and the remaining constituting members; or

(b) the commissioner, the remaining constituting members and another local commissioner appointed by the commissioner.

(2) Section 53A(5), '(3)(b)'—

omit, insert—

(4)(b)

2C Amendment of s 64 (Adjournment of conference)

(1) Section 64(2)—

omit, insert—

(2) However, if the commission is constituted under section 50A for a conference, it must adjourn the conference to obtain the commissioner's endorsement if it proposes to make an income management decision.

(2) Section 64(4)—

*omit.***2D Amendment of s 68 (Decision to enter into agreement)**

Section 68—

insert—

(3A) Also, if the commission is constituted under section 50A, a notice mentioned in subsection (2)(b) may only require the person to be subject to income management if—

(a) the requirement has first been endorsed by the commissioner; or

Note—

See section 64(2) which provides for the conference to be adjourned to obtain the commissioner's endorsement.

(b) if, after considering the requirement and each of the constituting member's reasons for the decision or not agreeing with the decision, the commissioner does not endorse it—the requirement is affirmed by the commission as constituted under section 53A(3) or (4).

2E Amendment of s 69 (Other decisions)

Section 69—

insert—

(3A) Also, if the commission is constituted under section 50A, a decision mentioned in subsection (1)(b)(iv) may only require the person to be subject to income management if—

(a) the requirement has first been endorsed by the commissioner; or

Note—

See section 64(2) which provides for the conference to be adjourned to obtain the commissioner's endorsement.

(b) if, after considering the requirement and each constituting member's reasons for the decision or not agreeing with the decision, the commissioner does not endorse it—the requirement is affirmed by the commission as constituted under section 53A(3) or (4).

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr ELMES (3.51 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr ELMES: I move the following amendment—**2 After clause 5**

Page 4, after line 20—

*insert—***6 Insertion of new s 158**

After section 157—

*insert—***158 Transitional provision for Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Act 2013**

(1) This section applies to a conference if—

(a) the agency notice to which the conference relates was received by the commissioner before the commencement; and

(b) all or part of the conference is held after the commencement.

(2) This Act, as in force immediately before the commencement, continues to apply to the conference despite the commencement of the amending Act.

(3) In this section—

amending Act means the *Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Act 2013*.

commencement means the commencement of this section.

Amendment agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (3.53 pm): I move—

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (3.53 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.

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

Second Reading

Resumed from 6 August (see p. 2295).

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (3.53 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I would like to thank the Education and Innovation Committee for its report, tabled 4 November 2013, regarding the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. I am pleased to note that the committee supports the bill and recommends that it be passed. The committee also made two further recommendations to which I will now respond.

The committee recommended that the government ensure that the Ministerial Industry Commission establishes strong and effective mechanisms to ensure consultation and communication with relevant stakeholders, including specific industry groups and training providers. I want to assure all members that the Newman government is committed to reforming and modernising the VET sector in Queensland and ensuring that Queenslanders can access first-class training that leads to real employment outcomes.

In June this year we released Great Skills, Real Opportunities, the Queensland government's reform action plan for further education and training. This action plan outlines the government's five-year plan for reform of the VET sector to support Queenslanders in accessing and completing the training that they need to get a job and contribute to the state's economy and their own prosperity. A key action under the VET action plan is for the government to work in partnership with industry and employers to identify priority skills needs for the economy and to match training to employment.

As members know, to support this action the government is establishing the Ministerial Industry Commission to advise me as minister on Queensland's skilling priorities and industry needs and priorities for funding qualifications that will align with job opportunities. The commission will be chaired by the Assistant Minister for Technical and Further and Education, Saxon Rice, and comprise industry leaders with expertise in labour market economics, human resource management and marketing and communications in informing the work of the commission and its advice to the minister. The

commission will create a direct relationship and a true partnership between government, industry and employers. This partnership will provide industry and employers with a genuine voice on how public training investment is directed.

Small, medium and large enterprises will be able to provide advice to the commission through regional information forums which will feed into an annual skills priority report to me as minister. Once established, the commission will determine other mechanisms for streamlined industry engagement, including consultation with specific industry groups and training providers to inform me about the state's skilling priorities.

With the establishment of the commission the government proposes to abolish Skills Queensland, returning its remaining functions—primarily the regulation of apprenticeships and traineeships—back to the department. In this regard the committee also recommended that I amend page 2 of the explanatory notes for the bill to clarify that the functions being assumed by the director-general of the department include functions around restrictive callings. While it is clear in the bill and the explanatory notes that the director-general of the department will assume functions relating to restricted callings, I am pleased to table an erratum to the explanatory notes to correct this minor omission on page 2.

Tabled paper: Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013, erratum to explanatory notes [\[3745\]](#).

I thank the committee for its valuable contribution to this bill and table the government's response.

Tabled paper: Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 23—Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013, government response [\[3744\]](#).

The response addresses a number of points of clarification sought by the committee in relation to the bill. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs SCOTT** (Woodridge—ALP) (3.57 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. The opposition will be opposing this legislation. We are not able to support a bill that abolishes Skills Queensland at clause 21. This government's decision to disassemble Skills Queensland contradicts the advice provided by its own Skills and Training Taskforce and the recommendations of the government's Commission of Audit. Both the task force and the Commission of Audit recommended that the vocational education and training system in Queensland have an industry led statutory body to engage with industry and provide advice to the minister.

Before I read the relevant recommendations from the Skills and Training Taskforce and the Queensland Commission of Audit, let me first quote a passage from the Commission of Audit that explains when and why Skills Queensland was founded. It said—

Skills Queensland was established in late 2010 to engage with industry and advise the responsible minister on the direction of the VET system in Queensland.

That is from the Commission of Audit, volume 3, page 152. Bearing this in mind, I will quote the recommendations of the task force and the Commission of Audit. Recommendation 2.1 in the Skills and Training Taskforce final report states—

The Queensland Government establish a truly industry-led Queensland VET sector characterised by the creation of an independent Queensland Skills Commission directly accountable to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment.

That is from the Skills and Training Taskforce final report, page 41. And recommendation 91 of the Queensland Commission of Audit states—

An independent industry-led skills statutory authority be established, with leadership responsibility for developing a competitive skills market through a clearly defined purchaser role in the Vocational Education and Training system.

That is from the Commission of Audit, volume 3, page 154. Both the Commission of Audit and the Skills and Training Taskforce have advised that Queensland's VET sector needs Skills Queensland, yet this government has decided to scrap it anyway. The government acknowledged in its response to the task force's final report—

Queensland needs an independent, industry-led body to effectively partner with industry to truly identify the needs of industry sectors, including regional and cross-sectoral needs as well as the needs of small to medium enterprises

Yet this government decided to scrap Skills Queensland anyway. Skills Queensland is an industry led statutory body, established to strengthen Queensland's economic base—an organisation that contracted industry bodies to provide advice and intelligence on emergency skills needs, skills investment, workforce planning and workforce development activities.

This government has the hide to stand behind claims in the Skills and Training Taskforce report that Skills Queensland was not sufficiently independent and then devise a model that has even less independence. This government is ignoring the advice it received from its own Commission of Audit and its own Skills and Training Taskforce. It is ignoring the need for an independent statutory body to instead establish the Ministerial Industry Commission which would be responsible for advising the minister on the state's skills priorities, with the remaining functions of Skills Queensland transferred to the director-general and the Department of Education, Training and Employment. This government has decided to ignore the fact that the Costello Commission of Audit stated—

The independence of this statutory body is important to encourage industry participation in the VET system, and also to provide quality assurance for Government in relation to technical issues of the skills market, such as market analysis, priorities and pricing.

Commission of Audit, volume 2, page 153. To quote the Costello Commission of Audit further—

The functions of this skills authority should include:

- providing industry advice to Government through effective engagement arrangements
- declaring skilling pathways to be competitive and suitable for response through a market
- developing and maintaining market information systems to inform industry, employers, individuals and suppliers on relevant demand and supply data and trends
- determining the level of priority of different skilling pathways
- reviewing pricing and setting the level of government subsidies
- managing supplier entry into the market
- monitoring competition and provider performance.

I note that Skills Queensland was already performing many of these functions. Instead of heeding this advice, the government has taken it upon itself to be a unilateral decision maker on the future of Queensland's VET system. Contrary to the decision made by this government to cut Skills Queensland, the Commission of Audit stated—

... the current role of Skills Queensland should be expanded to become a skills authority ...

The Commission of Audit went further, stating—

The skills authority should remain a government statutory body. This would provide industry with a strong leadership role through its board and engagement activities, but at the same time would ensure that Government retains the ultimate authority for investment decisions relating to public funding.

The Commission of Audit envisioned a skills authority as an independent purchaser of VET services. It is clear that a Ministerial Industry Commission will lack this independence.

It is not only the opposition that is disappointed with this approach. The Australian Council for Private Education and Training has also advised the Education and Innovation Committee of its disappointment. The opposition does not support the Education and Innovation Committee's response to this issue that a Ministerial Industry Commission be established despite a lack of proper consultation.

After promising a larger role for industry in the VET sector and much talk and rhetoric, it appears that, in the end, this government is concerned more with privatising TAFE services and closing services for people from disadvantaged backgrounds than with developing any real approach to matching skills training to industry demand. Already we have seen this government rip \$43.9 million in funding from training, tertiary education and employment this financial year. Meanwhile, Commonwealth funding has increased by \$58 million. This is pretty astonishing, when the Newman government's supposed outcome from the Queensland Plan was to boost education and skills. The government went out and asked Queenslanders, 'What do you want?' Queenslanders answered with, 'Enough of your cuts to skills and training'—and this government spins this as a positive. This government is so wrapped up in spin that I sometimes wonder how ministers remember when they get out of bed in the morning which position they are holding for a particular day.

Last year we saw 349 staff cut from the VET sector in Queensland. The minister is yet to advise how many more staff or what learning programs are expected to go this year as the LNP progresses towards full private sector contestability of TAFE services by July next year. We will have to wait and see if Prime Minister Tony Abbott decides to rip further funding from the VET sector.

Despite what Queenslanders told them at the Queensland Plan summit about the need for skilling and training, government members will not listen. They are so arrogant and so blinded with their own power they truly believe that they do not need to listen and that they are above accountability. They believe they can invent the truth and make it up as they go, just as they made up legislation as they went for a new TAFE statutory entity but failed to include provisions for temporary employees in the TAFE Queensland Bill 2013. Those provisions are now included in this bill. The opposition supports the Education and Innovation Committee's point of clarification in relation to this issue—that is, why this bill lacks the level of detail about temporary employment as exists in the Public Service Act 2008.

I also recognise the work of the Education and Innovation Committee and parliamentary staff on this bill. To conclude, this bill makes it clear that this government is more interested in cost cutting and privatising the VET sector than making it more responsive to industry skill demands. As the Queensland economy enters an economic transition towards non-mining investment and with a future characterised by a lower Australian dollar, the responsiveness of skills development to industry demands is more important than ever. This government is too focused on politics and spin to see this bigger picture, even when Queenslanders tell it as part of its Queensland Plan. The opposition cannot support a bill that places political opportunism ahead of real policy development.

 **Mrs MENKENS** (Burdekin—LNP) (4.10 pm): I am very happy to rise to provide a contribution to debate on the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. I fully support this bill because vocational education is one of the most important education sectors across Queensland. This bill was referred to the Education and Innovation Committee on 6 August and, after consideration of the bill, the committee's report was tabled on 7 October. The committee made three recommendations and has sought two clarifications, and I thank the minister for his acknowledgement of those and his comments. The committee was briefed by staff and officers from the Department of Education, Training and Employment and officers from TAFE Queensland and received only two written submissions from stakeholders—Growcom and the Australian Council for Private Education and Training.

The objectives of this bill are to amend the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act—the VETE Act—to abolish Skills Queensland and to give the director-general of the department responsibility for a large range of its functions. Its other purpose is to amend the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 to ensure that TAFE Queensland has the capacity to employ staff on a temporary basis.

Just to give some background to this bill, in 2012 the government commissioned an industry led review of Queensland's VET sector conducted by the Queensland Skills and Training Taskforce. This was specifically set up for this purpose and had quite a wide body of industry participation within it. The task force issued its final report outlining a range of recommendations to revitalise the provisions on VET and the management of apprentices and traineeships. The government gave in-principle support to the task force's recommendations.

However, in June this year the government launched Great Skills, Real Opportunities, which responded to the task force's and the Commission of Audit's recommendations. The Great Skills, Real Opportunities program has a five-year plan for the reform of the VET sector within it. Some of the key recommendations from the task force have been implemented by the government by establishing TAFE Queensland as an independent, commercially run, private provider of vocational education and training through the TAFE Queensland Act.

This bill seeks to implement recommendations to ensure that the vocational education and training sector is responsive to the needs of industry, and this is imperative. The functions of Skills Queensland as it currently exists include advising the minister on the direction of the skills system and workforce development, employment programs and skilled migration. Its other functions are partnering with industry skills bodies to identify demand through workforce planning to strengthen the quality of training delivery and the link with business needs and to stimulate further demand and make use of skills through workforce development activities. It also provides planning for state-wide training investment and provides strategic investment in training and workforce development.

The policy objectives of the bill we are debating today are, as I said earlier, to abolish Skills Queensland and to give to the director-general of the Department of Education, Training and Employment responsibilities for the functions that it previously had. Those functions include apprentices and trainees, restricted callings, vocational placements, group training organisations, principal employer organisations, employment exemptions and non-department employment skills development programs. This bill also ensures that TAFE Queensland has the capacity to employ staff

on a temporary basis. These policy objectives are effected through amendments to five acts within this bill—the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000, the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, the Industrial Relations Act 1999, the Public Service Act 2008 and the TAFE Queensland Act 2013.

The Great Skills, Real Opportunities action plan outlines the government's commitment to establish a Ministerial Industry Commission to directly advise the government on the skill priorities and critical training market issues affecting business enterprises, as well as informing government purchasing. The MIC—that is, the Ministerial Industry Commission—will also oversee the training market and will advise the minister on how best to ensure ongoing value for money in training and investment. Skills Queensland will be abolished. Those functions will transfer to the director-general of DETE when the MIC has been established.

The Growcom submission to the committee's inquiry supported this bill in principle but did note that its support is contingent on strong internal mechanisms to ensure that industry needs are addressed. The submission stated—

We note the proposal to establish an industry advisory body ... and request that intensive agriculture is represented by a body such as Queensland Farmer's Federation or ourselves. The needs of the intensive farming sector are unique and not adequately understood by the broadacre sector or groups representing urban interests.

Industry needs certainly are an essential driver of vocational education, and this was certainly recognised by the committee. This was reflected in the second recommendation from the committee—that is, that the government ensure the Ministerial Industry Commission is required to establish strong and effective mechanisms to ensure consultation and communication with relevant stakeholders, including specific industry groups and training providers.

The other submission received by the committee was from ACPET, the Australian Council for Private Education and Training. This is the representative body of registered training organisations that are private providers delivering education and training. It is the body of those organisations throughout Queensland in a range of industry areas. That submission acknowledged the decision to abolish Skills Queensland. ACPET was a member of the task force. Referring to the task force's suggested modernisation reforms of Queensland's VET system, ACPET did query the decision to depart from the task force's recommendation to establish an independent skills commission. Its submission stated—

We are ... disappointed by the subsequent decision to allocate responsibility for the former functions of Skills Queensland to the Director-General of the Department of Education, Training and Employment ...

From its submission, ACPET supports the task force's recommendation to establish an independent skills commission and is disappointed in the transfer of former Skills Queensland responsibility to the department and instead supports a collaborative approach strongly encouraging development of effective mechanisms for regular consultation and communication with stakeholders and wants ACPET and its members to share expertise with and to engage with the department.

However, the committee notes the comments of the Minister for Education, Training and Employment that the MIC will enable a direct relationship between the government, industry and employers that will give industry and employers a genuine opportunity to have input into how public training investment is made. The committee supports this intended function and wishes to ensure its effective delivery on the commencement of the MIC.

The bill amends the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 to ensure that TAFE Queensland has the capacity to employ temporary staff, as TAFE could previously under the Public Service Act 2008, from 1 January 2014. The committee queried why the bill's explanatory notes do not explain why the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 does not currently allow for the employment of temporary staff by TAFE Queensland. However, in response to committee questioning at the public briefing on 21 August 2013, staff from TAFE Queensland advised that, although the TAFE Queensland Act did not specifically exclude TAFE Queensland from employing temporary staff, the amendments set out in this bill are intended to provide clear definitions and ensure a level of clarity so that the current arrangements that operate under the Public Service Act can, in fact, continue without significant change or without any risk of confusion for future staff.

This is a fairly straightforward bill. Certainly, that was borne out by the very few submissions on the bill that were received. However, the task force consulted very widely across the community in its 2012 review and it would seem that that was reflected in the community's perception of this bill and from what we saw from the inquiry. I particularly wish to thank the staff of the department for their briefing and the staff of the minister's office for their responses to the committee's requests. As

always, the tremendous work of the research staff is really appreciated by the committee: Bernice Watson, our research director; principal research officers Emily Booth and Greg Thomson; and Carolyn Heffernan, the executive assistant. I also thank the deputy chairman and the members of the committee, who always work well together. I particularly congratulate Minister Langbroek for bringing this bill to the House and for his ongoing commitment to education and training across Queensland.

 **Mrs RICE** (Mount Coot-tha—LNP) (4.22 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. This bill is a step on the way to rolling out the government's training reforms, which are crucial to our productivity and economic and social prosperity as a state.

One of the key drivers for reform of the vocational education and training—or VET—sector in Queensland is the need to ensure that the sector is able to meet the current and future skills needs of Queensland's economy. The development of a labour market with skills that are matched to industry requirements is pivotal to delivering on the government's commitment to growing a four-pillar economy, reducing unemployment and making sure that Queenslanders across the state can access the benefits that employment brings. This bill makes changes that are necessary so that Queensland can have a truly effective way of engaging with industry around skills and workforce needs. By working with industry and employers to identify their needs and direct the state's training investment priority areas, we can generate a sustainable supply of skilled workers for Queensland employers and grow the economy to everyone's benefit.

The foundation of this bill is in the Skills and Training Taskforce. As the minister mentioned, the task force was appointed by this government in mid-2012 to make recommendations about ways to improve the VET sector in Queensland. According to the task force report, released in November 2012, chronic skills shortages have plagued Queensland's industry and economy and there has been no growth in VET student numbers in Queensland over the past decade, despite the growth in population in this period.

The task force also found that the way that we had been doing industry engagement around skills in this state through Skills Queensland was not working as well as it could. The task force concluded that Skills Queensland had not been effective in addressing the fundamental strategic skills needs of industry and that there was an opportunity to look at how this important role can be best achieved in the future. The task force recommended establishing a new industry led Queensland skills commission to direct the state's finite training investment to deliver real solutions to the state's skills needs.

The government considered the task force's findings, agreeing with the intent to deliver a new model for industry engagement. Ultimately, the government decided that the best approach for Queensland is a Ministerial Industry Commission to be established as a direct advisory body to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. This body will be responsible for advising the minister on the state's skilling priorities and industry needs and priorities for funding qualifications that will align with job opportunities.

As the Assistant Minister for Technical and Further Education, I was delighted to accept the invitation of the minister to chair the commission—an invitation reflective of the importance that the minister places on partnerships that he is keen to foster between industry and the government. The announcement of the members of the commission who will join me in this important role is imminent and, as the minister has said, the commission will include representatives of industry and employer bodies with expertise in labour market economics, human resource management and marketing and communications.

The commission creates a true partnership between government, industry and employers, allowing real identification of the needs of industry sectors, including regional and cross-sectoral needs. The Minister for Education, Training and Employment will use the commission's advice to prioritise training that is linked to employment outcomes, to be published in an annual VET investment plan. Overall, it is intended that the functions of the Ministerial Industry Commission will include advising the minister on skilling and funding priorities; creating a genuine partnership between industry, employers and government through a new strategic engagement framework that will give industry and employers genuine opportunity to input into how public training investment is made; overseeing the effectiveness of the contestable training market, which delivers the skills outcomes needed by the economy; streamlining existing industry consultation arrangements and reducing duplication; improving regional information forums to give small, medium and large industry a voice on local, regional and state skilling requirements; working with industry and employers to stimulate

confidence in and demand for accredited training; and publishing key documents on skilling and funding priorities including an annual skills priority report, an annual skills highlight report and key research, policy and advice that informs the commission's market oversight role.

By focusing public investment and training towards the skills needed by employers, the government will drive labour market productivity and realise the benefits that come from increased workforce participation. This bill helps set the stage for this to be delivered. The government decided that, to avoid unnecessary duplication and the potential for confusion in the VET sector, Skills Queensland should not be retained in addition the Ministerial Industry Commission. Therefore, this bill abolishes Skills Queensland and transfers its functions relating to apprentices and trainees, vocational placement, group training organisations and principal employer organisations to the director-general of the Department of Education, Training and Employment. Skills Queensland's other area of responsibility, which is advising the Minister for Education, Training and Employment on the state's skills needs, will be performed by the new dedicated commission. The commission will consult with industry and employers to identify the state's skilling and funding priorities and give small, medium and large industry a voice on local, regional and state skilling requirements. In short, the commission will inform the relative priority of every government subsidised qualification in Queensland.

To ensure that training funding yields the most effective return on investment, the Queensland government is creating a new era for training, which is characterised by contestable training funding, targeted investment based on industry advice, closer alignment between training and the skills required for employment, increased student choice and access to training and greater certainty for training providers. In summary, the Queensland government intends to focus on its core business of determining training policy and strategy while supporting providers to deliver services to their customers. I am proud to offer my support for this bill to amend the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act and help provide a solution to the skills and training needs of industry.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (4.28 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013, which seeks to establish a more direct relationship between training activity and the actual needs of Queensland industries. The bill will also ensure that TAFE Queensland has the capacity to employ staff on a temporary basis.

As a member of the Education and Innovation Committee, which considered the bill and recommended that it be passed, I am confident that the Queensland VET sector stands to become more efficient as a result of the measures proposed in this legislation. As someone who is a product of TAFE and someone who has trained many apprentices through the VET sector, I can attest to the importance and absolute resolve that I have to ensure the best VET sector in the country. I know my electorate has strong visions and plans for a great VET sector.

With regard to skills and workforce development, it would seem only logical that the focus of those overseeing vocational education and training should be on those areas that are in most demand by industry. However, the Skills and Training Taskforce reported that the existing statutory body, Skills Queensland, had not been effective in addressing the skill needs of industry, hence the main reason this bill is now before the parliament.

This legislation will help the government and the VET sector address those needs by abolishing Skills Queensland and transferring its functions to the director-general of the Department of Education, Training and Employment. Most of Skills Queensland's day-to-day regulatory functions were delegated to the department's regional officers anyway so there will be no noticeable difference in the service provided to industry, employers or employees. What will change is the quality of advice and the government's ability to take meaningful action on the state's skill priorities and the needs of employers.

The Ministerial Industry Commission will be responsible for providing accurate, timely and practical advice directly to the minister. This means a more efficient process for aligning training with career opportunities and determining which qualifications require government funding. The commission will also ensure that the contestable training market is able to deliver the skills needed by the state by consulting closely with all levels of industry and the minister to ensure the right training is being offered and stimulating demand for accredited training.

At this point I acknowledge the submission made to the committee by ACPET, the Australian Council for Private Education and Training. ACPET were represented on the Skills and Training Taskforce that recommended setting up an independent skills commission as a statutory body. In

their submission they expressed some disappointment that the government had chosen a different model in establishing the Ministerial Industry Commission and opting to transfer the functions of the existing body, Skills Queensland, to the director-general of the department. As a result, there is an expectation that the Department of Education, Training and Employment will develop effective mechanisms for regular consultation and communication with all industry stakeholders. I know that the minister and the director-general will ensure this happens.

As for the commission, its make-up will reflect a broad range of industry and employer groups as well as a solid depth of understanding when it comes to labour market economics, human resource management and critical issues. I feel confident that an effective team will be put in place to achieve the objectives of the Ministerial Industry Commission. This is something that was lacking under the previous government and we are happy today that we are able to take some positive steps forward.

Moving to the second objective of the bill, which is to amend the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 to ensure TAFE Queensland has the capacity to employ staff on a temporary basis, the committee has sought clarification from the minister as to why this provision was not included in the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 in the first place and why this bill lacks the level of detail that is included in the current legislation that oversees temporary employment, the Public Service Act 2008. I am now confident this has been addressed and welcome the process of the committee's work in getting this resolved. I support the committee's position in seeking clarification on this and would like to see this point addressed by the minister before the bill is passed. In saying that, I am sure that the minister will be diligent. We all know it has been good to date and we can expect more to come.

In conclusion, I thank the minister for bringing this bill to the House and commend my fellow committee members on the work performed during the inquiry. I believe the measures put in place by this legislation will help Queensland's VET sector address the skilling needs of industry far more effectively than the current system.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Albert—LNP) (4.33 pm): I rise today to make a brief contribution to the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. Education is the cornerstone of modern society. As Nelson Mandela famously stated, 'Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.' In Queensland our focus is on using education to prepare the current and next generations for the rigours of a changing world in a changing marketplace. I believe that what Nelson Mandela said is a truly factual comment. Education is the most powerful tool we have to change our lives, the destiny of our state and our country. Education was highlighted during the Queensland Plan by being voted the most important topic. It shows the emphasis that Queenslanders place on education with real outcomes. One of my school principals, Colin Torr, was a delegate on the Albert team and participated in the Queensland Plan summit. The issues he brought up were very factual and thought-provoking.

Education facilities have to provide relevant courses that industry demands and deliver real employment outcomes. My fellow parliamentarians would all agree with me that when we visit our schools we see our most valuable assets. Our future is in their hands. I take the liberty of speaking on behalf of all parents when I say that all we want is the best chance at a fruitful life for our children, with strong career pathways and education certificates that will deliver them the edge with employment opportunities locally, nationally and globally. To highlight the wonderful work of teachers in our schools, the students at Mount Warren Park State School improved in 12 NAPLAN areas. This is certainly a great result.

Disappointingly, Skills Queensland, which was established in 2010 to meet the demands of industry, was not effective. It failed to be the catalyst to bridge the needs of industry into an educational environment. Great Skills, Real Opportunities is a key action plan to encourage government, industry and employers to partner effectively to meet demand through appropriate training that is aligned with job opportunities. Furthermore, Great Skills, Real Opportunities is focused on the establishment of an industry advisory body, the Ministerial Industry Commission. Its role is to investigate Queensland's skilling priorities and industry needs through priority funding for qualifications that have real job outcomes.

To highlight the importance of vocational education and training, the certificate III guarantee, selected registered training organisations will compete for an additional \$42 million in funding this financial year. In addition, by July 2014 all government subsidised training will be delivered on a contestable field. This will give students the necessary choice in a training provider they feel best suits the pathway they are pursuing.

Building the economy of tomorrow takes planning and consultation with all levels of industry to identify skill requirements and industry expansion. The commission will be made up of individuals with front-line experience in the industry sector and employer bodies. This is about making hard-earned taxpayers' money go further by directing it towards priority training facilities that will deliver real results. I would like to thank my fellow committee members, committee chair Rosemary Menkens and the staff, Bernice, Emily and Geoffrey. Most importantly, I would like to thank the minister for this progressive legislation. Having a young family—a daughter and a son who will be attending prep and primary school in the near future—it is heartwarming for me to see this legislation coming through to provide a better future for our children. I support this bill.

 **Mr SYMES** (Lytton—LNP) (4.40 pm): Today, as a member of the Education and Innovation Committee, I rise to make a brief contribution on the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. The bill has two objectives. The first is to amend the VETE Act 2000 to abolish Skills Queensland and give to the director-general of the Department of Education, Training and Employment the responsibility for its functions in relation to apprentices and trainees, vocational placements, group training organisations and non-departmental employment skills development programs, just to name a few. The bill also amends the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 to ensure Queensland will have the capacity to employ staff on a temporary basis.

Under this proposal, functions that are currently provided by Skills Queensland will be transferred to the director-general of the department of education, thereby streamlining the functions and roles of the department whilst reducing duplication. As outlined in the explanatory notes, from July to October 2012 there was widespread public consultation on the proposed changes and the abolishment of Skills Queensland through the committee process, with many face-to-face consultations conducted in that period with the stakeholders within the industry. I support the bill.

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (4.42 pm): Today I rise to speak in favour of the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. In the early 1900s, William Howard Taft stated—

I think the most important education that we have is the education which now I am glad to say is being accepted as the proper one, and one which ought to be widely diffused, that industrial, vocational education which puts young men and women in a position from which they can by their own efforts work themselves to independence.

That is as true today as it was then.

Education is a vital tool in an individual's ability to change their lives and the world, and it is our responsibility to ensure that the best possible and most effective tools are available for our students to access. This amendment bill seeks the abolition of Skills Queensland by streamlining its functions—apprentices and trainees, vocational placements and group training organisations, to name a few—and transferring them to the director-general of the Department of Education, Training and Employment.

In July 2013, TAFE Queensland was established as a statutory body governing the public delivery of vocational education across the state. As such, the governing legislation that covered temporary staff came under the Public Service Act 2008. To ensure the continued effective operation of TAFE Queensland, this amendment bill will ensure that TAFE Queensland maintains its capacity to employ staff under the temporary employment arrangements.

The professional delivery of vocational education through the various delivery methods available can be regarded as critical to a state's growth as infrastructure or transportation. VET courses and TAFE programs provide the instruction of much needed skills that ensure that every aspect of the employment market is filled with well-trained and motivated employees. In my electorate of Logan, a tech training centre operating out of Flagstone State Community College provides students with the ability to lay the foundation for careers in construction, digital media and technology, among many other trades, all of which come under the guidance of vocational education and training.

Apprenticeships and traineeships are a vital part of the Queensland economy. They are the key entry point into the trades for many sectors. That is why this government has committed to invest an additional \$86 million to deliver an extra 10,000 apprenticeship commencements over six years. It is also why this government is making changes to the apprenticeship system to encourage broader participation and make the system better for all parties: apprentices and trainees, training providers, industry and employers.

The Skills and Training Taskforce commissioned by this government in mid-2012 reviewed Queensland's vocational education and training as a whole, including the challenges facing the state's apprenticeship and traineeship system. To summarise, the advice the task force received was

that the apprenticeship and traineeship system was not broken, but times have changed since it was established, with workers and employers having different needs, expectations and patterns of working these days. As a consequence, the system needs reform, modernisation and new flexibilities to make it more responsive to a quickly changing economy and to encourage more Queenslanders to take up and complete apprenticeships and traineeships. The task force concluded that what is needed is complementary trade training and skilling pathways that can respond to significant labour market restructuring and the changing needs of individuals, industry and employers being observed in Queensland and nationally.

In November 2012, the task force made 11 recommendations to streamline and modernise apprenticeship and traineeship arrangements in Queensland. In response, the government has made several key commitments, including commitments to harmonise Queensland apprenticeship and traineeship provisions with other states and territories and finalise any legislative changes from 2014; introduce more flexible trade training arrangements, including the Registered Trade Skills Pathway; and create effective incentives or other interventions to generate genuine trade training opportunities and employment outcomes.

The government has set out its plans in more detail in *Great skills. Real opportunities*. The Queensland government reform action plan for further education and training, released in June 2013. As part of this five-year action plan, from 2014-15 school based apprentices will be encouraged to continue their trade training after year 12 through a four-year, \$10 million initiative. We have introduced a \$3 million, three-year program to fund group training organisations to create additional apprentice places and we will make it easier for employers to employ and manage apprentices by streamlining apprenticeship administration, for example through provisions to temporarily or permanently transfer apprenticeships or traineeships, and suspend training contracts by mutual consent.

This bill abolishes Skills Queensland and transfers the regulation of apprenticeships and traineeships to the Department of Education, Training and Employment. Given that recent practice has been for Skills Queensland to delegate this responsibility to departmental officers anyway, this transfer of responsibilities will not make any change to the day-to-day experience of apprentices, trainees or employers, but it will make the system simpler. It means the department can focus on the everyday business of regulation, while the new body we are setting up to provide advice to the minister on skills and workforce needs will be able to concentrate on that strategic role.

I applaud the continued efforts of the Minister for Education, Training and Employment and his ministerial and departmental staff for their ongoing efforts to forge a more operationally sound and effective delivery of education services that will benefit generations of Queenslanders for years to come. I further commend the efforts and hard work of our Assistant Minister for Technical and Further Education, the honourable member for Mount Coo-tha. The assistant minister has played a critical role in shaping the VET and TAFE sectors. I also thank the assistant minister for attending a recent school leaders awards presentation that I hosted here at Parliament House and for her words of encouragement to the students as they embark on the next part of their academic journey. I also commend the Education and Innovation Committee and its chair for their role in ensuring that the legislation that this honourable House tables is in the best interests of all Queenslanders. I am pleased to support this bill to move us forward with our important vocational education and training reform agenda.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (4.47 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution on the debate to the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. Before I get into the substance of the Labor opposition's objection to the bill and why we will not be supporting it, I take a moment to reflect on the one-year anniversary of the shooting of Malala Yousafzai, the 16-year-old Pakistani woman who was shot by the Taliban for standing up for the education of young women in Pakistan.

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order. That has nothing to do with the bill. The honourable member can make a private member's statement on Thursday, but that has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order! I ask the member to come back to the substance of the bill.

Ms TRAD: I shall, and it is obvious that the minister is such a small-minded person that he will not allow a general comment and an acknowledgement of the one-year anniversary of an incident involving one of the world's most adamant activists for education.

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order.

Ms TRAD: That is what we are talking about.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for South Brisbane, please take your seat.

Mr LANGBROEK: May I suggest that the honourable member seek to make an adjournment speech tonight. That would be the appropriate time to make a speech such as this.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order! Member for South Brisbane, I have asked you to keep your comments relevant to the bill. I am going to direct you again to keep your comments to the bill. Please specifically address the bill.

Ms TRAD: I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2013. As the member for Woodridge has already explained, the opposition will be opposing this legislation. We are opposing this bill for a very specific reason. That is, this bill represents a further erosion of Queensland's vocational education and training sector. This is something that this government seems to be very good at—eroding services and standards of service for Queenslanders across-the-board.

Abolishing Skills Queensland is not the way to achieve a stronger vocational education and training sector. It is very clear from some of the discussion that has been had in this chamber tonight that that is not the way to go. This misdirected approach to skills is typical of an LNP government that does not believe in the benefit of lifelong learning and training. It is more reflective of people who were born with privilege and with an expectation that they should have all of the privileges that life has to offer.

Government members interjected.

Ms TRAD: It is obvious that those opposite are very happy to dish it out but they really cannot take it.

Mr Choat interjected.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I do find it offensive that the member for Ipswich West would refer to me as 'sweetheart'. I ask you to ask him to withdraw that offensive statement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Ipswich West, I ask you to withdraw.

Mr CHOAT: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: Another disappointment for Queenslanders generally is that this government not only is dismantling the vocational education and training sector but also has denied very much needed additional education resources through Gonski or the Better Schools funding program that was offered by the previous federal Labor government. This would have seen Queensland state schools receive so much more money.

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the fact that that is not part of this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, the long title of the bill does not refer to secondary education at all. I would ask you to address your comments to the long title of the bill.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, I will, Mr Deputy Speaker. But there was some flexibility given to the member for Albert to talk about prep. I did not notice the education minister jump to his feet then.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I do not expect you to contradict my rulings. If you have a problem with them, would you please take it up with the Speaker. I am asking you now to simply return to what is in the long title of the bill.

Ms TRAD: Sure. Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. This is obviously a government that is used to wielding the axe—wielding the axe on programs that are currently established in the VET sector, wielding the axe when it comes to any potential funding for schools. They do not like money for public education. They do not like quality public education. That is why they are shutting schools and turfing kids out with only 10 weeks before the next school year.

This government that is so used to wielding the axe has wielded the axe when it comes to Skilling Queenslanders for Work. It was a program that was successful in training adults who were significantly disadvantaged and adults who needed assistance in re-entering the employment market. It was a program that was independently assessed by Deloitte. It was a program that proved to be successful in training and empowering vulnerable and long-term unemployed people to get them back

on their feet and back into the workforce. It was a program that stood on its own two feet. It was a program that reaped an eight-fold benefit for the state for every dollar spent in assisting vulnerable and marginalised adults re-enter the workforce.

This is emblematic of what this government cares for when it comes to vocational education and training. It does not care for those people who are marginalised. It does not care for those people who are vulnerable. It cares nought for trying to inject into the Queensland workforce those people who would benefit from having some level of assistance to get in there and work hard for Queensland and work hard for Australia. This is emblematic of what this government cares for and who they are here to serve. It is not Queenslanders. It is themselves and their mates who fund their QForum fundraising arm.

The Skilling Queenslanders for Work program not only provided great training for people to get into employment, it also helped prepare people for TAFE and vocational education and training.

Mr Choat interjected.

Ms TRAD: It helped those people—if members can hear me over the yapping from the member for Ipswich West—who not only wanted to work but also wanted to study more through the VET system so they could go on to do more things for their community and get a better job than the one they found themselves in. But what did this government do? This government just axed it. They did not even wait for the independent report that they knew was around the corner. They just axed it.

Now we find the LNP's commitment to vocational education and training lacking again. Clearly, the LNP is prepared to put its ideological interests ahead of public interest. We know that they are not here to serve Queenslanders. They are here to serve themselves. This minister is more focused on dismantling our vocational education and training system to make it easier to privatise. The government is more focused on closing schools than they are on educating Queenslanders.

Despite going to the election in 2012 claiming that they would not privatise, this bill gives the LNP an ability to continue looking after their mates in the private sector at the expense of the Queensland community. In the same way that they are privatising hospitals and outsourcing important public health functions to their mates, they are privatising vocational education and training. This bill gives them the ability to do that.

I was interested to note when attending the Queensland Plan summit last week that one of the key findings and one of the priority findings was ensuring that education was flexible and responsive to the needs of Queenslanders. What we do know is that there is a very long list of motherhood statements that have come out of the Queensland Plan that really do need a great deal of detail around them, particularly when we are talking about vocational education and training. We can have the noblest ambitions and the most wonderful sounding motherhood statements but unless they come with some detail and unless they come with some funding, which this government seems intent on withdrawing or axing, then they are worthless.

When the government and minister have an opportunity to reflect on that finding in their policy they fail the test. They have a one-size-fits-all approach to vocational education and training, hardly the flexible education that Queenslanders participating in the Queensland Plan summit last week wanted. This one-size-fits-all approach to vocational education and training—that is the delivery of education through the private sector—fails this test. There is no regard for whether the market will actually meet the future demands for skills. There is no regard for the quality of the training provided. There is no regard for the workers who will be abandoned. There is no regard for those who are vulnerable and marginalised and who need a little more assistance in order to access the vocational education and training sector or a job. This bill is much like everything else that comes out of this government. It is short-sighted, policy driven ideology that proves that this government is all about serving themselves and their mates.

 **Mr LATTER** (Waterford—LNP) (4.59 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill. We have heard the objectives of this bill, and they are: to amend the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act to abolish Skills Queensland and give the Director-General of the Department of Education, Training and Employment responsibility for its functions regarding apprentices and trainees, restricted callings, vocational placements, group training organisations, principal employer organisations, employment exemptions and non-departmental employment skills development programs; and to amend the TAFE Queensland Act to ensure TAFE Queensland has the capacity to employ staff on a temporary basis. Nowhere there do I see any clear indication that the assertions of the member for South Brisbane are indeed the case. In fact, to say that the government lacks a

commitment to vocational education is perhaps a misdirection. This is not an abolishment of vocational education or training; this is simply a tightening up or a smartening up of the administration of such. Also, the explanatory notes state—

Under current arrangements, Skills Queensland delegates most of its day to day regulatory functions to regional DETE officers. It is anticipated that on assuming responsibility for the abovementioned Skills Queensland functions, the Director-General will also delegate these functions to regional DETE staff.

So it stands to reason that to place the responsibility for this directly with the director-general is a much better, much clearer way of managing a situation that is occurring already. So to say—and I note the assertions of the member for South Brisbane—that we are eroding services is incorrect. In fact we are not eroding them at all; we are simply taking control of those services that are already occurring.

The member for South Brisbane also talked about the closing of schools. Again, this goes to vocational education and training. There is no winding back of the availability of vocational education and training. This bill is simply a smart administrative move to control something that really should be under our care as well. And who better to manage vocational education as an ongoing form of education and in fact to set the guidance for how vocational education occurs in order to make sure that our apprentices and trainees are fit for purpose when they get out there in the big wide world than the Director-General of the Department of Education, Training and Employment?

This bill, as are many of the bills that this government puts through—and certainly I have accredited this particular achievement to the Minister for Education before—is a common-sense bill. It makes sense, and that is far more than I can say for the argument by the member for South Brisbane against this. In fact I would encourage the member for South Brisbane to perhaps take another look at the bill and maybe she might come on board and support what is a common-sense approach to vocational education and training.

I find this issue of particular pertinence to my area because it is fairly true to say that we are not all academics. We do not all follow the same path in terms of educational qualifications. We need flexibility in education. Vocational education plays a very big part in that. I, for one, am very pleased that far from eroding services, far from a lack of commitment to vocational education, we are making the decisions that support a better standard of vocational education, that support a better standard of training and apprenticeships, that meet ongoing job requirements into the future.

The ability of the department to maintain a level of flexibility in this space not only meets the direction that this government is heading in but also meets—and I thank the member for South Brisbane for acknowledging the Queensland Plan—the very loud and clear requirement from the community for flexible learning outcomes. This goes a long way to assisting the government to achieve what the community is asking for in this space. On that basis, I support the bill.

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (5.04 pm), in reply: I thank all contributors to the debate this afternoon. I especially want to thank the government members and, of course, the chair of the Education and Innovation Committee, the honourable member for Burdekin, for her contribution in leading that committee in what has been another good committee response to a proposal of the government. I also want to thank opposition members who made a contribution, and I will come to their contributions in a moment.

It was interesting to hear some of the statements made by the honourable member for Woodridge. We heard this morning from the opposition about the role of the executive in the parliament and the committee system, and we have heard something similar from the honourable member for Woodridge this afternoon—that is, in reference to the bills introduced this morning, we heard from the Attorney-General that of course there are times when the government may seek advice, as we have done in training and education in establishing a task force, but it does not necessarily mean that the government executive will accept those recommendations.

On the one hand, we hear the honourable member for Woodridge arguing that supposedly the Commission of Audit had made a recommendation about how we should be getting advice about training. So one part of the honourable member's dissenting report was that the Commission of Audit did not recommend that we set up a ministerial industry commission but that we should have an independent statutory body. Once again, we see the lack of knowledge of those opposite about the system that we operate in and the distinction between the executive and the parliament, where sometimes people give advice to government but the government then has to consider that advice, as we did with the Commission of Audit and as we did in my department with the Skills and Training Taskforce that was set up and which did have industry representation on it.

Once again this morning we heard that about the bills that have been introduced and declared urgent because of the issues that we have seen in the community over the last couple of months. They are not necessarily going to go through the parliamentary committee system, and that is something that has been decided by the government as a priority. The committee can make recommendations. In the nine years that I have been in this place I remember a number of times when we had reports, reviews and recommendations made by independent people and independent bodies that the previous Labor government did not necessarily enact. Sometimes they were particularly significant—such as coronial reports—and yet when there were recommendations made that governments or ministers should be considering, those things just gathered dust.

By contrast, we listen to those particular recommendations and then we as a cabinet decide on the important priorities, weighing up the advice that will have been given in good faith by the people who make those recommendations but then deciding on what we believe is best for the people of Queensland in the particular areas for which we may have control—and in this case it is about training dollars. We have had an independent statutory authority—Skills Queensland—which by their own admission have not necessarily been as focused on their job as they might have been. Distracted by the floods of 2011, instead of giving advice about training, Skills Queensland were subsequently directed to provide some of their resources to the disaster response which took their mind and their eye off their own job. Who was it who that made that concession? It was Skills Queensland themselves.

In their own submission to the Skills and Training Taskforce they themselves acknowledged that they had become sidetracked by worthwhile but resource intensive programs such as the development and implementation of the 2011 Natural Disasters Jobs and Skills Package. Even when additional resources were made available with the transition of apprentice and trainee regulation following TERC losing that particular power, Skills Queensland was unable to maintain a central focus on its role as an industry led body providing advice on skills needs and funding priorities. Why were they unable to maintain a central focus on their role as an industry led body? I will tell you why, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is because they had too many unionists on their board. They had representatives from the AMWU, representatives from the AWU and representatives from the QTU.

We are not going to be taking advice from them. The representation on that board led to Skills Queensland having to acknowledge that they themselves had failed in the job with which they were tasked. Those opposite love to rail about whether we on this side understand the needs of working people. The member for South Brisbane is an absolute glaring example of someone who has marched out of the suburbs, into the inner city. She walked away from the lathes and walked towards the lattes. That is how relevant she is to old-style Labor.

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. Notwithstanding that he is misleading and incorrect, those statements are incredibly personally offensive and he should withdraw them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order! Minister, would you please withdraw those comments.

Mr LANGBROEK: I am happy to withdraw—

Mr Newman: Suck it up.

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. The Premier just told me to 'suck it up'. I ask that he withdraw that interjection. He is a disgrace and he is not fit to hold that high office.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for South Brisbane, you are allowed to make a point of order, but you cannot stand up and debate it. Premier, would you please withdraw those comments?

Mr NEWMAN: Happily.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, you have the floor.

Mr LANGBROEK: 'Bring up the curtain,' it sounds like. We have the member for South Brisbane on her feet and performing. No wonder the Labor Party is seen as being so irrelevant. It is no longer the party of chippies and plumbers, but of the self-appointed self-righteous.

It is pretty clear what we want. We want more jobs in better facilities. We want a publicly provided system as well as a private system that acts for the customers, for our students, and that is sufficiently nimble to be able to deliver people what they want in facilities in which they wish to train. We do not want more money being delivered for worse outcomes, and that is what we have seen over a number of years from a number of prime ministers who were not interested in what was actually happening but who were happy to outsource their decisions to a statutory authority that, by its own admission, was not able to do the job with which it had been tasked.

That is why when I respond to the honourable member for South Brisbane and her class-war rhetoric and when I respond to the member for Woodridge and her statements and her dissenting report I want to make the point very clearly that this government, with recommendations from the Commission of Audit and the Skills and Training Taskforce, is very clear about what we are trying to do. During this debate we have heard from government members about what they want for their constituents. They want alternative learning and training pathways for students, some of whom may not go to university and some of whom may. In our attempts to make education a more horizontal pathway instead of one that is based on whether you have gone to TAFE or university in a tiered way, we want people to be able to consider going from a certificate or a diploma all the way through various levels of degrees—bachelors, masters—to a PhD and be able to get on and off that educational pathway. Vocational education and training is a very important part of being able to do that to give people more options. It is imperative that there is proper focus on what is important to Queenslanders and not to have union-led domination of boards of statutory authorities, which then leads to that authority's own admissions that they are not able to do the job. That is why we have made the decisions that we have. That is the focus of the Vocational Education, Training and Employment (Skills Queensland) and Another Act Amendment Bill.

The member for Waterford made a very good point about what was actually happening with Skills Queensland. It had about 29 staff who were centrally based. The honourable member for Hinchinbrook, my ministerial colleague, acknowledges that in his region in North Queensland if it was a training issue, the local DETE—Department of Education, Training and Employment—officials would be almost subcontracted to Skills Queensland to do the work on the ground. So bringing this back to the department in terms of the regulation of apprentices and trainees is not out of this world. In fact, it has been done in a couple of other jurisdictions. Western Australia has done it and, as I understand it, Tasmania has as well. They are things that have worked very successfully in Western Australia, which has not seen it taken out of the department and then brought back in as we are doing here.

I want to refer to some of the comments of the honourable member for Woodridge, who spoke about supposed cuts to training and higher education. We have just completed a federal election campaign. I recall, as will other members, that I had to stand in this place to condemn the then Rudd government. While, on one hand, Kevin Rudd, the then Prime Minister, wanted to talk about taking over TAFE, in August he took \$242 million in training dollars from the training sector. There were 14 cuts to training dollars during the term of the Labor government, the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd government. That comes from ACPET as well, the Australian Council for Private Education and Training to which the honourable member for Woodridge referred. There we see selective amnesia from the honourable member for Woodridge, who spoke about these cuts. However, it was the federal government which also brought in this two per cent efficiency dividend for universities. That was a major reason why we said that we had a significant problem during negotiation of our future education funding given that we in Queensland were putting in a significant amount. An amount of \$110 million was cut from the Education Investment Fund. That is money that I know has funded a new announcement in Gladstone and significant announcements for Central Queensland University, which is merging with nine of our TAFEs in Central Queensland to become our first merged university. With that merger, we know that we can have that good mix of practical skills that come from TAFE with the theoretical skills that come from university—something that the people in Central Queensland said very clearly that they wanted to see. However, the federal government was cutting more money from those EIFs—Education Investment Funds. That happened also during the election campaign with no comment from those opposite. They are supposedly the party of education, yet it was the previous federal Labor government that cut funding on 14 separate occasions.

ACPET, of course, are very happy that they and private training providers are going to be able to access another \$42 million of contestable funding from 1 July. The only delays that happened in training in Queensland were due to the recalcitrance of the federal government in signing off on a national partnership which the Premier signed as one of his first acts as a premier in April 2012, just after the election. We signed a national partnership with the federal government and then the federal government, under four successive ministers, failed to sign off on the implementation plan. We in Queensland were going to ensure that we would conform with everything that was in the national partnership. In other words, 'The feds have asked us to do something. We agree to do it. We sign off on the national partnership.' We then waited for funding. Until June or July this year the implementation plan was never signed off on. So we lost a program called the Productivity Places

Program which was worth \$50 million. For another 11 months we lost money that we should have put into the training system. I can tell honourable members that ACPET and other providers were not too happy about that.

That is an example of what was happening in terms of those opposite. Federally, they were the ones who were affecting training in this state and yet we did not hear anything from them about the fact that we had signed off on a national partnership. Julia Gillard, the Prime Minister at the time, had signed off on the deal with our Premier, but then four ministers—Chris Evans followed by Chris Bowen followed by Craig Emerson and then at the death it was Brendan O'Connor—all had to get up to speed with what was happening in their portfolio and then come to an arrangement with Queensland. To his credit, it was the former trade minister who became the training minister when he held the 'superportfolio', Craig Emerson, who finally signed off on the implementation plan to allow that money to flow for the national partnership.

Those opposite can say whatever they like about issues, but let us get the facts on the table. It is obvious that they have no idea what they are speaking about when it comes to real outcomes in training in Queensland. On the other hand, we only have one agenda. As we often hear from the Premier about fast-tracking and supercharging the Queensland economy, that is all about increasing productivity, and productivity is all about getting people into the workforce who may not have been there before.

That is why we have announced \$42 million for people who are disadvantaged and who are not necessarily receiving other government funding. They will be able to access training dollars so that they can become part of our economy, and that is something to which we have made a significant commitment in the last couple of weeks. The members for South Brisbane and Woodridge obviously missed the announcement that we made \$42 million available for community learning to highly disadvantaged and marginalised groups. They are things that we are actually doing instead of just railing about things that are completely irrelevant.

I have mentioned that Skills Queensland has not been effective in addressing the fundamental strategic skill needs of industry. The Skills and Training Taskforce recommended that we establish a truly industry led vocational education and training, or VET, sector. The Commission of Audit recommended that an industry led skills authority be established with the responsibility of developing a competitive skills market through a clearly defined purchaser role in the VET system. Whilst we did not follow those recommendations to the letter, I will outline what we are going to do with our ministerial industry commission, which will be led by the assistant minister, the member for Mount Coot-tha, to ensure that we have a significant reporting mechanism. We will be happy to be judged by our results.

The reason why we decided not to follow that particular recommendation was because the same approach of outsourcing to a statutory authority has not been successful. Let us have a look at the jurisdictions in which it has not been successful: Victoria and Tasmania. The Liberal Party in Tasmania, under the opposition leader Will Hodgman, is hopefully going to be successful at the next election, but I know that as a result of the last election there has been a Labor-Greens alliance. Having created a statutory authority and purchasing VET that way, that government realised that it is not the best way to achieve the objective of creating better alignment between training and the needs of employers, and so they brought it back to their respective departments. We all know what happened to TAFE in Victoria when there were significant changes to allow too much contestability too quickly, and that is why we have taken a very measured approach to contestability. We do not believe the private sector could ramp up enough if we were to make it open slather, and we want to make sure we maintain quality. Some of the reforms that we have made include having a TAFE board to ensure we have a strong and vibrant TAFE with better infrastructure and better assets. The industrial arrangements in those other states need to be brought up to date too, which will, in conjunction with the private sector, result in better training outcomes. They are the things that we are focused on.

Other concerns that we had about establishing an independent industry led skills statutory authority were that we would have a loss of government control over purchasing decisions and reduced public accountability, while retaining the financial risk and responsibility for the outcomes of the training system; the real and perceived conflicts of interest for industry leaders making funding decisions; the disincentives for industry to invest private funds in skills and workforce development; and the lack of impartiality in advice received and heeded by a skills authority. A simple example of that was after the floods when even Skills Queensland acknowledged that they were advised they should have been doing something else, and so they lost focus on the main part of the job they were supposed to be doing.

Let us now have a look at why the Ministerial Industry Commission will succeed where Skills Queensland have failed. We will ensure that the Ministerial Industry Commission creates a genuine partnership between industry, employers and government through a new strategic engagement framework that will give industry and employers genuine input into how public training and investment is made, identifies the skills needed for economic growth and directly advises the government on the priorities for funding qualifications that match training with job opportunities. There will be no more training for training's sake. Here it is: accountability! The commission will prepare an annual skills priorities report and an annual skills highlights report on the departments responsible for analysing training investment and employment trends, implement a new industry engagement strategy and prepare policy advice and implement strategies taking into account input from the commission and other sources. The commission will be supported by a secretariat within the department and will receive information and advice on a range of skilling and employment matters from the department as needed. The commission's advice will inform an annual vocational education and training investment plan developed by the department. The investment plan will ensure public investment is in prioritised training that industry indicates is linked to employment outcomes. The commission's advice will be based on consultation with industry and employers to identify the state's skill priorities and training market issues affecting small, medium and large enterprises. Existing market oversight arrangements within the department will also be expanded to support the commission in advising me, as minister, on the effectiveness of government purchased training in meeting the needs of employers.

I would hope that I have dealt with many of the concerns raised by those opposite. It is important that we get on with the job of making sure that we do have training available for Queenslanders, wherever they are in this state, but we have to acknowledge that some of our infrastructure is out of date and tired and our utilisation rates are not what they could be. For all of us who know TAFE in our suburbs but don't know what happens in them, we want to make sure that they are vibrant places full of students getting great jobs and great opportunities as they move into the economy. I know the Premier speaks all the time about supercharging the economy, and we are all committed to that. This is an important part of that strategy, and this is another milestone on the road to making sure that we achieve better outcomes. On that note I once again want to thank honourable members and commend the bill to the House.

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

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

NOES, 13—Byrne, Douglas, Hopper, Judge, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Debate, on motion of Mr Langbroek, adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (5.34 pm): I advise the House that the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today resolved, pursuant to standing order 136, that the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report on the Liquor (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 14 November 2013.

MOTION

Workers' Rights



Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (5.35 pm): I move—

That this House recognises the fundamental rights of workers, including a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, job security and safe working conditions, and condemns the LNP government for its sustained attack on Queensland workers that has resulted in a massive erosion of rights and conditions during the past 18 months.

Since March 2012 Queenslanders have seen a concerted and ongoing attack on their rights from this extreme, ideologically driven LNP government. As we have seen the Attorney-General introduce the latest of these attacks today, this is a good time to remember and reflect on what actions have already been taken.

Last year we saw the LNP attack the independent umpire—and we know that when the LNP go after workers their first step is to knee-cap the independent umpire. They also introduced the requirement for the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission to consider the ‘fiscal position’ of the government in any deliberations. That testimony was not open to cross-examination or able to be tested. The ridiculous nature of this so-called ‘evidence’ saw the Under Treasurer literally reading out passages from the Costello interim report. We all know how independent the Costello report was! Apparently the information that should form the basis of workplace negotiations is contained in the report done by Peter Costello.

Not content to leave attacks on workers to the chambers of the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, the LNP also destroyed the very core of public sector job security with the stroke of a pen. The LNP ideological approach was to hang an axe over the heads of all public sector workers. Apart from it being unfair and a lousy management approach, it also contributed to people tightening their belts and closing their wallets and led to slowing economic growth in this state.

At times it seemed the ideological approach of the LNP was to make changes out of spite. They changed the century-old traditional date of the Labour Day public holiday, just because it had the word ‘labour’ in it; they made it easier for the Attorney-General to unilaterally intervene in disputes; and they stripped protection from outworkers, the most vulnerable workers in our community—all while giving themselves a huge pay rise.

We know that there are more attacks to come. The LNP have announced that they have a planned program for outsourcing. Under the Orwellian description of ‘contestability’, we know what it means for workers: a drive to the bottom for wages, safety and services. While the LNP see numbers on a page, we see men and women who deliver for our community. Those opposite must understand: they are the pathologists who test the blood of your mother in hospital, the wardie who assists your husband, the cleaners who keep patients’ rooms infection-free and the cooks who keep people healthy. But the LNP government do not see a hardworking paramedic who cares for a cancer patient struggling to make it to hospital; they see only business opportunities for their mates.

Of course, the worst was still to come. The LNP seemed surprised that workers would actually resist their horrific sackings and the stripping of core rights. So when the public campaign got too tough for the Premier and his glass jaw, the LNP introduced draconian legislation to try to silence workers and their representatives in public debate. The LNP introduced laws aimed to: silence the voice of workers by imposing impossible administrative burdens on organisations to exercise their free speech; force burdensome requirements on unions and officials, including disclosure requirements far beyond that of even company directors; impose ‘transparency’ requirements for unions but not for employer associations; make it harder for workers to join their relevant union; and make it harder for union representatives to enter a work site to protect the rights of members.

Every time we hear from the Attorney-General about ‘harmonisation’ of legislation, we know that it is all about hiding ideological agendas. What the LNP did last year with the Industrial Relations (Fair Work Act Harmonisation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was cherry-pick the most difficult areas, add their own in and pretend it was harmonisation. The devil is always in the detail with the Newman government. They are absolutely politically motivated and absolutely out to destroy unions, which have a very strong history of defending workers’ rights here in Queensland. The silencing of unions by prohibiting them from spending their own funds on matters of public importance and issues at the core of their members’ interests is, in short, the most extreme measure in the modern democratic world.

As we discussed in the debate on the industrial relations legislation, the LNP introduced a new and perverse version of red tape. Barely a day goes by in this chamber that LNP backbenchers do not roll up and say their prayers to the deity of small government and rail against the dreaded red tape. So blinkered are they when it comes to ‘red tape’ that they cannot tell the difference between red tape and best practice regulation—cutting protection for vulnerable outworkers, stripping communities of a voice in planning decisions, removing protections for vulnerable and significant environments, all under the flag of reducing red tape. In those circumstances the red tape was a side-effect of the policy goal: protecting the rights of low paid workers, having well-thought-out planning

that involves community input and protecting vulnerable and significant environmental areas. But with the LNP hatchet job on free speech, red tape was not a side-effect; it was the very purpose of the legislation.

Imposing such an administrative, logistical and costly burden, just to spend their own money, effectively ties their hands behind their back. Teachers cannot campaign about teacher-student ratios. An issue that is at the heart of their industrial and professional lives is prevented from being aired in the public realm. If the Police Union want more police on the beat or the UFU want better conditions for their firefighters, they are prevented from spending their own money to raise these very public issues in the public arena—all because the Premier and his lapdog the Attorney-General cannot handle alternative views about matters of public policy importance. And then of course we see the LNP attack on our workers compensation scheme. I was proud to work hard with fellow MPs as part of the Finance and Administration Committee that conducted the inquiry into Queensland's workers compensation scheme.

Mr ELMES: I rise to a point of order. The member for Mulgrave is talking about workers compensation and there is a bill before the House.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I ask the member to address the motion and not anticipate debate on another issue.

Mr PITT: Madam Speaker, I will not. I will go into details of that process in a moment, but firstly it is a sad indictment of the approach of the Premier and the Attorney-General that when the committee delivered a unanimous report they treated it with such disdain. One of the specific recommendations of that report delivered by an LNP dominated committee regarded the definition of 'worker'. This was dealt with in previous legislation. The Finance and Administration Committee and then the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee clearly recommended that the definition of 'worker' be strengthened. What did the Attorney-General do? He changed the definition to weaken protection for workers, excluding thousands of workers from protection. The inquiry was the most comprehensive committee inquiry in this parliament. Submissions were received from employers, unions, employer organisations, representatives from WorkCover and many legal representatives who have worked in the field of workers compensation for decades. Let me borrow the words of the member for Coomera, the then chair of the committee, where he outlined in his foreword to the committee report that the inquiry—

... received 246 submissions, held public forums in Mackay and Cairns, held 14 public hearings in Brisbane, including five in-camera hearings, and held three public departmental briefings.

But in a slap in the face to his own LNP colleagues, committee staff and those who provided submissions and testimonies, the Attorney-General simply threw the unanimous report aside. He forced through changes to the definition of 'worker'—literally redefining thousands of workers as not being employees, stripping them of protection. What strikes me is how flippant the Attorney-General is when it comes to stripping men and women of their working rights. The protection that injured workers deserve is currently in place because we believe in the basic principle that people who go to work and get injured by a negligent employer should receive care and support. A construction worker who gets injured on a site should be treated as an employee and be protected—not thrown to the scrap heap to fend for themselves—with proper return-to-work support and the prospect of an ongoing income.

This government has form. It has form when it comes to attacking decent working people. It has shown a commitment to continually remove fairness and decency from the public sector and let its ideological obsessions cloud what the community has come to expect. We on this side of the House are proud to stand for a strong and independent Queensland Industrial Relations Commission; security of employment to Queensland workers; the right to join a union and organise fellow workers to pursue common interests; and the freedom to raise issues of importance in the public arena to promote the interests of workers and the policy outcomes that they stand for. It is somewhat shocking that in 2013 I have to stand in this chamber to spell those basic differences out. At one point I was worried that we were all converging into the middle and that people may not be able to see the differences between the political parties. Isn't it amazing what we are seeing now? You could not find a more stark difference between the two sides of politics than that in this parliament. I have to say that this government is going the right way to repeating the efforts of the Borbidge-Sheldon government, which was an absolute horror—an absolute horror—in the mid-nineties. Those opposite are borrowing a range of things from the Joh era and borrowing things from the Borbidge era. It is doing the tory play book when it comes to commissions of audit and everything else that you can find. It is absolutely shocking how quickly the government is digging itself into a hole.

It is grossly shocking that, to many people on the LNP government backbench, those basic and widely accepted values that I just talked about are unacceptable. We will continue to stand up against the LNP's attack on decent Queenslanders and we will fight the coming changes and bring the community with us. That lot over there can be arrogant in this chamber with a huge majority, but if they are not careful they can overstep the mark and the voting public will let them know. I sense that many members from the LNP party room will be approaching the Attorney-General shortly to prove me right about some other things that we are not allowed to talk about in this debate.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.44 pm): I rise to second the motion moved by the Manager of Opposition Business. At the outset let me say that this LNP government will stop at nothing to attack Queensland workers in this state. It is a government that has no shame in stooping to any level to savage workers' rights, to inconvenience workers and to sack over 14,000 people and throw them on the unemployment scrap heap. We can all go back to what the Premier said before the election when he said that the Public Service had nothing to fear. They were his words: the Public Service had nothing to fear. Let me tell you: 14,000 people do not think that any longer. This is a government that has been in office for 18 months but in those 18 months thousands of Queenslanders have been attacked, they have been humiliated and they have been treated with every indignity, and they are unlikely to forget that. In that short period the LNP government has forged itself the worst reputation in our history when it comes to jobs and workers and their rights. It is a shameful record that warrants examination.

In 18 months the Newman government has attacked the independent umpire, the QIRC, made it harder for unions to stand up for their members and destroyed employment security for government workers with the stroke of a pen—and that is not even taking into account the over 14,000 hardworking Queenslanders who were stripped of their dignity, stripped of their pay packets and stripped of their ability to support their families when they were shown the door by this heartless Premier and this heartless government. We all know that the Newman government talked a lot about the cost of living, and I have said in this House on countless occasions that you cannot pay the bills, you cannot pay your mortgage and you cannot pay your rising electricity bills if you do not have a job. Last week I attended a town hall meeting at Ipswich and a lady there talked about her husband losing his job and the impact that that had on their family, and let me say that it was not a good story to tell. It was not a good story at all. When you take away someone's job, you take away their dignity. You take away their ability to earn for their family. You take away their strength of character and you reduce them to the scrap heap. This government has a lot to answer for.

Mr Elmes interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will listen to you in a minute, member for Noosa. This government has a lot to answer for when it comes to stripping away workers' rights in this state. It has been callous and heartless and members of the public will remember this when they go to the ballot box in 18 months time. And this is just the beginning. More is yet to come and none of it is good. Among the fresh pain to come, this government has plans for massive outsourcing across core government services, including health. It wants to sell off local schools. It wants to privatise our public transport network. It wants to look at putting our energy businesses up for sale—moves that will likely further drive yet more service cuts and job losses. It is taking a sledgehammer to community services and community workers' rights across this state, and it is happening in every electorate. Every member sitting here will know that their community organisations are having job losses and there are other people in their communities who are feeling the pain of their cabinet's decision. You are a part of this government and you must share the blame. You must absolutely share the blame. When I travel across the state people tell me the impact that losing jobs is having, especially in regional communities.

In Townsville, in Rockhampton, in Mackay, out at Longreach, in Mount Isa, down on the Gold Coast, on the Sunshine Coast, the LNP's job cuts are having a huge impact on the regional economies. Once we lose those people, they will move from Queensland and we will lose a generation of minds that would be able to contribute to our economy well into the future. The LNP's plans for the mass privatisation of government services will continue to hurt communities. They will hurt every time people take their kids to school; they will hurt every time they need to use a hospital; they will hurt them every time they need to pay their energy bills. Queenslanders will continue to pay the price for the LNP cuts and the workers will be shown the door. There is nothing more important than the dignity of work and the dignity of having a job. This government is disgraceful.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. GW ELMES** (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (5.50 pm): I move—

That all words after 'conditions' be deleted, and the following words inserted—

and congratulates the Newman LNP government for enshrining these values in the 54th Parliament and promoting job opportunities throughout this great state.

Tonight, I want to focus my remarks on an important section of the Queensland workforce, the Public Service. This government's goal is to reform and renew the Queensland public sector to make it the best Public Service in Australia. The people of Queensland are entitled to a Public Service that provides the services they need and the Public Service has a responsibility to deliver those services as efficiently and in the most professional manner possible. That is what they are getting from this government. To help public servants deliver the better services that Queenslanders demand, this government has put in place a renewal and reform process that ensures that public servants have the right attitude, support and skills.

The development of the new, aspirational Queensland Public Service values was an important outcome from extensive engagement with thousands of employees across the state at all levels. Given the extent of renewal that we are leading across the sector, it was essential that we gathered the views of employees on the values that should be put into action in their workplaces. The Pulse survey and forums also asked employees to discuss the behaviours and culture in their current workplaces and to provide their views on the way they would like to work in the future if we are to provide better value for money for the people of Queensland. The extensive staff consultation produced five values to guide and drive Queensland's public sector into the future: putting our customers first; turning great ideas into action; unleashing the potential that exists amongst our 220,000 strong workforce; taking calculated and courageous decisions rather than doing things the same way we always have; and empowering our people by developing and supporting them to perform at their best. If we ensure that those values are manifested, we will provide better workplaces, more engaged employees, increased productivity, better services to the people of Queensland and reduced cost of services to taxpayers. Our culture and values renewal is an investment in our people and central to the broader renewal framework to achieving the government's goal of becoming the most responsive and respected Public Service in the nation. The new values will support public servants in their workplaces as they strive to deliver smarter, simpler and better outcomes for Queenslanders.

Having more public servants does not automatically equate to a better Public Service, just as having fewer does not mean a less effective Public Service. The government has a responsibility to utilise taxpayers' money in a way that provides the best possible service to the greatest number of people within existing financial constraints. The opposition's motion ignores the fact that unions can sometimes be the worst enemy of workers, because they operate to their own agendas rather than to the needs of members in terms of pay and conditions. A case in point is the frustrating negotiations that have gone on now for nearly 18 months over a new enterprise bargain agreement for the 50,000 public servants who are covered by the core agreement. Since the end of last year the state government has been trying to give core public servants a fair and reasonable pay rise, but it is being blocked by Alex Scott and the Together union at every turn. We have been opposed at every stage by the Together union, which is supposedly standing up for workers. Two-thirds of core public servants are not members of the Together union, but so far they have been denied a say in what pay rise they should get.

The continuing opposition from the union forced the Public Service Commission to ask the Industrial Relations Commission to conduct a direct ballot of all core employees to try to resolve the situation. The union wanted the minority of affected public servants who are union members to decide the outcome for all core public servants. The commission refused the request. So the matter remains in the arbitration process.

The government is of the firm belief that it is only fair that all affected employees have a say, not just the minority who are union members. If the government had its way, core public servants would have had a 2.35 per cent pay rise backdated to July last year, but because of the Together union these public servants are being denied a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. I noticed Alex Scott on the television news tonight.

(Time expired)

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (5.55 pm): I rise to speak in support of the amendments to the opposition's motion. The key to this debate is the notion of a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, not the opposition's support of a bleating union movement's sense of entitlement. I am disappointed that tonight we have to continue to highlight the problems that existed in the state under the previous government instead of getting on with the real work of reforming this great state—a great state with great opportunity under the right government.

The problem has been those in our community who expect the state government to continue to pay and pay regardless of the financial climate or what the unions actually contribute. The state was close to a fiscal meltdown. We had a bloated Public Service that required the continued borrowing of money just to pay the wages and keep the lights on. The unions must want higher taxes, especially on the wealthy or small businesses, the real generators of employment in this state, with their continued push for job security and protests about voluntary separation packages that have been offered. I ask members to remember that, while the unions continued their deceitful campaign, the previous government had mismanaged the state, with debt heading to \$85 billion. We inherited an interest bill of \$100 million a week, or \$650,000 per hour, all the while being cheered on by the unions in this state.

No-one can argue against this proposition and certainly members on this side of the House do not. The word 'fair' is one of the fundamental concepts of industrial relations. Unfortunately, until recently bullying, industrial might and union secrecy have all been dominant in how unions conduct their enterprise bargaining. This government has introduced measures to ensure that fairness is extended to union officials' dealing with members and transparency in how union officials spend their members' money. Under the new laws passed recently in this place, Queenslanders can have greater confidence in the governance of industrial organisations. Following the Health Services Union scandal and in conjunction with the government's commitment to openness and transparency, these new measures enable Queenslanders to have greater confidence in the governance of industrial organisations. These measures cover both unions and employer groups. These changes benefit grassroots union members. Union members deserve to know how their membership fees are being spent. They also deserve to have a say on political advertising and campaigning. I am sure that there would be plenty of Together union members who would object to the spending of \$100,000 on a push poll earlier this year. If only they had the chance to have their say.

The Newman government believes in freedom of association for workers and the legislation supports workers' rights to choose whether they join an association or not. These laws also delete union encouragement clauses in Public Service contracts. If unions want to increase their membership, they can do that themselves. This government is not a recruitment agency.

Having greater accountability and transparency is in everyone's interest. It is time to put an end to the scandals and to let the light shine in. Under this legislation, four publicly available, retrospective registers are set up and they are required to be kept up to date from 1 July 2012. Those registers include a register of material personal interest declarations, gifts and benefits given and received by officials and employees and a register of ballots for expenditure on political items costing more than \$10,000. The necessity for this legislation has been proven by disclosures provided by unions, as they are now bound to do. Those disclosures show that union officials spent more than \$2 million on credit cards last financial year. More than \$1 million of Together union membership fees goes towards paying the union bigwigs. Of course, the biggest bigwig of all, our friend Alex Scott, is on a pay packet of \$212,000.

Miss Barton: A lot more than you.

Mr BENNETT: A lot more than me. This is a man who last year stood in the way of 50,000 public servants covered by the core enterprise bargain agreement getting a pay rise of 2.35 per cent. Maybe the union officials could examine their own consciences and see if they are giving a fair day's work for the fair day's pay that they receive.

 **Mr MULHERIN** (Mackay—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (6.00 pm): The Newman government's callous attitude towards Queensland workers started in March 2012 and continues to cause unnecessary strife and distress across the state. Queenslanders will never forget the brutal attack on public sector employees which has so far resulted in the mass sacking of more than 17,000 workers. At the halfway point of this LNP administration the impact of the failed, simplistic, tory ideology is only too plain to see. The Treasurer can spin it how he chooses, but he cannot escape the fact that he has so far overseen a fall of 8,900 full-time jobs in Queensland. At the same time as the unemployment queue in our state has grown by more than 12,000, the rest of the nation has created

47,200 new full-time jobs. The LNP economic theory that if you deregulate, remove workers' rights, sack government workers and withdraw aid for those seeking work the market will provide, has been a sensational failure. We knew it would be. We said it would be. But the government would not listen and thousands of working families across Queensland are suffering as a result.

Job creation remains historically weak. In fact, it has not been so poor since the recession of 1990-91. No wonder regional economies are in the doldrums. It is no surprise either that economic growth in Queensland took a catastrophic tumble in the wake of mass sackings and yet the mantra from the Premier and the Treasurer was that they would reduce the state unemployment rate to four per cent over six years. That rash and unrealistic promise is looking increasingly hollow for all those who are seeking work. The longer the member for Clayfield is the Treasurer the harder it gets to find a job. But instead of changing tack, instead of facing up to the facts, the Newman government is ramping up its attack on working people. After sacking thousands and scrapping proven schemes like Skilling Queenslanders for Work we can be certain that the prospects for those who are in the unemployment queues are only going to get worse. More jobs are at risk from the LNP drive towards privatisation of sectors such as health, energy and social services.

The lack of job security in the public sector has a corresponding economic impact on small businesses in our rural and regional communities. People who are out of work and those who fear for their jobs hold onto what they have. They do not eat out, they do not buy household items or cars, they do not renovate their homes. The smaller the community the more severe the economic impact of those job losses. LNP MPs who represent such communities must know that. They must see that pain, but they remain silent. They should be crying out for their government to invest in infrastructure projects that will stimulate and revitalise moribund regional economies. Yet incredibly the Newman government has yet to commit a single cent to any new major infrastructure project in regional Queensland. The only project of note kick-started by the LNP so far is the new executive building in William Street for the Premier and his ministers. To justify it the government has engaged in a fire sale of state assets by selling seven Brisbane office blocks at a loss of close to \$230 million compared with their book value.

When it hears the protests from working people and those who speak up on their behalf, the Newman government's instinctive reaction is not to stop beating them but to beat them harder. Attorney-General Bleijie has been at the forefront of the assault on the rights and ambitions of working people through his evident hatred of trade unions which exist to protect and represent them. He seeks to shackle and gag unions to effectively prevent them from speaking up for some of the most disadvantaged workers. In proposing to reduce the WorkCover entitlements in defiance of the LNP dominated parliamentary committee which concluded no change was necessary, he has proved himself to be a despicable and extreme ideological stormtrooper. Sadly he is not alone.

This disgraceful treatment of Queensland's most respected workers, our firefighters and paramedics, underscores this government's destructive lack of respect towards those who seek to earn a living by helping other people. The attempt to rip employment and safety conditions from our front-line emergency workers has resulted in the failure to settle annual pay increases for them. Tens of millions of dollars that would have been spent by families of these essential workers in struggling regional economies is instead sitting in the Treasury coffers where it is helping no-one. Nothing better demonstrates the Newman government's love of money and hatred of working people.

 **Mrs FRANCE** (Pumicestone—LNP) (6.03 pm): I rise to speak in support of the amendment. Implicit in the opposition's motion is the biased reliance on all the benefits of society passing to workers with no regard for the risk and investment put in by others to generate these jobs. The biggest generator of jobs is the private sector. The latest figures show that Queensland is leading jobs growth across Australia. Labour Force data for September shows that Queensland has recorded the strongest trend employment growth in both monthly and annual terms of any Australian state. There were 17,000 full-time jobs, seasonally adjusted, created in September alone. Queensland and Western Australia were the only states to show trend employment growth in September. The fact that we have seen a strong increase in full-time jobs suggests businesses are gaining confidence. Job creation generates wealth and wealth generates spending which generates, in turn, more jobs.

Other recent data showed the state's economy exceeded expectations and grew by four per cent in 2012-13. The four per cent growth is well ahead of the 2.6 per cent average across Australia's other states. The June quarter result was especially pleasing, with the Queensland economy expanding by 1.3 per cent compared to the rest of Australia which grew at 0.3 per cent. Queensland is outperforming the rest of Australia on a number of measures. Household consumption in the June

quarter was up 0.8 per cent in Queensland, but only half a per cent in the rest of the country. Similarly, exports showed strong growth in the quarter of 1.7 per cent which almost doubled the rate of growth in the rest of Australia.

The outstanding results reinforce that the government has made the right decisions in supporting private enterprise to grow our economy. The latest Westpac-Melbourne Institute consumer sentiment index is further evidence that the Queensland economy is heading in the right direction. In Queensland the CSI is up 3.9 per cent to 110.7 points, compared to a national decline in the index of 2.1 per cent. The positive CSI figures come on top of a 7.4 per cent rise for Queensland in the index in September and put consumer sentiment at its highest level since August 2010.

These figures are yet more evidence that the economic management of the Newman government is being well received by the business community and is taking Queensland in the right direction. The results for Queensland are in stark contrast to other states, with New South Wales, Victoria and even the boom state of Western Australia reporting a decline in consumer confidence. The Newman government is making it easier for businesses to invest, employ and grow in Queensland, because Queensland is once again open for business. We are reducing red tape and other road blocks to business and we are freeing them up to get on with the job that they do best and creating new jobs for Queenslanders. This government believes in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work and the opportunity for people to work if they want to. We understand there is not always a specific job for a person that they might want in the area that they desire at the pay that they think that they are worth.

Notwithstanding the recent positive economic results for Queensland, these are challenging economic times. One only has to watch the nightly news or read the daily papers to see the high unemployment and financial difficulties being experienced by many other countries. In difficult times we must all share the burden. The only consequence of workers demanding more than a business can afford to pay is to drive that business into insolvency and a loss of jobs that will go with it. Unions have to realise that workers are the losers if pay condition demands are not in line with the capacity of the business to pay. Labor and the unions are in denial about Queensland's strong economic indicators, pointing to a government that is on the right track. Instead, they choose to talk Queensland's economic growth down and bask in their distorted recollection of the glory days when they were in power and they could do no wrong. The people of Queensland, and certainly this government, have not forgotten the legacy of debt and deficit that they left and the real cost to Queenslanders.

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (6.08 pm): The Newman LNP government has a well-known and much despised history when it comes to Queensland workers and families. In our great state they have weakened the independent umpire, the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, by reducing its powers and they attempt to weaken workers being represented by trying to restrict members from even joining unions; removing payroll deduction even when workers ask for it to occur; they have stripped workplace entry rights of unions to support their members from visiting workplaces of their own members; and they have destroyed employment security for our great public servants in this state.

The government has sacked about 20,000 public servants and they will react at the next election and vote it out. In our great state, they have sacked over 4,000 health staff, which also impacts greatly on the provision of health services to Queensland workers. Further to that, they have started the Americanisation and the privatisation of our health system, which further lets down the workers of Queensland and puts in limbo the many Queensland Health staff who work also for the better health quality of all Queenslanders.

When it comes to WorkCover, they have even taken the step of redefining the definition of what is a worker. Our great state has the best WorkCover scheme in Australia. Queensland stands above the other states when it comes to our WorkCover system. Queensland has had a proud history of workers standing up for Queensland and fighting for access to schemes such as WorkCover. Workers, through their representative unions, have fought long and hard and at great personal cost to ensure the rights of their fellow workers and their families. They are proud Queenslanders who saw the effect workplace injuries had on themselves and on their fellow workers. At the weekend I went to Collinsville and joined with the coalmining families—in fact, they gave me this shirt—for a memorial day for the 24 workers who were killed in coalmines there. They know the difficulties that a family faces in making ends meet when the bread winner has lost his life or is off work due to injury. The cost that has on families in financial, emotional and social wellbeing terms was something that they could not let occur. They wanted to look after future generations of Queenslanders.

Although often overlooked, nevertheless it is very important to recognise the suffering within families of victims of workplace injuries. The strain on the partner and the kids of workers can mean bills are unpaid, meals are skipped, school trips are abandoned, there is the possibility of eviction from houses because they cannot pay the rent and trouble with the bank if they cannot make their payments. I know it because I lived through it. My father survived a cave-in at the Southern Cross colliery at Ipswich. To this day he has the black scars down his back and on his legs from workplace injuries that should never ever ever have happened in this state. The loss of income puts stress on families in relation to medical bills and can cause marital stress and family breakup. The stress of those pressures is felt at home, as is the lack of social interaction because they are restricted from their workplaces, which adds to the stress at home and in personal lives. Workers understand those stresses on themselves and on other workers and we will continue to work to right any wrongs in this regard. In fact, it was the unions and our workers who put the 'we' before 'me' and started working towards the instigation of the workers compensation system that we see here today. Arrogantly—

Mr ELMES: I rise to a point of order. Two speakers, same point: there is a workers compensation bill before the parliament.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I am listening to the member in respect to examples that are not all to do with workers compensation. I will ask the member to stay with the motion and not anticipate debate.

Mrs MILLER: My point is this: I have been contacted by constituents who have been impacted a great deal by the Queensland workers compensation scheme.

Madam SPEAKER: Member, I will ask you to not anticipate debate in respect of the legislation before the House.

Mrs MILLER: I shall not. I say this: in relation to the rubbish that the member for Noosa talked about with regard to the Public Service, what the LNP means is that if it moves sack it and if it does not move privatise it or sell it for profit.

(Time expired)

 **Mr LATTER** (Waterford—LNP) (6.13 pm): I rise to support the amendment. I want to talk about the process behind workers getting a fair day's pay for a fair day's work and the fact that some workers are denied a fair day's pay because of the actions of others. The Public Service is a case in point where the Together union hierarchy is denying a pay rise to workers covered by the core enterprise bargaining agreement. As the minister mentioned in his opening speech, the state government has been trying to give those 50,000 public servants a pay rise since last year. I note the honourable minister, the member for Noosa, was cut off before he could conclude and I am sure he was going to make reference to the appearance by the Together union secretary, Alex Scott. I say to Mr Scott that he is the only person standing in the way of those 50,000 public servants getting a pay rise. Only about one-third of workers are members of the union and yet the majority are being denied a say in whether they should accept the government's offer of a fair and reasonable pay rise. The result is that the matter is now awaiting arbitration, but the matter is unlikely to be heard until the middle of next year. That means that core public servants will potentially go without a pay rise for up to two years, all because the Together union acted in its own interests rather than in the best interests of public servants. They are playing politics. Maybe we need to reform the provisions around the EB process so that all affected workers have a say, rather than just those who are a part of the union.

These are times when restraint is needed from all parties so that we can retain as many Public Service jobs as possible. We need recognition from some Public Service unions that wage increases exist within a broader environment. Some unions and workplace units have acknowledged that and engaged in the enterprise bargaining process in a spirit of genuine negotiation about what is possible. I note that new EBAs have been negotiated with teachers, salaried medical staff, TAFE teachers, Transport and Main Roads employees, police, rail employees, and Housing and Public Works staff.

Wage negotiation is not just what workers want, but also is what the employer can afford. Unfortunately, and it is unfortunate, we cannot afford the larger wage increases and expensive agreement conditions being sought by some unions. If unions are serious about representing their members, the best thing they can do is work with us to find savings, flexibilities and efficiencies in the service so we can retain as many jobs as possible. The alternative, if some unions have their way, is paying more money to fewer people.

This government is on track towards its goal of reforming, renewing and rebuilding the Queensland Public Service. We need to create a great state of great opportunity. This government is focused on providing the people of Queensland with the best Public Service and our vision is for a refocused and more efficient Public Service that is focused on the core and essential services that the people of Queensland need and deserve.

Unfortunately, there were some tough decisions that the government had to make to achieve this and restore the state's finances to a sustainable level. None of those decisions was taken lightly. We wish that there had been an easier path to take, but there simply was not. The government has been as upfront as possible about the restructure of the Public Service which is necessary because of the neglect of previous governments over two decades. The Commission of Audit interim report showed that Queensland had more public servants than the state's population can justify. We are reshaping the Public Service to redress years of neglect and unrestrained bureaucratic growth. We are focused on ensuring that public servants receive a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. We want the Public Service to be rewarded fairly for the professional services we expect it to provide to the community. We will provide a safe and professional environment in which it can do that, with or without the cooperation of the opposition or the unions.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (6.18 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the motion moved by the Leader of Opposition Business in the House this evening. In my opening remarks, I take note of the comments made by the Minister for Education earlier this evening in another debate when he bemoaned the fact that he was over the class-war rhetoric coming from this side of the House.

I am pretty much over the talk from the big side of town that comes into this House from those opposite. I am pretty much over the antiworker, anti-Public Service talk that comes from the other side of the House. While ever people like those opposite in the LNP seek to strip away jobs and conditions for workers, Labor representatives like those of us here will always shine the light on unfair laws and unfair actions. That is what we are doing tonight.

I was very interested in the member for Noosa's contribution to this debate. The member for Noosa went on and on and on about how hard it has been to strike a deal with the Together union when it comes to the core Public Service EBA negotiation. I have some, I think, hopefully useful advice for the minister. That advice would be that for a start perhaps the minister and the government should not have lied to those in the Public Service when they said that they had nothing to worry about.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, that is unparliamentary and I ask that you withdraw it.

Ms TRAD: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: I ask that the member withdraw.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw, Madam Speaker. Perhaps the Queensland Premier should not have said before the election that they have nothing to fear and then go and sack more than 14,000 of them. Perhaps they should not have come into this place and demonised them for all of the woes that Queensland found itself in. Perhaps a deal would have been reached by now if the government had not challenged the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission's interim order for a two per cent pay increase. Perhaps if the government had entered into negotiations with the Public Service union in good faith they would have concluded a deal. Perhaps if the government had not left front-line public servants doing more work with fewer resources and fewer colleagues a deal would have been reached. Those opposite seem absolutely oblivious to the obvious.

I do want to make note of a story that has been running this week and something that the minister alluded to in his contribution to the debate. That is the costly exercise that the government has undertaken to determine core values for the Public Service. This is an exercise that cost three-quarters of a million dollars, but obviously that is not wasteful. That is three-quarters of a million dollars to determine five core Public Service values.

I have five core human values that perhaps the government might like to take on and they will not cost them three-quarters of a million dollars. How about we start with telling the truth?

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, before I call you to continue I point out that there are too many interjections, particularly from backbenchers. I ask you to cease your interjections. I call the member.

Ms TRAD: I take this opportunity to table the documents that I am referring to. One is a *Courier-Mail* article and the other is an answer to a question on notice kindly provided by the Premier.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 14 October 2013, titled 'The public service wanted to engage bureaucrats, it became a costly exercise in staff values' [3746].

Tabled paper: Question on notice No. 617, asked on 10 September 2013 by the member for South Brisbane, Ms Jackie Trad MP, of the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman [3747].

Here are five values that will not cost the government three-quarters of a million dollars. No. 1: do not misguide public servants; tell the truth. No. 2: treat people with respect. No. 3: keep your commitments to the people of Queensland. No. 4: enter into negotiations in good faith. No. 5—the last one: how about you just do not crash—

Government members interjected.

Mr Elmes interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Minister, your interjections are not being taken. I will start warning members. The noise levels are rising. I call the member.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your protection. I will go through those values again because I thought it was a bit too loud in the chamber. Let us start with the first value: tell the truth. The second value is: treat people with respect. The third value is: keep your commitments to the Queensland people. The fourth value is: enter into negotiations in good faith. The fifth value is: do not come into this place and trash front-line workers and blame them for your outrageous actions in terms of sacking public servants and axing programs. How about you come into this place and treat them with respect as opposed to coming into this place and trashing them.

Mr Elmes interjected.

Mr Newman interjected.

Ms TRAD: I will give you that advice for free, Minister.

(Time expired)

Madam SPEAKER: I would also ask the Premier if he intends to interject to only do so from his seat.

Mr Newman interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: I take the point that the minister with carriage for the debate was in the Premier's seat.

Mr PITT: I find the Premier sitting on the minister's lap offensive!

Madam SPEAKER: I apologise. I realise that the Premier was not able to take his seat because the minister with carriage of the debate is in his seat. On that note, I call the Minister for Local Government.

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (6.25 pm): I rise to support the minister's amendment. I have listened to the debate and I will not go over old ground. But I will point out something which I do not believe has been truly captured in the last hour of debate. On one side of the House there has been a feverish push about the value of unions and we have had great contributions from this side of the House about the accountability of unions.

There is one thing that has been lost. That is the point that to get a fair day's pay for a fair day's work there needs to be a job. I want to talk about what has happened in the last 18 months when it comes to creating jobs for the people that I represent. I am going to talk about some areas that I am very passionate about. Let us talk about laying the seed for job creation.

Let us have a look at what has happened as a result of the streamlined process that the Coordinator-General has put in place. There have been 200 decisions in the first 18 months of our government and there were 74 in the last 18 months of the previous government. What was the 200th decision? The member for Cairns is here this evening as I make this contribution. What was the 200th decision of the Coordinator-General? It was the final terms of reference for the EIS for the proposed \$4 billion Aquis resort. What does that mean for people in the part of the world where I come from? It means the potential for 9,000 jobs during construction and 10,000 jobs ongoing.

Why are we looking at a project like this? Because we have a government that understands if we work with the private sector rather than beating them up we can actually create jobs. The greatest gift a government can give private enterprise is to not put barriers in their way, not find excuses to ask

for another hurdle to be jumped over or another barrier to be overcome. Good governments are governments that set rules and police rules but make them fair and ensure that people who want to create jobs for hardworking individuals can do so.

Let us look at what has been done in the area of tourism. I point to things like DestinationQ where enormous opportunities have opened up at both ends of the state. I know that it creates howls from those opposite, particularly one, but I know what the long-term prospect for uranium mining will do for the people of regional Queensland. There are real jobs there and jobs for generations. There are towns whose futures will be made on the back of this industry.

We are also waiting on approvals to come through from the federal government for projects in Central Queensland that will mean so much to this state. It is a shame that they have been part of a political game and they have taken so long to be approved. They are things that will unlock the potential of this state for a generation.

What about in agriculture? The removal of portions of the Vegetation Management Act will allow development of high-value agriculture. We can double agricultural production—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I know that upsets the member opposite who probably has never been on a farm. The reality is there are jobs there—

Mr Newman: She's never had a real job.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I do not think so, Premier. There are jobs there for people on the land to create an industry that we can all be so proud of.

In my final minute I will seek to explain why we must as an economy be proud to be unlocking the potential of regional Queensland. I will always fight for the rights of workers. I will always fight for a fair day's pay. The government will always fight for safe working conditions and we will always fight for an economy where businesses can create real jobs for hardworking Queenslanders. I congratulate the government for enshrining these values in this parliament and I support the minister's amendment.

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

AYES, 65—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Newman, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

Madam SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 65—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Newman, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House recognises the fundamental rights of workers, including a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, job security and safe working conditions, and congratulates the Newman LNP government for enshrining these values in the 54th Parliament and promoting job opportunities throughout this great state.

Sitting suspended from 6.42 pm to 7.40 pm.

MOTION

Order of Business

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (7.40 pm): I move—

That government business orders of the day Nos 2 to 7 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

**CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AMENDMENT
BILL****TATTOO PARLOURS BILL****VICIOUS LAWLESS ASSOCIATION DISESTABLISHMENT BILL**

Resumed from p. 3161.

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (7.41 pm): I move—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (7.41 pm): I rise this evening to speak in relation to the three cognate bills that were moved by the Attorney-General in the House earlier today. From the outset I want to reiterate what I said in the debate in relation to the urgency motion. The opposition is still of the firm view that, in relation to these three bills of over 160 pages, the government had every opportunity to refer these matters to the appropriate committee for due consideration tomorrow. The committees could have reported back to the House and these laws could have been debated and passed on Thursday. However, as I said previously, what we are seeing is a side of this arrogant government wanting to ram through laws without proper consideration and without due process.

The other issue I want to reiterate to the House is that when you look at the three bills and you look at the consultation component of the explanatory notes, you will find that there has been no community consultation except for consultation within government. This is simply appalling. I would expect the government to do better and I would say that Queenslanders would expect the government to do better. There is no reason whatsoever why the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Bar Association, the Police Union and other members of the public should not have had a legitimate say in relation to these three pieces of legislation.

We are also very concerned about the complexities of the legislation that is before us in this House tonight. Upon reading we see that there are a lot of clauses and a lot of amendments. Considering that my staff were afforded a briefing at three o'clock this afternoon and we are now in the process of debating the legislation at a quarter to 8, I do not think that that is either fair or equitable.

Mr Bleijie: Well we won't give you the briefing next time.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that interjection. Let it be said on the record that the Attorney-General has said, 'We will not give you a briefing next time.'

Mr Pitt: Smug and arrogant.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This is arrogance to the extreme. This is complete and utter arrogance and it is a disgrace.

Mr Bleijie: We afforded you the briefing—

Madam SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you will address your comments through the chair. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This is arrogance to the extreme. I want to reflect on the situation that occurred recently in Broadbeach and I want to say at the outset it was disgraceful. All Queenslanders would have been horrified at the situation that arose down there when families on a normal evening out had to witness the violence and confrontation that followed. The police should be commended for the way they have tackled this issue since then, all under the laws that currently exist in Queensland—the laws that the previous government presided over. The Labor opposition supports endeavours to crack down on the violence and criminal activity engaged in by members of criminal organisations. That is why we introduced the Criminal Organisation Bill 2009 when in government. That bill was designed to disrupt and restrict the activities of criminal organisations and their members and associates. The laws were intended to augment but not replace those existing laws which were already available to combat serious organised criminal activity in Queensland.

The bill is window dressing. It is a public relations exercise that is more about giving the impression of attacking organised crime but is not the best possible response. There is already legislation in place which has not yet been properly utilised because the government cannot admit that it was wrong when it opposed that bill in 2009. What the opposition cannot support is an attempt to rush these laws through the parliament without adequate scrutiny by the committee charged with the responsibility for oversight of these laws. We also cannot support the failure to consult with the opposition. After repeatedly calling for a bipartisan response to the problem, this arrogant Newman government refused to let us know anything about their plans. How can they expect bipartisan support for an unknown response? Consultation with the opposition should have been one of the first things they did.

The consultation with the opposition should have only been a first step. Consultation with stakeholders should have been the next step. I will quote from the Queensland Cabinet Handbook 6.1, Community Consultation. It states—

Consultation with persons or organisations external to government (including employers, unions, community groups, and special interest groups) should be a routine part of policy development.

So often in this House we have seen amendments being moved during consideration in detail to give effect to suggestions made by the Queensland Law Society in particular. The Bar Association of Queensland, the Police Union and the Chief Justice have all made submissions that have contributed to the debate on many pieces of legislation that have come before this House. There have often been unintended consequences of legislation identified, and amendments made before a bill is passed are far preferable to amendments having to be made at a later date.

The actions taken by the previous government were in response to the possible threat of increased bokie activity in Queensland. Other states were developing laws and we wanted to make sure those laws would protect Queenslanders. By not taking the threats seriously, this government presided over a situation we are now having to address. In August 2012 Superintendent Ziebarth produced a report to dispel myths about crime on the Gold Coast. Whilst acknowledging that outlaw motorcycle gangs have members and clubhouses throughout the state, he said the Gold Coast had no particular monopoly on them. He said as at August 2012, 'We have no evidence to support claims that there is any looming bokie war.' He also referred to crime statistics over the 10 years from 2001 to 2011: offences against property were down 29 per cent; offences against the person were down 29 per cent; armed robberies were down 26 per cent. In terms of the prevalence of guns, crime statistics showed that in 2000-01, 1,236 people were charged with weapons possession compared with 605 people in 2010-11. Then on 26 June this year, the member for Mermaid Beach, Ray Stevens said, 'A major bokie war is brewing on the Gold Coast.' Between August 2012 and June 2013 a bokie war had started brewing. That happened under the watch of the LNP government. There were laws there and they simply refused to use them.

Mr Johnson: Who lit the fuse?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Gregory will have his own opportunity to speak in this debate, and it is my right to be heard this evening.

We cannot allow laws that have not had the benefit of proper scrutiny by stakeholders to be passed without any concern for whether or not they will be found to be valid by the High Court. The Premier has said that he expects the laws to be challenged and probably overturned. He said that it does not matter. I will quote from a *Courier-Mail* article last week, which said—

But he said he expected some of the new laws to be challenged and possibly overturned by the High Court. 'We know that some of these things will be challenged. We know that some may be overturned. It doesn't matter.'

But that is not what we need in Queensland. It does matter, Premier. What we need are valid laws that will withstand challenges in the High Court so that they can continue to provide protection for Queenslanders. If we as a community are going to ask our police officers to put themselves on the line in tackling outlaw criminal organisations we have a duty to provide them with the best possible tools, and that includes legislation that is designed to withstand court challenges.

The Premier has been giving us his expert legal opinion on this matter for quite some time. I hope we are not relying on the Premier's advice on this, because it has been found to be sadly lacking. In fact, what I would like to know is what advice has the Solicitor-General provided in relation to these three bills? In developing the 2009 bill the previous government worked very closely with Crown Law and the Solicitor-General to ensure that the laws would stand up in the High Court, and

that has certainly paid off. It is a disgraceful waste of resources to bring legislation before this House of such a controversial nature without an assurance from the second law officer that it is the soundest it can possibly be.

This government has never taken the issue of outlaw motorcycle gangs seriously in the past. Even in opposition they did little to support actions taken by the government because they did not believe that the threat from organised criminal gangs was real, and yet they ask us to give them our bipartisan support. Before the election in 2012 the Attorney-General was highly critical of the Criminal Organisation Act. He was publicly telling anyone who would listen, including bikie gangs, that if the LNP got into government they would tear up the Criminal Organisation Act passed by the former Labor government in 2009. Even as late as October 2011 in the lead-up to the March 2012 state election the Attorney was publicly dismissing the laws as a 'wasted opportunity' to go after organised crime gangs. Then after the 2012 election the Attorney was still saying he wanted to repeal the 2009 laws in favour of legislation covering unexplained wealth. That was until March this year, when Labor's laws had withstood a High Court challenge by the Finks motorcycle gang. Then the Attorney was suddenly saying how good they were. He even had the audacity to describe them in his media release as the Newman government's criminal organisation laws. Hypocrisy!

An honourable member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Deceitful! I will take that interjection. When the government finally became interested in organised criminal activity in this state after the 27 September incident at Broadbeach and there was mention in the media of the Finks patching over to the Mongols, Premier Newman said on ABC Radio that it was his belief that this would defeat the present application to have the Finks declared a criminal organisation that is before the Supreme Court. Embarrassingly, the police minister came out a few hours later saying that was not the case, and legal advice from actual lawyers and not the LNP bush lawyers totally repudiated that. It is always good to get the history on the record here.

But this was no surprise because the Premier says whatever he feels like saying, whether it is based on fact or fiction. In 2012, after a Gold Coast tattoo shop owned by the Bandidos bikie gang was blasted with bullets, Mr Newman ruled out banning bikies from parading their colours in public. Speaking on behalf of all members of the LNP the Premier said—

The team that I lead believe that you shouldn't be sort of penalised for wearing your footy team uniform or jersey.

Do we all remember that quote? I certainly do. Comparing bikies wearing their colours to footy fans wearing their team's jersey is not taking the outlaw motorcycle threat seriously at all, is it? He was also criticising the Criminal Organisation Act 2009 and the previous government's laws that existed to allow for the confiscation of the proceeds of crime. According to Mr Newman, under existing confiscation laws the prosecution must prove a link between the property and the commission of a crime. Wrong again! As media reports said—

Legal experts warned that Premier Campbell Newman's plan to toughen proceeds of crime laws, by scrapping 'the need to prove a link' between wealth and specific crimes, was redundant as current laws did not require this anyway.

A prominent solicitor said that the Premier's expert legal advice was not true. He said—

It can simply be that (prosecutors) have a reasonable suspicion that the property is the proceeds of criminal activity or it's property that is tainted in some way, so they don't actually have to show (a link).

It was this cavalier attitude by the Premier and the Attorney-General that has caused the situation on the Gold Coast to escalate to the point that it has. They may as well have taken the welcome mat down to the border and laid it out for the outlaw motorcycle gangs, because that is how they saw their responses to the laws. But what this bill does is highlight the absolute nonexistence of political ideology of the members opposite. It is an embarrassing testament to the failure of their strategy of political expediency when the Criminal Organisation Bill 2009 came before this House back in December 2009. For the benefit of members who are new to this House, especially a lot of new members, I will explain what happened so that we do have the history on the record. We need to have this history on the record.

A number of incidents had occurred where violence had erupted between outlaw criminal organisations around Australia. Many would remember the brawl that occurred at Sydney Airport where a Hells Angels member was killed. This attack occurred in broad daylight in front of hundreds of travellers in what is described as 'one of the most secure and monitored public spaces in Australia'.

This occurred only hours after the Bandidos had been involved in a series of drive-by shootings at six homes in Auburn linked to a feud with another club. The Hells Angel was travelling with other interstate bikies who had flown from Adelaide via Melbourne to reinforce the Bandidos' Blacktown chapter in its war with Notorious.

At that time the Labor government recognised that the activities of organised criminal groups were increasing throughout Australia and did not want Queensland to become a place where these groups would flourish, so it began a dialogue with Queenslanders on how to best deal with this emerging issue. On 26 March 2009, the day the new government was sworn in, the Premier told the incoming police minister 'to make the inception of tough new antibikie laws in Queensland an immediate priority after he is sworn in today'. In April 2009 the New South Wales parliament passed its own criminal organisation laws which followed laws passed by South Australia in 2008. The proposed laws were tough on criminal organisations. They were designed to disrupt their operations and impose serious restrictions on persons who were engaged in criminal activity. These measures were a significant change in the law and a significant movement away from how organised crime had been tackled previously, so in August a consultation draft of the proposed legislation was circulated to stakeholders for their input and for their consideration. Then in September the Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia found that the South Australian legislation was invalid. The government vowed to challenge the ruling in the High Court, but the Queensland government decided to undertake an extensive review of the draft bill in consultation with stakeholders to ensure that it would withstand a High Court challenge.

If any aspect of the new laws was found to be unconstitutional, the entire scheme could have been struck down, leaving Queenslanders with no protective legislation against outlaw criminal organisations. After more work, the draft bill was introduced into the Queensland parliament in October 2009 and was debated and passed in November.

The South Australian government's laws were declared invalid by the High Court in 2010 and the New South Wales laws suffered the same fate in 2011. However, Queensland's laws were upheld in the High Court when challenged by the Finks in 2013. The work that went into consultation and ensuring the laws would be constitutionally valid certainly paid off, and Queensland had the first successful organised crime legislation in Australia. That is a general synopsis of what occurred in 2009. What I might now flesh out is the LNP's attitude to the laws, their response and how they have treated the issue of organised crime in Queensland since their election.

Before the laws were debated the member for Southern Downs, the now health minister who was at the time the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and shadow Attorney-General, met with representatives from the United Motorcycle Council of Queensland to discuss the laws. According to the United Motorcycle Council of Queensland spokesperson, the meeting was supposed to be for 15 minutes but lasted for an hour and a half. As he said, 'He understands our position much more clearly now.' So the then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Surfers Paradise, the current education minister, declared that the LNP would oppose the anti-association provisions of the bill. A newspaper article quoted the now education minister as saying—

... association laws "did not strike at the nub of the problem"—tracking and recovering the proceeds of crime. The proposed laws also gave the police too much power ...

So that brings us to the debate of the bill. The bill had a number of aspects, but the main elements were to: enable the Police Commissioner to make an application to the Supreme Court to declare an organisation a criminal organisation; provide that the Supreme Court can make such a declaration where it is satisfied members of the organisation meet for the purpose of engaging in or conspiring to engage in serious criminal activity and the organisation is an unacceptable risk to the safety, order or welfare of the community; and empower the Police Commissioner to make further applications to the Supreme Court in respect of a declared organisation that control orders be made against individual members of a criminal organisation.

The member for Southern Downs had a lot to say during that debate. He seemed terribly concerned for the civil liberties of the persons who might be members of a criminal organisation, which, by definition, is an organisation where members meet for the purpose of engaging in or conspiring to engage in serious criminal activity and the organisation is an unacceptable risk to the safety, order or welfare of the community.

He did not like the idea of control orders, either. To remind members, under clause 18 of the bill a court could make a control order against a person if satisfied that the organisation met a number of criteria. Most members opposite would consider that reasonable today, but the member for Southern Downs did not consider it reasonable then. One of his major criticisms of the then Attorney-General was—

He is not even prepared to properly take on board the concerns of the likes of the Council for Civil Liberties, the Bar Association, the Law Society and a whole range of people who have raised serious concerns about this.

The member for Southern Downs mentioned the Council for Civil Liberties 10 times during his speech. It will be intriguing to see if the member speaks to this bill and, if so, how many times he mentions the Council for Civil Liberties.

Let us examine what else the member for Southern Downs had concerns about in relation to this bill. I mention the presumption against bail. He criticised Labor for this. Is he still opposed to it? The member for Southern Downs was also very concerned about the constitutional validity of the laws. He issued a media release on the day the bill was debated saying that 'they don't work and will be thrown out of court'. The member for Southern Downs got a bit excited when the High Court found the South Australia laws to be invalid. He came out to say that the High Court ruling showed the state's bikie legislation, which allowed authorities to place control orders on individuals or deem organisations to be criminal, simply would not work.

This statement clearly showed a lack of understanding of the laws and the measures that were included to ensure the Queensland laws would not offend the Constitution. There were vast differences between the approaches of South Australia and New South Wales and the approach adopted by the Queensland Labor government. But concern for constitutional validity appears to have gone the way of the concern for the civil liberties of the bikies.

The member for Southern Downs was not alone in his criticism of the laws. The member for Mudgeeraba was also a very vocal opponent. She was also concerned about the constitutional validity of the laws. More expert legal advice was offered by the member for Mudgeeraba. She said—

An article from the Civil Liberties Australia website clearly demonstrates that this law will be tested in the future and stands a very good chance of being defeated in a court of law given the precedent already set in South Australia.

My favourite, the member for Indooroopilly, also made an interesting contribution to the debate. The transport minister, as he now is, was concerned that 'laws that we introduce do not unreasonably restrict the freedom and liberties of individuals, including the freedom of association'.

Mr Bleijie: I thought I was your favourite.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Attorney-General, let me assure you: you are not my favourite—far from it! In fact, I do not think you are even on my Christmas list anymore.

In support of his argument the member for Indooroopilly quoted from the submission made on the bill by the now member for Ipswich, who at the time was president of the Queensland Law Society. The member for Indooroopilly said—

In his review of the bill, the Queensland Law Society president, Ian Berry, warned that the big problem with the legislation is that the court can be forced to make decisions on applicants based only on criminal intelligence from police informants.

The now member for Ipswich had a lot more to say on the bill. He said—

Both BAQ and QLS have the utmost concern about the proposed laws on two bases. First, the proposed laws would lead to the abrogation of basic legal rights which have been central to the operation of the common law, including the fundamental right to a fair trial. Second, there is little evidence that these laws are required in Queensland or that they are likely to be effective.

He then went on to say—

With this recent and documented successful Police action against motorcycle gangs under existing laws, and with Police powers to be supplemented with a telephone interception power, how can the required case be made out for the removal of fundamental rights?

In our respectful view, no such case can be made out.

When asked about his submission on the bill, a submission contained in a letter under his hand, the member for Ipswich suddenly became very coy. Mr Berry said that the letter outlined the position taken by the Queensland Law Society. I quote—

'As president I signed all correspondence on behalf of the society and it does not represent my personal views,' he said.

'I didn't write the letter. It was written by a policy advisor.'

Very embarrassing, member for Ipswich! 'I signed it, but I didn't really understand anything that was in the context of it.'

Mr BERRY: I have to take exception to that. My point of order is that I find it offensive to say that I did not understand the letter. That is personally offensive.

Madam SPEAKER: The member has taken offence at the comments. I take it the member is asking for them to be withdrawn under the standing orders?

Mr BERRY: Yes.

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, in accordance with the standing orders I ask you to withdraw.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I withdraw. The member needn't be so embarrassed: all members opposite expressed similar views at the time. It has not stopped them doing a complete, 180-degree turnaround. What is more concerning in his statement is that, even though he signed the letter, it did not represent his views. I think most people would accept that if a person signs a letter they are endorsing the contents of the letter. If you felt unable to do so, surely the proper and ethical thing to do would be to ask another member of the Law Society if they would be prepared to put their name to the letter and sign it. I am sure it is not the case that the personal views of a policy officer are paraded as the views of the Law Society.

The member for Indooroopilly likened the laws to George Orwell's *1984* when he said—

In *1984* George Orwell wrote of a world where you are told where to work and where you can go, where you are not entitled to know all the evidence against you, where the court is entitled to know your past criminal record and associations and where it only has to be merely satisfied of your guilt. We need to combat organised crime, but this is not the way.

The member for Glass House was also passionate in his opposition to the bill. Now the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, he quoted the Fink's spokesman, Ferret, who said—

'Bikies have got jobs, families, mortgages, just like everyone else. Maybe we're not like everyone else but,' he asks, 'if we're not criminals, why are we being treated like them?'

The member for Glass House commented that rights infringed on in the bill were numerous. He then detailed amongst them clauses which would reverse the presumption in favour of bail and clauses which have the potential to affect property rights. I would be very interested to know how the minister now feels in relation to those matters. He thought a better way to tackle the problem of organised crime was to better resource the current police services and organisations such as the CMC. It must have been of some considerable concern to the minister when in its first budget the LNP government ripped around \$1 million from the CMC and sacked around 50 staff. Shameful! This was in contrast to the Labor government, which in the 2010-11 budget allocated an extra \$4 million over four years to the Crime and Misconduct Commission. This was promptly reversed by the Newman government. Properly resourcing the CMC was an integral part of the plan to combat organised crime in Queensland. Through the combination of proceeds-of-crime provisions, traditional laws and the new criminal organisation legislation, the Labor government was mounting a comprehensive campaign against organised crime in Queensland.

The member for Currumbin, the now Minister for Tourism and Major Events, was also critical of the bill. However, she praised the work of the former Labor government in attacking the problem of organised crime in Queensland. Let me quote her—

The Queensland government, to its credit, in September 2006 implemented a task force known as Task Force Hydra to tackle the problem of bikie gangs. On 30 March 2009 the Premier announced that, since the task force's inception, police have made 322 arrests in relation to 931 charges, including attempted murder, arson, extortion, robbery and drug trafficking.

In April 2012, just one month after the election, Task Force Hydra had laid additional charges. However, the member for Glass House was very concerned about a police directive that had been issued about riding wearing club colours when he said—

Thankfully, not all the stories we hear relating to bikie gangs are bad and not all bikie gangs are involved in criminal activity. Recently, the Queensland police issued an order that gang members who chose to take part in the Morcombe charity ride on the Sunshine Coast were not allowed to wear their colours. The United Motorcycle Council of Queensland, which is made up of several bikie clubs, was offended by this decision, but out of respect for Daniel Morcombe's family they obeyed the directive and decided not to ride. Wearing their club patches is a badge of honour for these members and they will not ride without them. The UMCQ arrived after the ride and donated \$10,000 to the charity.

The member for Buderim and now Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing became quite animated during his speech. He said—

I am very concerned about the sweeping powers that this legislation will give the court.

I am glad to see that the minister has joined us. He also felt that our police and the CMC need resources, funding and adequate staffing levels and yet, like the member for Currumbin, he was a member of the cabinet that stripped \$1 million in funding from the CMC and approved the sacking of up to 50 staff. He also expressed some considerable concern for Skeeta, a former Harley Davidson riding tenant at a caravan park he owned. He was very worried that the laws would be used against Skeeta. Well, if Skeeta was not engaged in any serious criminal activity, Skeeta could not be touched by the laws because the laws could only be made against a person who was so engaged. They were not laws, as he described, designed to target those people who have long hair and wear different clothes from the rest of us; they were laws designed to target persons engaged in serious criminal activity. I am waiting to see whether or not the minister will raise the same concerns today. But his concluding statement showed his total lack of understanding of the bill he was debating when he said—

When the Attorney-General walks down the street and passes a bikie, he should remember the law that he made and that his government is looking to pass, because this is about victimising Queenslanders who have long hair and who wear patches on their back. Remember it, people: you did it.

Mr Bleijie: Who said that?

Ms PALASZCZUK: A member of the cabinet. Now let us come to the member for Kawana. Maybe we are leaving the best till last. I will now turn to the contribution of the member for Kawana, who is now the Attorney-General, during debate of the bill. The Attorney is deserving of special mention because, as the responsible minister, he bears administrative responsibility for the legislation. His first major criticism was this—

In March this year we saw the bikie brawl at the Sydney Airport. On 30 March this year the Premier announced that Queensland would prepare tough new legislation to respond to the growing threat from outlaw motorcycle gangs.

Does this sound familiar to anyone opposite? It could well have been—

In September this year we saw the bikie brawl at a restaurant in Broadbeach. In October this year the Premier announced that Queensland would prepare tough new legislation to respond to the growing threat from outlaw motorcycle gangs.

The major difference, though, was that in 2009 eight months was spent developing sound legislation that proved itself as the first such legislation to withstand a challenge in the High Court. He then set out the proud record of Task Force Hydra and said—

As criminologist Dr Paul Wilson indicated, the fact that there have been so many arrests indicates that existing laws are sufficient without the need to enact laws aimed directly at bikie gangs. We do not need to enact laws aimed directly at bikie gangs or other groups, but we do need to give more resources, more funding and more support to our police officers.

The Attorney's concern was that—

This bill encroaches on their personal freedoms and liberties. A government that tries to remove these freedoms and liberties is a government that is to be feared.

Hypocrisy!

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. I have listened for approximately 40 minutes to the Leader of the Opposition. I am wondering when she will get to the contents of this bill, not the bill that was passed in 2009.

Madam SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr BLEIJIE: My point of order relates to the standing order with respect to relevance to this bill, not an event that occurred four years ago.

Madam SPEAKER: I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am setting out the history so Queenslanders have it on the record for the rest of eternity. Let me get back to the member for Kawana, because I love talking about the member for Kawana. It gives me great joy. He then went on to quote the submission by the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, which stated—

The proposed legislation is so radical and far reaching that it should have been subject to the stringent Law Reform Commission process of an Issues Paper, a Discussion Paper and then a Final Report.

Mr Pitt: How about a parliamentary committee?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. The Attorney-General then went on to say—

The Queensland Council for Civil Liberties is not the only organisation to reject this bill. The Law Society, the Bar Association—both key organisations in Queensland—are opposed to the enactment of this bill.

Is the Attorney-General as concerned about the views of those stakeholders of his bill? I guess we will not know, because the Attorney-General is not prepared to let the bill go to a committee for proper scrutiny by stakeholders such as the Law Society and the Bar Association.

But the real concern about the bill is that it is in the hands of the bungling Attorney-General, who is known in the legal profession as the—

Mr Bleijie: Now I'm offended.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Does the Attorney-General want to know what the legal profession calls him or not? How can we trust the Attorney-General with a response to organised criminal groups when he cannot even hold two teenagers in a boot camp? I am at a loss for words. The Labor opposition has said that the problem of organised crime needs a sophisticated response. The people of Queensland should be thankful that the Attorney-General did not carry out his threat to destroy one of the key legal weapons introduced by the former Labor government that he is now using to tackle outlaw bikie gangs.

But the Attorney-General is intent on playing politics on this issue. Earlier this year—

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! There are interjections across the chamber that the speaker with the call is not taking. So I would ask that the interjections cease.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Earlier this year the federal government took a proposal to COAG for a national approach to unexplained wealth laws, anti-gang laws and reforms to the illegal firearm market. But the Attorney-General rejected that measure, calling it a cash grab by the Commonwealth. That was despite assurances given by the federal Attorney-General that no state would be worse off under the national unexplained wealth laws.

The Queensland government was fully briefed on the proposal, including the fact that the national laws would preserve state laws and that each state would be able to retain proceeds of crime seized under their own laws. When the Abbott government came to power and new Liberal Minister for Justice Keenan announced his intention to proceed with the national unexplained wealth laws proposed by the Labor government, the Attorney-General said that he would be happy to work with Minister Keenan on future law reform to tackle organised crime but certainly did not commit to cooperating on national unexplained wealth laws.

But things changed dramatically overnight, because 27 September was the night that the Finks and the Bandidos became involved in a brawl on the streets of Broadbeach. There has never been a faster change of heart by a government than we saw occur in the LNP. The Premier described it as a sea change. It was more like a tornado. After 18 months of dragging their heels over organised crime and refusing to cooperate with the federal government, now everything is urgent—so urgent that the bill was introduced this afternoon and is being debated in this House tonight with no scrutiny.

But this bill is not the sophisticated response that is required. It is a hastily pulled together response that plays up to populist rhetoric but does little to address the underlying problem of organised crime. The way to deal with organised crime is through a multipronged approach. The criminal organisation legislation is an important aspect of this approach, but so is better resourcing of our crime-fighting bodies, especially those such as the CMC, which are charged with the responsibility for disrupting criminal organisations.

For 12 months the CMC has been saying that it does not have the resources to deal adequately with the proceeds of crime legislation that exists already. When the unexplained wealth laws came into operation, there was no additional funding provided. At the estimates hearing in October 2012, the then chair of the CMC told of the great return on investment in the criminal proceeds confiscation area of the CMC and said—

So it is very valuable, but it would be worth doing even if it cost because of the damage that it does to criminal organisations. However, it does require resources and those resources are hard to find. I think that is a point that is apparent to everybody.

That was after \$1 million in funding was cut from the budget of CMC and around 50 staff were sacked. Then during the public hearing on the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation (Unexplained Wealth and Serious Drug Offender Confiscation Order) Amendment Bill, the following exchange took place between the member for Nicklin and the CMC. Mr Wellington said—

Ms Florian finished on the issue of resourcing. If I can use simple language, what you are saying is that you do not have the staff capacity to do the backlog of work which has already been referred to you and you need additional financial support from the state government to be able to undertake the work that this legislation is proposing. In other words, they are giving you additional tools which you welcome—we all welcome those additional tools—but the simple fact is that you will not have the current specialist officers to be able to use those new tools. Am I being too blunt, or can you clarify?

To which Ms Florian stated—

Well, that is blunt but I think accurate. The Western Australian proceeds of crime team, as I have indicated, has a staff of 29 FTEs to do just two parts of a much larger thing that we would be doing if this bill is passed. Resourcing will obviously be an issue.

But the government pressed ahead with the unexplained wealth laws without addressing the issue of funding of the CMC. Recently, at a joint meeting of the CMC and the PCMC the member for South Brisbane again asked about resourcing the important civil confiscation scheme. This is the information that she was given. The member for South Brisbane asked—

... can I draw your attention to the non-confiscation based civil confiscation scheme that is administered by the CMC? I know that this is an issue that has come up previously in the last public hearing and in other forums. Do you feel that there are effective resources in place to manage the confiscation of this property?

The response was—

Thank you for your question. There are a number of issues, of course, about how proceeds of crime legislation is developing. In terms of the civil confiscation scheme, we have been administering the civil confiscation scheme for some time. We have a small team. That team has not been able to meet the demand on proceeds of crime by law enforcement agencies in Queensland. As a consequence, we have moved to a queue system where we have to prioritise matters for proceeds of crime confiscation activity.

So after spending 18 months attacking the Crime and Misconduct Commission, after stripping it of funding and resources and staff, the government wonders why it is not able to work to capacity to undermine the organised crime networks in Queensland.

After hearing member after member explain that the Criminal Organisation Bill was not the way to go, that unexplained wealth laws were the way to tackle the Mr Bigs of the Queensland underworld, not a cent in additional funding was provided to the CMC to utilise these laws. In fact, funding was taken away from the CMC to hamper its already great work on criminal proceeds confiscation. And there was no reason for it because, as it was explained at the public hearing on the bill on 6 March 2013, the figure quoted for return on investment for the confiscations unit was 145 per cent. At the joint meeting on 23 August, the figure given was 188 per cent return on investment in the CMC's work in proceeds of crime. It is extraordinary that the government would not give the CMC whatever resources it needed if it was able to make this type of return. To increase the CMC's workload without any additional resources was inexcusable and can only be seen for what it was: an attempt to nobble the CMC.

The Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013 is far-reaching legislation. The five hours between the introduction of three bills and the debate of those bills is insufficient to get across the full detail of what they contain.

Mr Bleijie: You've just wasted 45 minutes.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will put everything on the record. I love putting the Attorney-General's quotes on the record.

Mr Bleijie: You'd better hurry up. You've only got 15 minutes left.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The arrogance of the man knows no bounds. I would like to thank—

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I was about to do a thankyou, but perhaps I will not. I thank that my staff were provided with a briefing for about an hour in relation to the issues that were coming before the House tonight. The bill creates a new limb by which an organisation can be declared a criminal organisation. This is done by the minister prescribing an organisation by regulation. Schedule 1 of the bill contains the list of organisations to be prescribed upon assent of the bill and others can be added at a later date, also by regulation. Clause 28 sets out the criteria to which the Attorney-General may have regard when deciding whether to recommend that an entity be prescribed as a criminal organisation. I am concerned about the manner in which organisations are declared. The minister having power to make the declaration without reference to a court of law with no grounds for review and no method for being undeclared all add doubt to the validity of the provisions.

I would like the Attorney-General to please provide advice to this House on whether the Solicitor-General has advised that he is satisfied that these bills will stand up to the scrutiny of the courts. Once prescribed there are certain offences created in the Criminal Code for which participants in that organisation would be liable. The definition of 'participant' is very wide and it includes anyone who attends more than one meeting or gathering of persons who participate in the affairs of an

organisation. My concern is that this could also apply to a lawyer who provides advice to members of an organisation. The offence of being present in a public place with two or more other participants could apply to the solicitor and barrister walking across the road to court with their client. The problem is that the sentence for this offence is three years imprisonment with a mandatory term of imprisonment of six months. The offence does not have any element of criminality at all. Just being present is the offence.

There are many mandatory terms of imprisonment in this legislation. The opposition does not support mandatory imprisonment. There should always be retained in the judiciary a residual discretion to vary the sentence in the interests of justice and in exceptional circumstances. The Chief Justice has repeatedly made submissions to the effect on your legislation in the past, as have the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland. If three brothers who are members of an organisation go to their dying mother's bedside there is no basis on which to vary the mandatory jail term. It is similarly an offence to enter prescribed places and attend prescribed events. The current bill prescribes the clubhouses of the prescribed criminal organisations but further places and events can be added at a later date. The current Criminal Organisation Act 2009 contains an offence of recruiting persons to become participants in a criminal organisation. This bill contains a similar provision to apply to prescribed criminal organisations.

With respect to the Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013 I have a number of issues which I would like to raise. I note that this bill more or less seeks to replicate the licensing regime set up in New South Wales under the Tattoo Parlour Act 2012. I understand that it is necessary because of mutual recognition agreements that apply and any differences in the scheme could lead to persons moving jurisdiction to where the regulation is less. The bill also amends the Liquor Act 1992 to prevent the wearing of club insignia and associated colours in licensed premises. The bill will establish a new licensing regime for the tattoo industry. There will be two types of permits created: operator licences for business operators and individual licences for tattoo artists. It will now be an offence to carry on a tattoo business without a licence, for an individual to perform a tattoo procedure without a licence or for an operator to employ a tattoo artist who is unlicensed. The maximum penalty for these offences is 18 months imprisonment and 1,000 penalty units where a third or later offence has been committed.

The opposition will be supporting this bill but we have concerns and I want to place them squarely on the public record. I am concerned that the regulation of the tattoo industry will simply encourage outlaw motorcycle gangs to branch out into other industries. In fact, there is already clear evidence that outlaw motorcycle gangs are involved in a variety of business enterprises such as restaurants, clubs, bars and massage parlours. This bill scratches at the surface of disrupting outlaw motorcycle gang business ventures. It is clear that the new regime is extremely strict for the tattoo industry. It will place a significant new burden on the industry and probably an unfair one on the many members of the industry who are law-abiding citizens pursuing a business and a vocation that they enjoy and that they are passionate about. It goes without saying that there has been no consultation with the industry regarding these new laws.

I have received quite a deal of correspondence from persons concerned about the imposition on legitimate tattoo businesses. Whilst the laws may help to eliminate any criminal activity or association with the industry, there is nothing to stop the intended targets of this legislation from branching into new industries and expanding their interests in the industries they are already involved in. I am concerned, therefore, that the bill will simply see the problem that we are told is present in the tattoo industry spread henceforth into other industries.

Regarding privacy concerns, the requirement to consent to finger and palm prints being taken on application for a licence is an extremely invasive measure. In fact, the explanatory notes highlight the fact that this is a significant breach of privacy. Clause 14 allows for a former licensee to request that those prints be destroyed. However, the application may be refused and the prints are able to be retained and used for other purposes. There is no right to have the prints destroyed. The explanatory notes in fact state they may be retained and used for intelligence purposes.

I also want to place on record my concerns regarding the decision making process for the granting of applications. In particular I am concerned that if an application is refused on one of the relevant grounds no reason is required to be given if it would result in the disclosure of criminal information. The decision of the CEO in issuing a licence is based on information from the QPS. That can be criminal intelligence at any level and it will never be known to the applicant. There is no court of law involved. There is no opportunity for the Public Interest Monitor to scrutinise the intelligence and how it is used by the CEO in determining the application. These are matters of concern to the

opposition. The Public Interest Monitor has been appointed. Why not use the resources that are available to ensure the legislation is as robust as possible. It is a matter of natural justice that a person should be able to find out why they have had such an application refused. I will be raising further issues with respect to the bill in consideration in detail and I look forward to responses from the Attorney-General.

The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill is based on the prescribing of criminal organisations. It uses the same definition of participant, a definition which may have unintended consequences, but the opposition will not be opposing this bill. The people of Queensland will make their own judgement about it. However, we certainly reserve our rights if the laws do not stand up to any challenge in the courts. I have placed on the public record that the lack of consultation and scrutiny cannot lead to good government and it cannot lead to good legislation and therefore the Attorney-General will feel and bear the full brunt of the responsibility if these laws fail in the High Court.

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (8.38 pm): I rise this evening to give support to the three bills that are before the House. This evening I will talk firstly about what we have seen in recent times in our state, I will talk about these bills and I will reflect on some of the issues that the Leader of the Opposition has put forward and demonstrate that once again we are seeing, when it really matters, the Australian Labor Party being found wanting in this place, particularly on matters of the safety and security of the people of Queensland.

On 27 September, 2½ weeks ago, we saw completely unacceptable scenes at Broadbeach. On a Friday night when families—mums, dads and kids—were trying to have a quiet night out, thugs burst into a restaurant and proceeded to have their puerile internecine warfare fought out on the streets. Even more disturbingly, when members were arrested and taken to the watch-house, to go down like they were in some wild-west film and demand that people be released was a completely unacceptable scene. Clearly, the people we are dealing with through the legislation before the House this evening, that is, criminal motorcycle gang members, feel that they are above the law and are living outside the law. That is unacceptable to the people of Queensland and, indeed, to this government. In the past I have said things on the record that I have acknowledged, both in the chamber today at question time and in public media conferences in recent times. In the last two and a half weeks I personally have crossed the Rubicon, as they say. This is a proud democracy and I am the first one to believe in freedom of expression and people's right to associate. However, what we saw on 27 September was a group of criminal thugs basically showing that they really do not deserve those sorts of privileges and rights in our society in Queensland.

Therefore, as we promised, the government is determined to take action. What does that action comprise? There are three elements. The first element is the effective resourcing of those agencies charged with fighting crime in Queensland. Before the end of the financial year, \$20 million will go to the Queensland Police Service so that we can go after those criminal gangs on the streets and in the suburbs, towns and cities of Queensland. Secondly, up to \$7 million has been allocated to the Crime and Misconduct Commission so that it can ramp up its organised crime activities and we can deal with the thugs within the existing procedures that the CMC has. As an added element, up to \$5 million is for Crime Stoppers so that we can help in the process of extracting criminal intelligence from members of the community by providing cash rewards through the established procedures of Crime Stoppers. That is the first component to the government's response.

The second component is what we are dealing with this evening, that is, three pieces of legislation that will introduce tough laws and enhance existing laws to give the police and the CMC the tools to do the job of dealing with criminal gang members. These are very tough laws. They are the toughest in Australia. For the past two and a half weeks we have said continually that that is the way that they would be. It should be no surprise to the opposition, no surprise to any commentator and no surprise to any Queenslander that these laws are going to deliver a purpose. The unequivocal purpose of the laws is to destroy criminal organisations.

This evening I ask the Leader of the Opposition and, indeed, all members of the opposition: will you support the elimination of these criminal gangs from Queensland? Does the opposition have the bottle this evening to stop with the flim-flam, the shilly-shallying and the calls for crime summits? Do they have the ticker to deal with something they should have dealt with over the 20 years that they had power in Queensland and move to crush these gangs? I cannot tell from the statements today. They have been all over the shop. On the one hand, they have been calling for us to sit down and sing *Kumbaya* and have a crime summit, but then they say we are moving too quickly. On the one

hand, this evening we heard that these laws will only scratch the surface, that we should be going further and what about the other activities that they will move into, but then they say that it is too hard and it is too tough and civil liberties are being breached. This is the pointy end for members of the Australian Labor Party. Will they support these appropriate laws or not?

Ms Palaszczuk: Listen—

Mr Bleijie: You don't support mandatory sentencing.

Mr NEWMAN: I take the interjections of both the Attorney-General and the opposition. I reflect back the words spoken by the Leader of the Opposition in the past 10 minutes when she said that they do not support mandatory sentencing. How can be you tough if you are not prepared to realise that the sentences being handed down by the judiciary, even the treatment of people who have been before the courts in recent days in relation to bail, have not been adequate or consistent with community expectations?

I return to the three-third element, which is this: those who are convicted under these new laws or existing laws will have a special prison experience in this state. We are not going to have those criminal thugs contaminating other prisoners who wish to serve out their time and who probably want to be restored to and have a new life back in society. We are not going to have them take over our jails, so we are creating for them a special experience at the high-security Woodford Correctional Centre. There are many things that I could talk about this evening, but I will move on. In summary there are three elements: resources for the police and the CMC, including cash resources; secondly, tough new laws that are there to give the police and the CMC the tools to do the job; and, thirdly, a unique prison experience, consistent with our international obligations, to make sure that those hardened criminals are properly treated, are properly protected if you like from each other and indeed, most importantly, are taken away from civilised and decent Queenslanders.

Let us turn to the background to this legislation. This is not a problem that arose overnight. This is not a problem that is exclusive to Queensland. It is not a problem that is exclusive to the Gold Coast. It is a national problem. I have been delighted and pleased with the response that I have had from people such as Premier Denis Napthine, Premier Barry O'Farrell and the new Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, who as one are determined to get on and deal with those gangs. I thank them particularly for their efforts in the past week in interstate crime operations. I also thank them in anticipation of what shall be done in the future.

Let us look at the pattern, at what has happened and at some of the things that have occurred. In this state, we have had a Labor state government that tried to pass a law. In 2009 it finally went through. At the time, concerns were sounded. What has that law achieved? The answer is, absolutely nothing! It took a long time for the process to declare the Finks and to move through this cumbersome and frankly downright stupid process. I digress by saying that, as usual, the Labor Party is focused on process and time wasting, but not outcomes. That is very much what its legislation was all about. At the end of that process, what did the Finks criminal motorcycle gang members do? That is right: they said, 'We're not Finks anymore; we're Mongols'. We were back to square one. The Labor Party needs to accept that its legislation is not worth anything.

Mr Bleijie: It is not working.

Mr NEWMAN: It is not working, it has not worked and it will never work. That is why this evening they need to get behind these tough new laws to deal with criminal motorcycle gangs.

Let us quickly look at some of the features of the legislation. The first bill before us is the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill. What is it fundamentally about? Firstly, it is about ensuring that those members of vicious gangs who do not cooperate receive very tough penalties. There is an element in there about breaking them up and we make no apologies for that. I said before that we intend to destroy those gangs. This legislation provides a strong incentive and a strong disincentive. The disincentive is the very harsh and onerous penalties, but the incentive factor is about showing people that if they break solidarity with a gang, if they inform on the gang and if they give information that leads to the police being able to successfully prosecute other members of the gang they will get some relief. They will get out of jail while they are still in their youth. They will not moulder away in jail. That is the importance of the first piece of legislation.

The second piece of legislation is the Tattoo Parlours Bill. I note that the Leader of the Opposition said that this only scratches the surface. In answer to her implied question, we will do more. We are more than happy to come in and make other amendments. I believe the Attorney-General has already foreshadowed that. If he has not, I know that he will. We are also keen

to see how we can amend other legislation for licensed premises to ensure that the gangs cannot infiltrate legitimate industries. This is a step forward because we know that, according to the police and the CMC, in Queensland 90 or 95 per cent of all tattoo parlours have some sort of link with criminal motorcycle gangs. That is why we should go after this one.

Mr Bleijie: And we don't licence them.

Mr NEWMAN: We do not licence them at the moment. I take that interjection from the Attorney-General.

The final piece of legislation is the legislation that allows us to declare some of these gangs as criminal motorcycle gangs. I want to stress that there is a process around this. Cabinet has met and agreed a set of criteria. Those criteria demand that the police or the CMC provide evidence that these organisations are engaged in criminal activity. Having approved such criteria, the cabinet has been pleased to consider the recommendations of the Queensland Police Service and the CMC.

The list that is part of the package this evening contains the names of organisations that are criminal motorcycle gangs. They are not people who enjoy motorcycle riding. They are not people who just love the free spirit of being out on the road. These are criminal motorcycle gangs—organisations that are involved in drugs, in prostitution, in extortion, in rape, in murder, in assaults. They are truly criminals. They are not loveable ruffians. They are not outlaws. They are not big-hearted people with hearts of gold that just do toy runs. They are crims. For too long in this state and in this nation these people have been tolerated, indeed in some sections of the media even lauded and applauded—no more in Queensland.

That is why 'outlaw motorcycle gang' is not part of our language. I note with some concern that it is still the language of the opposition in this place. These people are criminals. They are not Robin Hood. They are not robbing the rich and giving to the poor. They are crims in the way that I have just said. This third piece of legislation allows us to deal with them accordingly. Again, what do we hope to achieve? We hope to achieve a mechanism where we can take away their motorcycles, their clubhouses, their guns, their drugs, their ill-gotten gains. That is what it is all about.

To talk about all three pieces of legislation and to address some of the concerns expressed by the Leader of the Opposition I say this, and it is a very important point; the legislation may be challenged or elements of it may be challenged. We have always said that that could be the case. They can hardly talk. Their own legislation was challenged. Their own legislation went through a tortuous process and never achieved anything. We have sought the best legal advice available to us—none other than Walter Sofronoff.

Mrs Miller: Right.

Mr NEWMAN: I hear them scoffing. What a slur on a great legal mind. Walter Sofronoff, the Solicitor-General of the state of Queensland and one of the finest constitutional lawyers in this nation, has worked closely with the Attorney-General and his people to actually ensure that this legislation is going to do the job that it is meant to do. If we fail, if it is challenged, I have said before and I say again tonight, we will keep trying. Unlike the Australian Labor Party, we will not go and have a conference. We will not hold hands and have a crime summit. We will not say one thing and do another. We will not have these contradictory positions inside of one evening in the parliament. We will act. That is what we are doing this evening.

Mrs Miller: So arrogant.

Mr NEWMAN: I hear the interjection about arrogance. Arrogance is when you ignore the community. The Labor Party ignored the community for years when they said that there was a problem and they wanted them to act. They never provided appropriate action. We are not arrogant; we are listening to Queenslanders. We are delivering on the things they wanted.

Mrs Miller: Arrogant.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Member!

Mr NEWMAN: Madam Speaker, I am personally offended and I ask the member to withdraw.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, I ask you to withdraw.

Mrs MILLER: I withdraw.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Bundamba. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: Sometimes things that the member for Bundamba says are sweet. It is sweet to hear her withdraw for once.

These things have been considered because they are things that the people of Queensland want. That is not arrogance. Arrogance is refusing to listen to the community. Arrogance is saying that you know best. Arrogance is ignoring the will of the people and we will not do that. This evening we take decisive action along with the other measures that I have indicated deal with these gangs.

The test for the Australian Labor Party is this: stand up tonight and back this legislation. People on this side of the House back this legislation. They have the courage, they have the fortitude, they have the strength, the will and the character to take this forward. Importantly, they also have the courage to explain to Queenslanders why we need tough laws and how we are delivering a safer Queensland.

Will those in the Labor Party do that or will they continue to be astride the barbwire fence? Will they say one thing and do another? Will they put one point of view this evening and put another later? Will they continue to say that we are scratching the surface but then say we are being too tough? They have to work it out. This is their moment to actually explain whether they will be tough on crime.

To conclude, the problem we have is one that has been burning for a long, long time. This administration, like no other in the nation's history—

Mrs Miller: Arrogant.

Mr NEWMAN:—is prepared to go out and destroy these people. Madam Speaker, I ask her to withdraw again. I am personally offended.

Madam SPEAKER: I did not hear the interjection.

Mr NEWMAN: The member for Bundamba keeps making the same interjection.

Mrs MILLER: I was not addressing you.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, did you make an interjection?

Mrs MILLER: No, I was talking to Bill.

Mr Bleijje: Yes, you did. We heard it.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, I would ask you to withdraw. I would ask members to please pay attention to debate.

Mrs MILLER: Madam Speaker, what was I alleged to have said? Because I was actually talking to Bill.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, there was an interjection. Whether it was directed across the chamber or sideways to other members in the House, it was heard by members. Offence has been taken by the Premier who has the call. I ask that you withdraw.

Mrs MILLER: I withdraw whatever may have offended the Premier.

Madam SPEAKER: Just withdraw unconditionally, please.

Mrs MILLER: I withdraw, but I do not know what I was supposed to have said. I withdraw.

Mr CRANDON: I rise to a point of order, Madam Speaker. The same terminology as was used prior was clearly heard across the chamber. I would suggest to you that the—

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, take your seat.

Mr CRANDON:—member is misleading the House.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, I know you just withdrew but it was not unconditional. I would ask that you just withdraw.

Mrs MILLER: I withdraw.

Madam SPEAKER: I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: The Labor Party has a decision to make this evening. The interjections again indicate their contempt and their arrogance and their failure to say unequivocally what they are going to do this evening. They can laugh. The member for Bundamba can laugh. The member for Mulgrave, who was a minister in a former government that did not do anything about this issue, can interject and carry on. But what are they going to do? That will be fascinating. We have been here for 18 months and we are taking the most decisive action of any government in the nation's history. We have heard from the opposition that we are going too far and going too fast and it should not go through and that it is a breach of civil liberties. But then we have heard that we are not going far enough and we are scratching the surface. They are very confused people.

I believe this evening I have outlined very clearly what this is all about. I have outlined what occurred that assailed the senses of Queenslanders. I have outlined why it is such an assault on the safety and security of this state. I have gone through the elements of the legislation describing in broad terms what each is meant to do. I have also talked about the overall government strategy in terms of the resources to the police and the CMC, the legislation we are dealing with and the unique jail experience that will be provided to members of criminal motorcycles gangs.

To conclude, I say this to the criminal motorcycle gangs of Queensland: go and get proper jobs; it is over this evening or when the Governor provides royal assent to this legislation. We are going to hunt you relentlessly. The government is not going to stop like the Labor Party would have. This is not some flash in the pan or momentary phase. We are going to hunt you down. I say this evening: take off your colours, get a real job, act like decent, law-abiding human beings and become proper citizens in the state of Queensland and you will not have to go to jail. If you continue to persist as members of criminal gangs, with criminal activities, creating fear and intimidation across Queensland you will be destroyed, and we make no apologies for that. I urge all members of this parliament this evening to get behind this legislation 100 per cent, without equivocation, without hesitation to shut down and destroy these gangs.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the police minister, I wish to acknowledge visiting in the gallery tonight is the Deputy Mayor of the Gold Coast, Donna Gates, and also Councillor William Owen-Jones.



Hon. JM DEMPSEY (Bundaberg—LNP) (Minister for Police and Community Safety) (8.59 pm): The Queensland community and this government have had enough of criminal gangs. It is a great pleasure to rise this evening to speak on the three bills that we have before the House. The Newman government is determined to do whatever it can to make sure that it gets rid of criminal gangs and to liberate Queenslanders from the intimidation and fear that these parasites bring to our communities. We will do whatever it takes to protect all Queenslanders.

Let's make no mistake about it: the purpose of this bill is to shut down these criminal gangs. To achieve this, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act will be amended to allow police, without warrant, to stop and search a person reasonably suspected of being a criminal participant or to stop and search any vehicle which they may be travelling in. Police officers will be able to require persons reasonably suspected of being a criminal participant to state their name and address and provide proof of who they are. If they cannot provide the proof, police officers can detain them and take them back to a police station, take their fingerprints and photographs to positively identify who they are.

New offences will be inserted into the Criminal Code dealing with three or more participants in criminal organisations associating in public and participants in criminal organisations entering prescribed places, which include their clubhouses, and attending prescribed events. Furthermore, it will be an offence for participants to try to recruit members. If they use their vehicles in connection with the commission of these offences, their vehicles will be forfeited to the state.

The offence of affray will include a circumstance of aggravation where the offence is committed by a participant in a criminal organisation, with the circumstance carrying a minimum penalty of six months imprisonment and a maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment. Again, if they use a vehicle to commit this offence, the vehicle will be forfeited. The evade policy provisions in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act will be amended to ensure the minimum penalty is 50 penalty units—that is, \$5,500—or the equivalent period of 50 days imprisonment to be served wholly in a corrective service facility.

Additionally, there will be a circumstance of aggravation for participants of a criminal organisation where the minimum penalty is 100 penalty units—that is, \$11,000—or the equivalent period of 100 days imprisonment to be fully served. Furthermore, a participant of a criminal organisation who evades police will have their vehicle forfeited.

Participants in criminal organisations will be banned from owning or operating tattoo parlours and will be banned from wearing gang paraphernalia in licensed premises. To further support our police, criminal gang members who commit a serious assault on a police officer will have to serve a minimum period of 12 months imprisonment to be fully served in a corrective service facility.

Long gone will be the days of these thugs being let out on bail, enabling them to commit more offences. The Penalties and Sentences Act will be amended providing a presumption against bail for participants in criminal organisations. On top of these powers, the coercive powers of the Crime and Misconduct Commission will be enhanced and anyone refusing to answer questions will face mandatory imprisonment.

Further upping the ante, the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill introduces laws based on the United States racketeering legislation and will impose extensive mandatory penalties where a person commits a prescribed serious offence for the purpose of, or in connection with, criminal associations. These prescribed offences are extensive and include such things as homicide, riot, torture and grievous bodily harm. The only way the penalties can be reduced is if the offender enters into an agreement to cooperate with a law enforcement agency.

To further ensure that these criminal enterprises are shut down, the Newman government has developed a multifaceted and prolonged unwavering attack on criminal gangs. The Queensland Police Service has initiated two task forces to target criminal gangs. These task forces are under the command of Deputy Commissioner Brett Pointing. Task Force Takeback is a highly visible police operation designed to put a stop to the violent outbreak of crime committed by criminal gangs recently witnessed on the Gold Coast. This task force is employing a zero tolerance approach to crime and public disorder committed by members and associates of criminal organisations. A large contingent of police are currently operating on the Gold Coast to achieve this objective.

Task Force Maxima is a multidisciplinary team of investigators and specialist staff focusing on the criminal business activities of criminal gangs. It will also identify business interests and target unexplained wealth of criminal organisations to dismantle and eliminate the illegal finances, businesses and associations of these criminals. Other law enforcement agencies including the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Taxation Office and the Australian Crime Commission have also committed to support Task Force Maxima in removing this scourge from all Queensland communities. The Newman government acknowledged that the police need information from members of the public and that is why up to \$5 million has been committed for cash rewards for information provided to Crime Stoppers.

Law-abiding persons have nothing to fear from these laws. These new laws are about protecting Queenslanders. Conversely, members and associates of criminal gangs should be concerned. We are coming after you, your vehicles and your ill-gotten gains. This is an unprecedented and prolonged crackdown, and the Newman government has the resolve to see this through. You may run and you may even hide, but rest assured we are coming after you and we are shutting you down.

They are a few words that I put together before coming into the House, but after listening to the members of the opposition here tonight I would like to say a few more words about the great work that the Attorney-General and his staff have achieved in putting this legislation together that reflects the want of the people of Queensland in relation to ensuring that Queensland is not just a great state but a safe state.

Those opposite will suddenly suffer a loss of memory, forgetting what has happened over the last 20 years. They will say that they put money into the Police Service, that they put money into the CMC and into organisations because that is their ideological behaviour. They think that by putting more money into something that will increase efficiency. But over time what we saw was the entrenchment of criminal gangs throughout the whole state. Being a former police officer for nearly 20 years, I remember seeing the statistics relating to drug labs in particular increasing in Queensland. Every other state was experiencing between five and 10 drug labs a year. Queensland's statistics were going through the roof. Why? Because, as we have just heard from Labor members opposite, they can talk but there is no action in relation to their determination. For example, they took 10 years to implement phone-tapping powers and they did not even provide the police with a proper radio system where they could talk to other emergency service workers and they could not even talk securely amongst themselves, so the rest of the criminal element in Queensland knew exactly what was happening.

All members in the community know that when there is a break-and-enter in our community it generally involves drugs being stolen, someone being bashed through thuggery type behaviour or young children suffering because a parent or a loved one is addicted to certain types of drugs. Where does that money stream go at the end of the day? Who supplies the drugs? That stolen property does not just end up at the pawnbrokers down the road. There needs to be a criminal network to be able to disseminate it right across the state and the nation. That is why these criminal gangs may front up in certain weeks and smile and think they are great citizens when in fact they are the scum of the earth in relation to how they treat the most vulnerable citizens of this great state.

Tonight it is a great privilege as a member and also as the Minister for Police and Community Safety to have an opportunity to rid this element from our society. In no way, shape or form do they value add to our community. They bring pain and suffering and they continue to hide behind certain civil libertarians and certain members of the legal fraternity who profit from these organisations. This is a time for all Queenslanders to work together and to stand by each other to actually make a difference not just for our community now but for the communities in the years ahead. In doing that we will certainly have a better state not just economically or in terms of having the best health or education system but also in terms of having the safest state, which will attract people to come here and will let people feel secure in their homes.

Recently we held Police Remembrance Day. One of the themes of that day is that when people go to bed at night and the darkness of the evening descends, they need to know that they can sleep safely in their bed. Tonight the community of Queensland will be able to sleep a lot safer in their beds. I look forward to the challenges ahead of meeting community expectations and ensuring that the police have the resources, the modern technology and also the confidence of knowing that this government finally stands behind them, supports them and backs them 100 per cent because of the difficult task ahead. This government supports all Queensland families, especially the families of our police and emergency services workers.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (9.11 pm): I rise to make a contribution to this debate. For those who were not listening, the Labor opposition will be supporting this legislation at the second reading, although, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, we carry serious reservations given the limited opportunity we have had to scrutinise this legislation—and rightly so. It was interesting for me to hear the Premier talk about crossing the Rubicon because, frankly, when I looked at this legislation, in the limited time we have had to actually scrutinise it, I thought the new title of this bill might be ‘Cry “Havoc!” and let slip the dogs of war’, which is very much Shakespeare from *Julius Caesar*. I use that phrase because there is nothing sophisticated about these bills. There is nothing that has been rigorously or intellectually tested whatsoever. What a sad set of circumstances this government finds itself in. This government has demonstrated nothing but complete ineptitude and incompetence when it comes to the issue of dealing with organised crime and particularly bikie related crime in this state.

Previously, I have risen in this parliament to make the point very clear that the LNP have dropped the ball in dealing with organised crime in this state. On 5 June last year I rose to make the very points that I am sure members of the government are trying to take ownership of today. What did I receive at the time? I received the howls of jackals, the mob rule of the LNP dominated parliament. At the time I said that bikie gangs were a problem in our communities and our communities wanted them removed from society.

I contrast that with the nonsense that has been peddled by the LNP since 2009. I call on the Attorney-General, ministers and backbenchers of this government who participated in the 2009 debate on the Labor Criminal Organisation Bill to retract their position stated at that time. Many on the government side of this chamber should be hanging their heads in shame. I could have a lot of fun reflecting on the stupidity of the commentary emanating from the then opposition but, given that the current opposition leader has already made a point of that, I will move on to challenging members of that LNP opposition, who are now ministers of this government, to get up and be honest with Queenslanders by admitting that they got it absolutely wrong in 2009. A bit of a humility and honesty would not go astray for a bunch of ignoramuses who so flagrantly and opportunistically got it wrong.

The Attorney-General in particular should stand in this House and retract everything that he said for four years. He was completely wrong in 2009 and he either did not understand the legislation at the time or was completely incompetent. What this saga tells me is that the LNP represents a movement of no conviction—no conviction whatsoever. This is a party that is prepared to say and do anything for the sake of generating a headline and spin.

I nearly expired with laughter when I went back and read the Attorney-General's speech of 2009. The first chunk of it was all about the number of government members speaking on the bill—the sort of grade 11 school debate standard. The Attorney-General then threw in the obligatory term ‘draconian’. Today he called that bill a bit soft. Four years ago it was all draconian stuff. Then he

talked about Queensland leading the way on freedoms and liberties of our people. Then he talked about the child safety crisis—clearly outside the long title of the bill, one would have thought—and then there was a direct quote referring to what Labor was doing from 2009. He said—

They wake up one morning, the Premier gets the newspaper and says, 'Goodness gracious! There's a shooting with motorcycle gangs! What are we going to do? We're a very proactive state so we're going to do something about this.' Absolutely not! It is just reaction after crisis management ...

This government needs to be proactive ...

That is exactly what he said in 2009. It is a bit of a joke for the Attorney-General to rabbit on about a proactive government. At the time he talked about how the LNP had tried to support the CMC with more resources. He made a big deal about more support. It is funny that none of that attitude actually migrated through to this government, which sacked 50 staff and ripped a million dollars out of the CMC. Of course there was a little rant about personal freedoms and liberties and the now Attorney-General had the hide to raise the issue of natural justice during that debate. Maybe the Attorney-General should give a lecture to the transport minister, who seems to have no idea whatsoever about what the term 'natural justice' means. Perhaps the LNP might like to adopt one of my rules: don't say something in opposition that you're not prepared to repeat on ministerial leather. Ultimately, the government's complete failure is symptomatic of a philosophy that always—

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! I call the member for Rockhampton.

Mr BYRNE: Perhaps the LNP might like to adopt one of my rules, which I just outlined. Ultimately, the government's complete failure is symptomatic of a philosophy that always puts form, that is spin, over substance which is measured by effect: a government entirely lacking conviction, a government entirely lacking competence that has shown not the slightest interest in addressing this issue for the many years when in opposition and government until now. What a bunch of charlatans!

Let us revisit some of the history because it dramatically portrays the head space of this government. The people of Queensland have seen years of vacuous, spineless pontification from the LNP. On 5 June last year in this House I made the following observations in the debate on the Criminal Organisation Bill. I said—

Too often the political debate about law and order has been corrupted and reduced to the lowest common denominator. Harsher sentences and a bidding war over constables—

always—

attract political attention.

Of course, that is where we find ourselves today: a government that has sat on its hands for nearly two years, failing to deal with the issue that has been self-evident to every Queenslander. Here we are with a government running around like a bunch of headless chooks, desperate to be seen to be doing something, desperate to maintain their mantra of being tough on crime despite their complete failure and lack of practical appreciation, desperate to provide a perception of control when of course this is a facade.

This House should be debating strategic issues deriving from the Keelty report. I can assure those members opposite that I have grave reservations about that report. Thirty per cent of it is probably worthwhile, 40 per cent is not supported by any evidence and the remaining 30 per cent represents one of the most disgraceful, verbose, ill-informed and irresponsible sets of recommendations that this state has ever seen. That 30 per cent will destroy our emergency services and destroy families. It is the very type of recommendations and trains of thought outlined in that report that made me join the Labor Party in the first place. I told the Police Union earlier this year what I feared about the Keelty review and I was absolutely right because the LNP are so predictable.

Instead of me pointing out the flaws in Keelty's report, here we are debating this finger-in-the-dyke stuff from an entirely reactionary administration. The 30 per cent of what he wrote that was actually worthwhile, in my view, includes the following remarks, which outline the trap that the LNP government has fallen into. The LNP paid over \$700,000 for that report but ignored Keelty's observations at the very first sign of trouble. Keelty said—

Media will often focus on a particular law and order problem, and the government will often feel compelled to respond. The cycle is completed by a promise of more police or a shift in resourcing which can sometimes treat the symptom and not the cause. The services or options provided by other agencies at all levels of government in collaboration with the police can be overlooked in the haste to find quick solution for a rapid media cycle.

I hope you have all read Keelty. He went on to say—

This cycle of event/response/promise of more resources is not sustainable and can mask inefficiencies in systems and how policing is conducted. In effect, the Queensland Police Service does not need to be able to produce better data or more information on the cost of its services because despite any inefficiency they are likely to be promised more police officers at a budget cycle in the not too distant future. Perversely this can drive a desire not to improve reporting capability, as good data may not support the resource increases being promised.

In turn, by being unable to pinpoint the effects of adding more police resources, the argument for more resources can be made again and again on similar grounds, chiefly the perception by the community about their safety.

This is exactly the point associated with this legislation and the government's reaction, and here we have the perfect case study playing out on the Gold Coast. In many respects these bills are a smokescreen for a government desperate to be seen to be doing something. If this government and the responsible ministers were across their briefs, we should be debating in this House the substantial issues raised by the Keelty report.

By the way, where is the government's response to that report? We know the report has been in the possession of the government since July. We know that Mr Keelty consulted with the government on a regular basis during the period of the review. We know the report was deliberately withheld until after the federal election for purely political partisan purposes. In order to demonstrate the consistency of my opinion, back on 5 June last year in this House I said—

Certainly greater emphasis on police intelligence gathering and analytical capacities represents a sensible discussion that needs to be embraced. Again, senior officers on the ground remain gravely concerned about this intelligence capacity, and virtually every policeman I speak to makes mention of it to some degree.

It is really a bit of a joke, because we all know the LNP's expressed views about Labor's Criminal Organisation Act. We all remember the public dismissals of that legislation by the now Attorney-General when he described it as a wasted opportunity. The Attorney-General was greatly concerned about the civil liberty implications of the Labor legislation. He did not think that anti-association laws were the right way to deal with rogue bkie gangs and other organised crime syndicates. Funny thing, that! What a turnaround by the Attorney-General and this government. It has been breathtaking, and intelligent observers must be shaking their heads watching this bump-and-go government blunder from one stuff-up to the next—an opportunistic government with no conviction.

I have heard the outrage from certain quarters regarding this legislation. Personally, I suspect that some aspects of this legislation will certainly not survive a High Court appeal. This is a matter to be tested, as I am sure it will be. Labor knew and knows that bkie gangs and organised crime represent a clear and present danger to our collective notions of decency and democracy.

I would like to point out Labor's record in relation to Gold Coast crime and bkie gangs, and I stress that these are not my figures. They come from Superintendent Ziebarth, who at the time was the district officer on the Gold Coast. The House should note the date of these comments, because they were made well into the LNP's term of government, on 17 August last year.

Superintendent Ziebarth stated that on the Gold Coast between 2001 and 2011 offences against property were reduced by 29 per cent. This means that Gold Coast residents had a 29 per cent less chance of being the victim of a break-and-enter or vehicle theft. Superintendent Ziebarth stated that between 2001 and 2011 offences against the person were reduced by 49 per cent. This means that the former government reduced your chance of being assaulted on the Gold Coast by nearly 50 per cent. Armed robberies were reduced by 26 per cent. In contrast, the LNP has seen motor vehicle theft on the Gold Coast rise from 1,835 in 2010-11 to 2,028 for 2012-13—a 10.5 per cent rise in vehicle thefts.

In August 2012 Superintendent Ziebarth attempted to bust the myth that bikies are taking over the Gold Coast. Remember, this is under the LNP's watch. I cannot imagine who from the minister's office approved the following statement by Superintendent Ziebarth. The previous government was certainly concerned in 2009. I have no idea how this issue was dropped off the radar by this government in 2012. At the time Superintendent Ziebarth said—

Outlaw Motorcycle Gangs (OMCG) have members and clubhouses throughout the state. The Gold Coast has no particular monopoly on them.

It would be a mistake to underestimate their criminality, or to believe the PR spin that they are simply motorcycle enthusiasts who are unfairly targeted by police.

But we have no evidence to support claims that there is any looming 'bkie war'.

We are well aware of the activities of these groups and their individual members, and do everything in our powers to ensure criminality is curbed, and offenders brought to justice.

This means using all the legislation available to us to make things as difficult as possible for those groups who do the wrong thing. We liaise closely with law enforcement agencies throughout Australia and internationally to combat OMCGs.

I ask the government members: what has changed in your view since August 2012? Why has the government been so comatose for so long? The Premier describes a sea-change moment from his position that wearing colours was akin to wearing a football jersey. This was under the LNP's watch, and the community needs an explanation about that performance.

One thing that has changed, of course, is that the Attorney-General ripped a million dollars out of the CMC and sacked 50 staff when the CMC gave evidence in a parliamentary hearing stating that they did not have the resources to deal with the proceeds of crime legislation. I say to the government: this is your watch; this is your responsibility; and you are accountable to the people of Queensland. I submit that while the language that this government has been using has been tough the effect has been insignificant. That must change! I believe that this narrow legislative approach of itself will not deliver the long-term effect required, despite how the House will be portrayed in the media.

I firmly believe that only investment in the intelligence apparatus of the state, with the associated scrutiny of all financial dealings of those parties identified, will result in the destruction of these criminal networks. Perhaps properly funding and enabling the CMC might be a good start for this government. The Labor Party believes more must be done to give effect to that notion. The former government's Criminal Association Act was successful in the High Court. The police minister and the Attorney-General need to explain this important question to the people of Queensland. When the High Court decided that the laws were constitutional earlier this year, why didn't the LNP hand out control orders to every other gang in Queensland? Once the High Court had ruled, the LNP should have been handing out these things like confetti. Instead the Premier and Ministers Dempsey and Bleijie turned into the three wise monkeys who let gangs free to do what they wanted, which led to the Bandidos being free to operate openly on the coast without any action to declare them. Is this just a smokescreen for their failure to pursue these gangs with the full force of the law when they should have already done so? The government must take responsibility—

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! There have been continued interjections. The member for Rockhampton is not taking interjections. I call the member and ask for silence.

Mr BYRNE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I don't mind. It is okay with me. Keep it coming. The government must take responsibility. They have hidden all the information about this bill until the last minute. They stymied debate. They promised a briefing on the Gold Coast, but reneged. They have attempted to rewrite history from 2009, when they got into bed with the very people that they are so ardently opposing today. They are hypocrites of the highest order, and they will be found out in the long run by the people of Queensland. I mentioned that the government is ultimately responsible, and that responsibility extends well beyond debates within this House or the passage of individual pieces of legislation.

As I have pointed out repeatedly in this House, the people of Queensland have been calling for action from this government—not just on the Gold Coast but also in Townsville, Cairns, Rockhampton and everywhere else. People across Queensland saw crime rates last year go up on average two per cent under the LNP's watch. Some areas, like Ipswich, have seen statistics in some crime categories go through the roof. I have already remarked about motor vehicle theft going up 10 per cent since Labor's last full year in government.

I genuinely look forward to the day that any minister can stand up in this House and report substantial progress in the elimination of organised gangs in this state. The government will be measured against this target. I will hold the government to that, as will Queenslanders. It is what the LNP had promised the community. The government can pass any law it wants because it has the numbers, so the government must eliminate organised gangs or it will have failed once again.

Members should remember that numerous Australian citizens travel overseas and undertake drug-dealing enterprises with the prospect of a death penalty. I am not sure that 15-year penalties will change the way in which some of the individuals in bikie groups conduct themselves.

To have a determined, intelligent, comprehensive and sustained effort against organised bikie gangs we must first have a proper debate with appropriate experts and advisers. With that effort in mind, we must have a debate within the bounds of civilised reason. Whether this Attorney-General is capable of civilised reason is a question of debate in itself.

It concerns me that the LNP is not even worried about enacting laws that will probably not survive a High Court challenge. This concerns me a great deal, as it concerns most Queenslanders. It would be devastating to hardworking police if the large number of hours they put into these investigations was wasted because it was all thrown out by an adverse finding in the High Court. The Attorney-General should provide to this parliament the legal advice about this legislation to give us confidence that it has some chance of surviving a High Court challenge. I conclude by saying that the Labor opposition will support this legislation within the bounds just described.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! I call the member for Ipswich.

Ms Palaszczuk: This'll be good!

 **Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (9.32 pm): Thank you, Leader of the Opposition, and thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker Cunningham, for giving me the opportunity to speak to these bills. I will certainly address the comments of the Leader of the Opposition shortly. I support the passage of the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, the Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013 and the Criminal Law (Criminal Gangs Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013. I will speak mainly with respect to the first bill.

It really is upon me to give an address on the history of the bikie gangs. I know that almost every speaker in the House tonight has averred to it and made reference to it, because it is an important point. The important point is that there was a time when the activities of bikies were overtly prominent. Of course, the Labor Party responded to that. I will make comment about that in due course.

While recent events have highlighted the dysfunction in our society by the brutal intrusion of bikie gang members, their friends and the office bearers on our restaurants, coffee shops and businesses, the reality is that for some time their actions and conduct have permeated our society. In recent times we have become overtly aware of this increase in the illegal activities of these criminal motorcycle gangs, or CMGs as they are known in police parlance. There have been instances where our values have been challenged and the effectiveness of our laws has been tested. And it seems that our laws, as promulgated by the previous Labor government, have come up short.

These bills will change the legal landscape. I mention the reference by the member for Rockhampton to deterrence because that is the issue here. That is the issue when we are dealing with professionals and not so much where we are dealing with emotive offences.

It is not long ago that the people of Queensland had their lives shaken by events that were once reserved for television screens. Those recent events include the incident concerning the arrest of 18 brawling bikies on the Gold Coast. On 27 September 2013 a melee leading to offences from assault to stealing and involving as many as 60 members of motorcycle gangs happened outside a Broadbeach restaurant. A following incident happened outside the Southport watch-house, where three motorcycle gang members were arrested, four police officers were injured and 18 people were charged with offences which included public nuisance, assault, obstructing police, assaulting police and being disorderly on licensed premises. There was a second brawl only weeks later. Another melee erupted outside a Nobby's Beach coffee shop/juice bar, where the projecting of metal chairs occurred in the clear and uninterrupted view of the patrons, passers-by and holiday-makers—something we had not witnessed for quite some time on the Gold Coast. It was, quite frankly, surprising that innocent citizens were not injured or perhaps even worse.

This brought to a head a cancerous, festering sore which has dogged Australian societies for decades. By example, our criminal history is dotted with motorcycle gang incidents including the murder by bikie gang members at the Sydney airport in 2009 to which the Leader of the Opposition has referred. That was a case where members of the Hells Angels Motorcycle Club and members of the Comanchero Motorcycle Club fought each other, and this fracas resulted in the death of one of the combatants. In all, six people were convicted of the murder of one Mr Zervas. Needless to say, it has been very well highlighted what impact that had on the citizens of Australia when news of the incident was shown on our television screens.

Surrounding this event there were drive-by shootings. These all formed part of Sydney's daily newspapers and television broadcasts. Bikies have now overtly challenged the authority of the rule of law and have done so blatantly and with total disregard for the laws that prevail. Unfortunately, the evidence is clear that this cancerous growth has been multiplying unchecked in other Western countries as well as within Australia and bikie gangs have been linked to the manufacture of illegal drugs including ecstasy and ice, extortion, prostitution, money laundering and other activities,

including entry into legitimate businesses. Permeating these illegal activities are large amounts of money—unexplained wealth. Inextricably mixed with the unexplained wealth is the collateral damage associated with these shootings, bombings, torture and executions, which all seem to be linked. Yet not anything was achieved by the Bligh government. Valid legislation—perhaps so, but no conviction.

I would like to know: what is the point of having legislation if it does not work or if you do not use it? It is therefore for the Newman government to act immediately and decisively in excising this cancerous growth from our civil society. The people of Queensland demand it. Government demands it. Biekie gangs must be brought before the people's courts to account for their actions. The members of biekie gangs and their associates need to be brought to account.

The concern for government has been the increasing influence in criminal motorcycle gangs. The Bligh legislation has not yet yielded a result whereby the people of Queensland can feel that effective steps have been taken to decrease the growth of the illegal influence of these criminal motorcycle gangs.

I return briefly to the two Gold Coast incidents because they of course are on our minds and they are relevant to the way in which we now view criminal motorcycle gangs and motorcycle gangs generally. There is no doubt that Queensland, and indeed Australia, has a huge problem. When biekie gangs are muscling up on the streets of the Gold Coast, urgent action is demanded.

To say to the people of Queensland that the Newman government will act and act decisively is an understatement. We have before us a trilogy of bills which are, in my respectful view, the harshest in the land and probably the most effective. I would be very surprised if other jurisdictions did not follow suit.

I want to make a comment about the measures to be taken by this government to enact these legislative provisions as a deterrence to the increasing boldness and the wanton flouting of Queensland laws, and at this point in time I make one observation about the member for Rockhampton's speech when he said that spending an extra 15 or 20 years in jail will not be a deterrent. I am sorry, but I fail to understand or see the logic of that reasoning. To say that somebody will not change their ways or change their behaviour—perhaps covertly—defies description. It is quite clear that they will change their ways—the question we do not know is how they will do it—but by changing their ways and having an effective control provision it makes it easier to hunt them down.

The breach of these laws places people and property in the line of fire, and that is the problem that we have. It is the collateral damage that will affect us—that is, our citizens will be caught up in the malaises and the fracas and the brawls and innocent people will be hurt, maimed, damaged or, for that matter, killed. What will be an effective deterrence? That must be answered by looking at legislation that has previously been enacted in Australia and abroad. The Gold Coast reportedly has nine motorcycle clubs aptly fitting the description of biekie gangs. The two previous brawls were not isolated but part of a continuum of unlawful conduct. In March 2006 a fight with knives and guns erupted between the Finks and the Hells Angels when a Fink defected to the Hells Angels and the battle ground was the five-star Royal Pines Resort. What does that do for our tourism industry? What does that do for the safety and security of our fellow citizens?

The objects of this legislation are to disestablish associations which support persons who engage in committing serious crime and the collateral effect is to enhance public safety and security while denying support from the associations supporting the persons who are carrying on the activities of committing serious offences. This will be achieved by ramping up the terms of the imprisonment for those vicious lawless associates who commit declared offences. Schedule 1 sets out the declared offences. For example, in schedule 1 the majority—if not all—of these offences are offences against the person, whether it be directly or indirectly, and that is the important point. It refers to safety and security and making sure that those people who interfere with our lives are well and truly prosecuted and put away for lengthy periods of time. By removing parole for vicious lawless associates with respect to declared offences, it is a bold and forward step. There are limited exceptions, but those exceptions are well placed and necessary. But this is the high-water mark that we need to reach in order to send a very clear message not only to those criminal biekie gangs but also to our citizens that the Newman government means business.

To be a vicious lawless associate this person must commit a declared offence, is a participant in the affairs of the association and the declared offence was committed either for a purpose of the association or in the course of participating in the affairs of the association. It is very clear that the

elements are clearly set out as to what the connection is and for all of those elements to be proved in order to bring about a prosecution. To be a participant in the affairs of an association, the associate must assert membership with an association or wants to be a member or otherwise is associated with that association. It is clear as to what the police are required to prove, and of course there will be intelligence that needs to be gathered and there will be police who will need to be brought into play to ensure that these laws are enforced, as well as lawyers who will prosecute these matters in courts and on appeals.

It must be made very clear that this legislation will not affect motorcycle clubs that carry out lawful objects and enjoy the pastime of companionship, company and camaraderie, which is the common desire of most motorcycle riding charity groups that enjoy that pastime. The tough part of this legislation is embodied in clause 7—that is, upon proof of all of the elements of which I have described proving a declared offence, the finding of proof of the declared offence by the vicious lawless associate will involve the jury being invited to make their finding as being proved. If so, then the associate will receive a non-parole period of 17 years imprisonment. If the convicted vicious lawless associate is then proved to be a member of that association, then a further 10 years imprisonment will be imposed.

I refer fleetingly to the speech in this debate by the Leader of the Opposition. The leader refers in glowing terms to the highlight of the Bligh government's response to criminal motorcycle gang activity. She said, 'We have legislation that works. It received a koala stamp from the High Court. We have delivered.' One small point: that may be a perception, but the reality of life is that there has not been one conviction recorded. What is the point of making laws if you cannot deliver on them? The resolve of the Bligh government is really abysmal to think that in fact it went to the High Court and got the koala stamp and yet nothing was done to pursue the object as to why the legislation was created.

As president of the Law Society, it was the practice for the president of the Law Society to sign correspondence. That is no big deal. It is an argument by the opposition leader that is hollow but of course will draw the maximum mirth of the Tarago. Accepting as a presumption that it did represent my view—if it did; let us make that presumption just to allow the debate to run its natural course—then have recent circumstances not changed the way in which we think about criminal motorcycle gangs? Has that not had an effect upon the Leader of the Opposition? But, then again, the Leader of the Opposition is not opposing the legislation. For 50 minutes or so I heard that she was not opposing the legislation. Heavens above! If she was opposing this legislation I would feel really worried about it all, but I am fortified and I am comforted by the Leader of the Opposition saying that it is not to be opposed. Even more so, when the member for Bundamba says that she is not opposing it I feel so comforted by it. I am at ease now, colleagues—at ease.

Mr Bleijie: That only means I haven't gone hard enough if the Labor Party—

Mr BERRY: I assure the Attorney that he has done an excellent job and that the deterrence in these bills will really send shivers through bkie gangs, because there is one thing they understand. They are in the business of power and money, and those things go hand in hand. It is great to have power, but power without money is not much good to you. It is not much good having power and money and spending 20-odd years in prison. It just simply does not work. From my viewpoint, this legislation has hit the nail on the head and it will be effective at ensuring that we bring bkie gangs to account because, quite frankly, we have had enough. Let me finish on this note: there has been a lot of talk and pigeon pouting which would certainly be the talk of all pigeons at Trafalgar Square. This is not Trafalgar Square; this is Queensland, and thankfully I am with a government that delivers. I support the passage of the bills through the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (9.48 pm): The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, the Tattoo Parlours Bill and the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill seek to disestablish associations that encourage, foster or support persons to commit serious offences, to increase public safety and security by the disestablishment of the associations and to deny the person who commits the serious offence the assistance and support that is gained from association with other persons who participate in the affairs of the associations. The severity with which the government has decided to tackle the issue of organised crime and bkie gangs is commendable. However, the approach taken is a threat to the integrity of the committee process and to the parliament itself. The sensationalism that the government drummed up by closing the parliament before introducing these laws only serves to create the impression that the government is right to bypass the committee system and avoid submitting the bills to any scrutiny before being passed.

Queenslanders rightly expect greater sensitivity towards their democratic rights when law and order policies are developed. One of their fundamental democratic rights is the right to lawful assembly. This bill places the responsibility on groups to prove that they are not conducting illegal activity. That means that police will have the legislative backing to presume guilt, which is a violation of the rule of law. When the onus of proof is placed on citizens, the democratic right of all civilians is under threat. This bill contains serious violations of democratic rights and principles. The government's unwillingness to submit such contentious legislation to public scrutiny is a major concern. If the Attorney-General believes that the legislation is consistent with community expectations, there is nothing for him to be worried about. So why does he not submit the bill to the committee process? The LNP strongly supported this democratic process believing that it was the right of people and the parliament that legislation be appropriately scrutinised. This legislation has been rushed through to create the perception that the LNP government is tough on crime. We have just had a federal election. That has taken precedence over what the LNP is doing here. So now this government is rushing through legislation to create the perception that it is tough on crime.

I notice that no government member representing an area in North Queensland will be speaking to this bill. We have the Premier and the members for Bundaberg, Ipswich, Burleigh, Greenslopes, Broadwater, Mermaid Beach, Lockyer, Logan, Southport and the Attorney-General speaking to this bill, but no members representing North Queensland are speaking to this bill. That is because North Queensland does not have these issues. The members representing North Queensland are not hearing about these issues. The issue that is talked about in North Queensland is the travel rorts of politicians, especially those members of the Liberal Party who are paying back their travel rorts. That is the issue that people are talking about in North Queensland.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. The member for Dalrymple is talking about federal politicians' entitlements. I fail to see any relevance at all. I know there are three bills to debate and there might be a broad catch, but there is no relevance. I ask the member to be brought into line under relevance.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, could you address the terms of the legislation, please.

Mr KNUTH: Yes, I will address the—

Mr Hopper interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Condamine, your cohort is addressing this chamber. Will you give him an opportunity, please.

Mr KNUTH: I will address the terms of the bills. This legislation is about the fundamental democratic rights of law-abiding people, including motorcycle riders, trail riders, Harley riders and Triumph riders. These bills come down hard on crime while the LNP is pushing for more gambling licences, more casinos, more pokies—

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. Madam Deputy Speaker, the legislation does not contain anything about pokies, casinos or gambling licences. I ask you to call the member to order on relevance.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Dalrymple, this is a cognate debate of three bills. Will you please contain your comments to the bills.

Mr KNUTH: Madam Speaker, I agree that my comments are borderline. There is a concern that these bills are being rushed through. We just had the Queensland Plan and all the applause that went with that. There was no reason to recall parliament so that we could rush these laws through as fast as we could because there was a matter of urgency. No, there was nothing like that. There was the standing ovation and the applause.

Today we had a briefing on one bill. The bill was tabled. The explanatory notes were not even there for us to scrutinise. This is what parliament is about. We could only get a briefing on one of the bills for one hour. We missed the briefing on the other two bills. We were never given the information. We never had the opportunity. But we were told that this was good for Queensland, that this was going to be beneficial for Queensland. However, we have law-abiding citizens expressing great concern that this legislation is going to affect their fundamental principles and rights. But we must support it by whatever means necessary because the LNP is right! They were elected. They have a massive majority and they are not like the Labor Party, which suspended standing orders every second parliamentary sitting to rush through legislation. The LNP will never suspend standing orders!

It will ensure that this parliament will have processes whereby everybody will be heard! Campbell Newman promised Queensland that he would be here for everybody. That is why we are laughing at this present moment. The members opposite are pointing their fingers in my direction. They can implement their pokies, they can implement their casinos, they can implement their rushed legislation, but the reality is—

Mr Hopper interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Dalrymple, will you resume your seat for a moment. The member for Condamine is having a debate happening in that corner that makes it extremely difficult to hear the member for Dalrymple. I ask all members to respect this opportunity for the member for Dalrymple to place his views on the record.

Mr KNUTH: If members of a motorcycle club go on a ride to raise funds for spina bifida, they want to be assured that they can do that lawfully and not be pulled over or have the perception created that they are a criminal bikie group. The HOGs—a millionaires bikie club—ride up to the Herveys Range tearoom. Those riders want to be assured that, when they go up there and put \$2,000 into the Herveys Range tearoom, they are not going to be pulled over by the police because of a suspicion that they are members of a criminal organisation.

A government member interjected.

Mr KNUTH: I cannot hear much while this parrot is right here beside me squarking. I would like the Attorney-General to tell the motorcycle riders and the trail bike riders that they will be able to ride their motorbikes up to the Yungaburra Whistle Stop on a Sunday morning and put their \$1,000 into the Whistle Stop without the fear of police pulling them over and questioning them. That is the question that we want answered. That is our concern. That is why we are here in the parliament.

Government members interjected.

Mr KNUTH: They can squark and they can squawk. They can yell and they can scream. They can cry and they can wish why on earth this person is here saying these things. We will be moving an amendment and, hopefully, the Attorney-General will accept it. We want to ensure the rights of motorcycle riders. We want to ensure that when police see 40 motorcyclists on Harleys or Triumphs ride past that they are not under pressure to check to see if they are an outlaw motorcycle gang. The people in my area really do not have this issue. For them, it is a minute particle. The members opposite can brag about this legislation, they can talk about the importance of what they must do, but the people in my area do not have this problem. I want to ensure that these motorcycles are not going to be affected, that they can ride their bikes, that they will not have retribution against them.

These are important issues and that is why we are going to move this amendment. I am sure government members will support it because it is about law-abiding motorcycle riders. It is about law-abiding Harley and Triumph riders.

Mr Cox interjected.

Mr KNUTH: We look forward to the government supporting this amendment because it is about protecting law-abiding citizens. The government does want to get tough on crime, like the rorting system that is taking place in travel.

Mr Cox interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! Member for Thuringowa, I would ask you to give the member for Dalrymple an opportunity.

Mr KNUTH: I want to bring these important issues to the attention of members of the House.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (10.00 pm): Can I start by thanking the member for Dalrymple for wasting 11 minutes of my life and everybody else's time with the drivel that just came out of his mouth.

Mr KNUTH: I rise to a point of order. I find that offensive and I ask the member to withdraw it. I have heard drivel all night. I ask him to withdraw that.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I apologise. I did not hear the comment, but the member has found it offensive and asked that you withdraw it. Please withdraw.

Mr HART: I withdraw, Madam Deputy Speaker. We have just heard from the member for Dalrymple for 11 minutes, but I do not think we heard whether or not he was supporting the legislation. I hope the Attorney-General took notice of his advice that he will be moving an amendment. We did not actually hear what that amendment might be. I am sure it will come out in the fullness of time once they have thought about it a bit more.

Hooray that at last we have a Premier and an Attorney-General who have the intestinal fortitude to do something about these criminals. Something had to be done about these criminals. One can completely disregard the comments that the member for Dalrymple made about there being no issue in North Queensland. There may not be an issue in North Queensland but I can tell members that there is an issue in South-East Queensland. There is an issue in my electorate of Burleigh. I have Hells Angels, Black Uhlans, some Bandidos and some Finks in my electorate. I have a little bit of everything down there and they cause trouble. We needed to do something about this.

For years and years, as we heard from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Rockhampton, the Labor Party attempted to do something about this. Typical of the Labor Party they started in 2009 with their anti-association laws and what good did they do? Did it stop the 60-odd Bandidos who went to a restaurant in Broadbeach on 27 September and pulled two people out of that restaurant and started attacking them? Did it stop the Finks and the Bandidos from having a fight at Nobby Beach a week after that? No, it did not, because it did not work. That is why we had members in this House in previous years who spoke against the Labor Party's anti-association laws. They spoke against it because quite simply they were not going to work. Those people on this side of the House now knew that that was not going to work.

It is not acceptable to me or the members of my electorate that these people can thumb their nose at authority as they did in Broadbeach on 27 September when they pulled these people out of the restaurant and attacked them and then went to the Southport watch-house and tried to intimidate the police there into releasing their comrades in arms. I fully commend the Premier and the Attorney-General for taking the action that they did.

This is not about people who ride motorbikes; this is about criminals. It is not about people with tattoos; this is about criminals. It is not about people who associate together, it is not about rotary clubs; this is about criminals. This is all about criminals. I stood for election to try to make a difference. That is what I am here for. This legislation is probably the biggest difference we are going to make in this parliament in our lifetime. This legislation will make a difference to the people of my electorate, to the people of Burleigh and hopefully eventually to the rest of the people of Australia. If we can stop these people from their criminal activity, if we can stop them from associating together, if we can stop them from attacking our citizens on the street, if we can make the people of our electorates feel safe in their homes, feel safe in the parks and feel safe in restaurants when they go out at night, then we have really achieved something and we are to be congratulated.

I am happy to admit that I have ridden a motorbike for the majority of my life. I started when I was a young apprentice riding trail bikes. I then moved up to bigger road bikes. I have ridden motorbikes for a lot of my life. I am sure that most of the members in the House can get a picture of me riding on a motorbike, my long hair flowing in the wind.

A government member: Don't mislead the House!

Mr HART: Believe you me, I am not misleading the House. When I was a much younger man I actually had an afro. My wife can attest to that. It was a lot of trouble putting a bike helmet on because I had an afro. I am getting away from the point.

Mr Gibson: I want to see photographs of that.

Mr HART: I have photographs to prove it and I have photographs to prove that I rode motorbikes for a number of years.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I can hardly hear the member for Burleigh over the noise in the chamber. Please respect the member for Burleigh so that we can hear his contribution.

Mr HART: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker. In previous years I have thought about joining something like the Ulysses motorbike group. They are a group of gentlemen who enjoy riding motorbikes.

Mr Choat: A great club.

Mr HART: I take the interjection from the member for Ipswich West. They are a great bunch of people who go out on the weekend to enjoy themselves on their motorbikes. They are not criminals. We are here tonight to take action against criminals. I am not really sure what it is that the opposition and the crossbenches cannot see about this. This is action against criminals. These people have no respect for our way of life. They have no respect for anybody else. They have no respect for the people in the restaurants. They have no respect for our children in the parks. They have no respect for anything. That is something that we need to fix in this state: the lack of respect that one person

has for other people. We maybe need to start this in our schools with our children having respect for their teachers and their elders. This is what leads to people in these criminal motorcycle gangs having no respect for our policemen. I remember when I was a young man and I went to police citizens youth clubs, the first thing that would be done if you stepped out of line was to throw you in a boxing ring with someone who was 10 years older than you in a pair of gloves and you learned your lesson pretty quickly. Sometimes I think it is a real shame that we cannot do those sorts of things any more. I actually lament the fact that we do not have caning in our schools any more.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr HART: That is another subject. I already hear the goody-two-shoes Labor Party over there starting to moan and groan about it so I will move on. As can be seen by the pictures in the newspapers, these people are pumped up on steroids. That fries your brain. One can see quite clearly they are not thinking. Their brains are fried. They are out there causing havoc.

There are three bills before the House and I fully support all of them. The first bill is the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill which is to deter individuals from participating in criminal organisations. It provides for an extra penalty for those convicted of declared offences. Obviously that is a serious offence. Those declared offences are listed in the legislation.

The bill introduces extra penalties for members of criminal motorcycle gangs who hold office bearer positions. That has to be a massive deterrent to some of the idiots who are the sergeants at arms, the presidents, the vice presidents and those people who hold a position that enables them to send somebody out to act like a thug in our areas. There was a prime example of that in my electorate when the president of a motorcycle group assaulted a lifeguard who was on duty on the beach at Burleigh. In the course of doing his job, that man apparently chipped a person. She reported that to her boyfriend who came down to the beach and thumped the lifeguard. That is not on. We will not put up with that sort of rubbish in our electorates.

Tonight we are also talking about the Tattoo Parlours Bill. There are multiple tattoo parlours in my electorate.

Miss Barton: Do you have a tattoo?

Mr HART: No, member for Broadwater, I do not have any tattoos, but I do not intend to prove that I do not have any tattoos. As I said, there are multiple tattoo parlours in my electorate. Two of those tattoo parlours have been fire bombed. I have had to tell people in my electorate that if one more tattoo parlour is fire bombed, there will be no tattoo parlours left. Most people would be pretty upset about that.

This legislation bans patch members from attending licensed premises. I have one question for the Attorney-General: recently on the TV we have seen an idiot who has had the 'Finks' tattoo on his forehead crossed out and it now says 'Mongols', 'Mongrels' or something like that. I hope that that will prohibit him from attending licensed venues around the place. Is such a tattoo considered to be a patch? It is clear identification that he is a criminal motorcycle gang member, as it is tattooed on his forehead.

Tonight we are also debating the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013, which basically stops people from associating together. It provides for up to three years imprisonment and a mandatory minimum penalty of six months imprisonment for those people who are caught knowingly gathering in groups of three or more in a public place, going to a banned location or promoting or recruiting for an organisation. Again, members should remember that this is aimed at criminals. It is not aimed at your normal—

Mr Ruthenberg: Ulysses, Patriots.

Mr HART: Yes, the Ulysses motorcycle group, the Patriots, people on a charity fun run, the cyclists downtown, the local Rotary club, the local Lions Club or members of the local chamber of commerce who decide to go for a ride. It is not aimed at them. It is aimed at criminals. For God's sake, we all know that these people are criminals and you can pick them out. There is no trouble with any of that. Why not believe the police when they tell us that these people are criminals? Let us tag them as such and get rid of them.

One of the things that I really like about this legislation is that it proposes to change the maximum prison sentence for an affray, which is what those guys did in Broadbeach on 27 September. On 27 September in Broadbeach, Bandido criminal motorcycle gang members were charged with affray. Previously, the maximum sentence was one year. Quite obviously that is not

enough and I commend the Attorney-General for pushing out that maximum sentence to seven years. More importantly, it is the mandatory six month sentence that is really to be applauded. If they use a vehicle before, during or after an offence, that vehicle will be crushed. Some of those guys live for their motorbikes. If they are involved in a criminal activity and we take and crush their motorbikes, that will really hurt them.

A couple of things really affect these guys. One is taking away their motorbikes. The second, and the whole reason that they are performing these criminal activities, is money. They are doing it for money. We already have legislation in place that we can use to take their money from them if it is proved that they have gained that money from a criminal enterprise. That will stop these people from associating, as will the legislation that the Attorney-General has now introduced to the House. They will also have their licences suspended and the presumption that they would automatically get bail is taken away if they are proved to be criminal motorcycle gang members. Those are good things about the bill.

Another good thing about the bill is that it does not apply just to criminal motorcycle gangs. It can be extended to organisations such as the Mafia and the triads that operate in Queensland and, even more importantly, to paedophile rings and the like. It is important that for the minute this legislation is targeting criminal motorcycle gangs, but it has the ability and it is portable enough to target other criminal activities.

As far as consultation goes, over the past few weeks I have been very disappointed at what I have heard from the member for Gaven. A number of Gold Coast members are primarily concerned with the activities of criminal motorcycle gangs on the Gold Coast, but one member does not seem to care about his electorate. He is out there moaning and groaning about how this legislation will affect people who are not criminals, which is not its intent at all. As someone once said, you cannot help but break a few eggs when you make an omelette. Never a truer statement has been said. There is no doubt that we are going to inconvenience a few people, but I have not yet run into anybody who is really upset about the fact that they may get stopped, they may get asked for their licence and they may get interrogated about who they are riding with. If you have nothing to hide, this legislation will not hurt you. We are after criminals. If you have nothing to hide, this legislation will not affect you.

If I have not made it clear enough tonight, I say again that I fully support this legislation. Once again, I commend our Premier and our Attorney-General for bringing this legislation to the House in such a speedy manner. On behalf of the people of Burleigh, I thank the Attorney-General for this legislation. Believe you me, we are making a difference with this legislation. This is something that the people of Queensland will not forget quickly. We have made a difference.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (10.17 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the three pieces of legislation relating to criminal motorcycle gangs introduced earlier today by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, the honourable member for Kawana. As was highlighted by the Attorney-General, given the very serious and urgent nature of these bills, they will bypass the normal committee process and are being discussed together in a cognate debate. I commend the Attorney-General and his team for their herculean effort in bringing this legislation forward in such a timely manner. Firstly, I address the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, the VLAD Bill 2013. The bill is designed to severely punish members of criminal organisations who commit serious offences. Those who do commit such an offence will be declared a vicious lawless associate and will receive an extra 15 years imprisonment cumulative to any imprisonment imposed for the declared offence. Further, if the declared offence involved violence, an additional cumulative period of 10 years imprisonment will also apply.

The second piece of legislation is the Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013, which introduces a licensing regime for tattoo parlours and tattooists. Members of criminal organisations will be banned from owning, operating or working in tattoo parlours. This act will also prohibit these thugs wearing their colours inside licensed premises and within areas prescribed by regulation. Also, licences such as building and security provider licences will be refused to individuals who are members of these criminal gangs.

The third piece of legislation is the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013 which will amend the Criminal Code to include a number of new offences and circumstances of aggravation. Some new offences under this bill will include: a maximum three years and minimum six months imprisonment and mandatory crushing of any vehicle used when knowingly

gathering in groups of three or more in public places, going to banned locations as prescribed by regulation and promoting or recruiting for the organisation; an increase in the maximum penalty for affray from one to seven years, with a minimum six months imprisonment and crushing of any vehicle used; mandatory disqualification of drivers' licences for three months; changes to the Bail Act with a presumption against bail for members of these criminal gangs, coupled with mandatory passport surrender; enhancement of evade police offences and search and identifying particulars powers; and myriad additional powers to the CMC.

As the Attorney-General indicated, there will also be a special, ultrasecure facility at Woodford Correctional Centre to house the highest risk members of these criminal motorcycle gangs. As prisoners they will face restricted out of cell hours, no TVs, no gym, increased drug testing, one hour of visit time per week, frequent cell searches, phone monitoring and mail censoring. Make no mistake, those that do the crime will most definitely do hard time.

Since coming into government in March 2012, the Newman government has been unapologetic in our tough stance on law and order. We are totally committed to cleaning up our streets and making Queensland the safest place to live and raise a child. I have represented the Currumbin electorate for almost a decade now and during that time I have frequently stood up in this House and called for stronger measures. I often referred to the Labor government as limp-wristed and soft on crime, unlike the LNP who put community safety first and foremost.

While I acknowledge this legislation imposes tough penalties—some civil libertarians have even referred to them as draconian—we make no apologies for this hard-hitting stance. This government has been left with little choice but to take strong, swift and decisive action to put a halt to the obnoxious behaviour of criminal motorcycle gangs. From surveys I have conducted over the years, Currumbin residents have continually indicated that they rate law and order as the highest priority. People have a right to feel safe in their homes, and safe on their streets. As the government of Queensland, we have an obligation to deliver that.

I am in no way suggesting Currumbin is a crime hot spot—quite the reverse actually because of a close-knit community working with our dedicated police officers. From Senior Sergeant Mark Johnston at Coolangatta to Senior Sergeant Chris Ahern at Palm Beach and Senior Constable Kurt Foessel at Elanora Police Beat, these officers and their teams are to be commended for their efforts in ensuring Currumbin remains a safe and happy environment for people to live, work and bring up their families.

Despite the very best efforts of our police, there are certain low-lives in our society who believe they can live outside the law and place innocent people in danger. Well, honourable members, they cannot. Their time is up. They have shown a total disregard for public safety and the people of Queensland have had enough. This government has had enough. This government has drawn a line in the sand. Thugs that are members of these criminal motorcycle gangs are going to feel the full force of the law as we show them they do not own the streets and their behaviour will not be tolerated.

Both the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police have introduced a raft of legislation over the past 18 months that has made significant inroads in cracking down on crime. These include: tougher penalties for drug trafficking; mandatory minimum sentencing for possession and trafficking firearms; tougher penalties for assault and murder of a police officer; and the toughest unexplained wealth laws in the country. This is on top of the extra police installed throughout the state over the past 18 months—some 140 on the Gold Coast alone.

In recent weeks we have seen these criminals defy these laws and act with total contempt for our officers and the wider community. With this legislation we will find them, we will stop them, we will punish them and we will put them behind bars.

An article in the *Sunday Mail* by Greg Stolz and Josh Robinson on 6 October 2013 highlighted the widespread reach of bikie extortion and standover tactics on small businesses indicating the problem is broader than just the Gold Coast. It is a state-wide issue and requires a whole-of-state approach to once and for all stamp this behaviour out of our communities. This legislation is poised to do just that.

The Gold Coast is a premier tourism destination, one that attracts millions of domestic and international visitors each year. It is a safe, family friendly location and remains so despite the ugly actions of a few. The Gold Coast is also home to 61,500 registered businesses, 96.5 per cent of them small businesses, many of whom have been doing it tough in recent years. Unfortunately, though, it

would appear some have been set up or infiltrated by motorcycle gang members and are involved in laundering and other illegal activities. Others suffer extortion, threats and standover tactics under the guises of protection. This behaviour will be targeted and stopped through this legislation and Task Force Takeback.

In order to have a swift response we need people to come forward and report these activities, to work with our officers and to contact Crime Stoppers with information that may help catch these miserable creatures who prey on decent Queenslanders. I applaud the decision to put Assistant Commissioner Brett Pointing, Superintendent Jim Keogh and Inspector Des Lacey in charge of Task Force Takeback. These are very senior officers with many years of experience, particularly on the Gold Coast. I recall their professionalism, their courage and their effectiveness when we had significant issues with out-of-control youth and parties in the Currumbin electorate about eight years ago. I have every confidence they will rid us of the scourge of criminal motorcycle gangs.

In this House on 2 August 2012 I said: 'Criminals should be afraid of this LNP government. They should clean up their act or get out of Queensland.' They would be very wise to heed these words or face some very unpleasant consequences as a result of their actions.

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (10.27 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on the three bills now before the chamber. The Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill amends the Bail Act, the Crime and Misconduct Act, the Criminal Code, the Penalties and Sentences Act, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and the Tow Truck Act. I note also it deals with making a regulation under the Criminal Code and amends the Crime and Misconduct Regulation 2005. The second bill that we are considering tonight is the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill. The third bill is the Tattoo Parlours Bill which amends the Liquor Act 1992 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000.

Earlier tonight I listened to the Premier ridicule the opposition and ridicule the process. He ridiculed anyone who dared to criticise the contents of the bill. During that contribution I was reflecting on the briefing that the crossbenchers received from departmental officers. During the briefing by departmental officers we heard how the government took into account the American Mafia laws. We heard how the government looked at the recent laws the New South Wales parliament has introduced. We heard the Premier speak about these laws being the toughest in Australia.

Prior to the debate on the bill today, we have heard government ministers speaking about how the laws were leading the crime-fighting movement in the world and could stand alone, or words to that effect. During the briefing with the departmental officers, I sought clarification as to documents to support the assertions that were being made. I was provided with an assurance that the material would be provided to me indicating the reference to the American Mafia laws and also the New South Wales laws. Can I say that as at five minutes ago when I checked my emails nothing has been provided. I suppose it brings me to the point about the arrogance of this government in the way this legislation is being rushed through this House.

Mr BLEIJIE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Nicklin raises the point about why he has not received documentation. I instructed the officers to tell the member for Nicklin to go on to this new invention called the internet and type in the 'racketeering legislation of the United States' and he would be able to find it there and the New South Wales tattoo legislation. If the member for Nicklin does not have a computer in his office or cannot get on the internet, then I suggest he might want to look at that.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! There is no point of order. I call the member for Nicklin.

Mr WELLINGTON: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Attorney-General is happy to say that all of this information is available, but it was this government which introduced the bill today that did not have copies of one of the very specific bills available for distribution as the standing orders require and as identified by the Speaker at the time. In the briefing I received an assurance. I was not to know what the Attorney-General instructed his staff, but what I can report to the House is what the departmental officers said they would provide to me.

Mr Bleijie: I told the officers—

Mr WELLINGTON: I am not interested in what the Attorney said. He will have a chance to respond later. What I am saying is that we were seeking some clarification, bearing in mind the very short time frames that have been provided by this government for the consideration of this bill. We heard the Leader of the Opposition say this morning that they would not oppose the debate of these

three bills during this week's sitting of parliament. I believe there is no opposition from members of the crossbench to the debate of these three important bills during this sitting of parliament. So what have we seen? When you have that level of support from non-government members, the government says, 'That's not good enough. We want to debate it all on the same day and we expect crossbench members, who do not have the resources of the government, to go and trawl through the internet and do all the other searches while being involved in this debate.' Quite frankly, Attorney-General and members of the government, we do not have the capacity to do what you expect us to do.

We will do the best we can to hold this government to account, but Queenslanders need to know that today, when there has been support from all of the non-government members, as I understand, for the debate of these important bills during this sitting, what did the government do? They said, 'That is not good enough. It is not good enough. We want to be provocative and bring it all together today, the very day it is introduced, in the hope that non-government members will vote against it.' Well, quite frankly, we are going to support the bill. Yes, there may be an amendment introduced, but before even seeing the amendment I heard the Attorney-General say earlier that he will not be accepting it. To me, that is a sign of arrogance. If the Attorney-General takes issue, I will withdraw. But all I can say is that what we have seen today, I believe, is an action of this government which is not consistent.

The Premier came in here and talked about criticising people who were concerned about process. Well, I am concerned about process. We have heard about looking to overseas laws as a template and looking to laws over the border as a guide and when we ask for the information it is not available. Quite frankly, I think governments around the world would be appalled at what is happening in Queensland. Yes, there is a case to respond to the bikies and the illegal activities, but there is a right way of doing it and a wrong way of doing it. I say to Queenslanders that this extreme Newman government is not doing it the right way. The right way is a more moderate and considered way. The right way is to do what the opposition and non-government members said: we will support the debate on reasonable terms, and the reasonable terms are that the legislation would be debated during this week's sitting so that the committee has a chance to briefly consider the legislation and to get some independent advice. But the government does not want the non-government members to have the chance to have some detailed consideration of this bill.

When I drove to parliament this morning I listened to one of the radio programs and there was talk about this bill coming to parliament this week. One of the radio announcers made some comment and then within about half an hour there was an update and the reporter said, 'Sorry, I have just heard advice that the government has changed that position.' So the media outlets were being informed before members of parliament had any information. There is no reason why non-government members could not have received more detailed information before this was introduced today.

So I say to the Premier and this extreme government that I hope Queenslanders will be awake to them at the next state election and see this as a real-life example of the extreme Newman government mandate that they believe they have. I do not believe this extreme Newman leadership team had a mandate at the last election to deal with introducing legislation this way. We all agree there is a need to respond. I was one of the members of the estimates committee that questioned the Attorney-General, which the opposition referred to, about funding the Crime and Misconduct Commission, and I will stand up for the law enforcement agencies of Queensland every day of my life and I will support funding for the CMC and our police. But what I will not support is an arrogant government, abusing the process simply because they have the numbers and the capacity to do so. This is not the commitment Premier Newman gave in the lead-up to the last election 18 months ago, and I hope all Queenslanders see this extreme Newman government for what they are.

All we asked for was a reasonable opportunity to consider this legislation and to consider it in a reasonable time. America does not deal with legislation like this. New South Wales does not deal with legislation like this. We have a responsibility as elected members of parliament to try to consider the legislation and to make informed comments about it. So can I say that I will support this bill and I am looking forward to—

Mr Bleijie: Channelling Clive.

Mr WELLINGTON: Quite frankly, can I say that Alexander Douglas, the parliamentary leader of the United Australia Party, will show Queenslanders a moderate conservative party at the next election—a moderate conservative party at the next election. I do not expect that he would deal with this the way—

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Nicklin, I would ask you to return to the business of the bill.

Mr WELLINGTON: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will. I was simply provoked by the Attorney-General and his comments about Clive Palmer. It was not that long ago when they were ridiculing Clive Palmer. Look at what he has been able to achieve in three months—three senators and maybe himself elected to the federal parliament! Do not ridicule the other conservative members in Queensland. Quite frankly, I am happy to stand up and say it as it is. Look at the voting at the last federal election—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Attorney-General, I ask you to cease interjecting. I call the member for Nicklin.

Mr WELLINGTON: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I was provoked by the Attorney-General. I will return to the bill. It is now half past 10. I will be voting in support of this bill, but I want it placed very clearly on the record that this extreme Newman government is abusing the process that has been tried and proven in Queensland. I do not even believe there were any examples of extremes of the last Labor government which went this far where they introduced a bill in the morning, rushed it through and then required debate on the same day. I stand to be corrected. Maybe the Parliamentary Library can clarify that, but in my time in this House I cannot recall a situation like this where a bill was introduced in the morning, where hard copies of the bill were not available at the time of the introduction of the bill by the minister, where briefings were cut short. I will put on the record that when we had our briefing we had one hour and five minutes.

Mr Bleijie: More than the Labor Party.

Mr WELLINGTON: The Attorney-General just said that was more than what other members were provided. Quite frankly, we were expecting to have a proper briefing, bearing in mind that one bill deals with some 97 pages, another 15 pages and the other 63 pages.

Mr Bleijie: It's because you were being rude. I pulled the meeting. I had feedback that your attitude—

Mr WELLINGTON: I take objection to those comments that I was being rude. Quite frankly, this was a meeting of crossbenchers.

Mr Bleijie: I'll tell everyone what you said in the briefing.

Mr WELLINGTON: You can.

Mr Bleijie: I will put it on record.

Mr WELLINGTON: You can. You were not even there.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr WELLINGTON: You were not even there.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! Attorney-General, I ask you to cease debating across the chamber. Member for Nicklin, please address your comments through the chair.

Mr WELLINGTON: I was provoked by the Attorney-General. We are talking about process. I stand for proper process—proper and reasonable consideration of bills. I was reflecting on some of the comments that the Attorney-General made prior to the last election when he was sitting on the other side of the chamber about the abuses of process and I thought, 'It is amazing how quickly the tide can turn.' 'Once we have the power, we know we can do whatever we want to. We will get away with it and it does not matter what happens!' I hope Queensland sees this action as an action of an extreme Newman government and hopefully they will remember that at the next election.

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (10.40 pm): I cannot help but rise and make comment about the ridiculous tirade we just heard from the member for Nicklin about the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill, the Tattoo Parlours Bill and the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill. These bills are about organised crime. If you go through a bit of a history of the whole issue you will come across paper clippings such as this one from 1975 'Gang raid on country pubs'. On that occasion the Jimboomba hotel was taken over by 200 bikies. Going back even further, *The Wild One* was a 1954 movie starring Marlon Brando. In that movie the bikies took over a whole town on Triumph motorbikes—not Harley-Davidsons, I might add. That was the start. Every time that movie was shown in Brisbane, the theatres would get wrecked. This was during the

sixties. The movie was banned in the UK until 1968. I have older brothers who used to ride Triumph Trumpies and Trophies and those sorts of bikes. They used to line up in Stanley Street when there were only a couple of sets of lights in town and race us down Stanley Street.

Bikers have always been on the limit. They have always pushed the limit. The real change happened—and the headline that I mentioned was from the early seventies ‘Gang raid on country pubs’—from the seventies onwards when they stopped working and they started dealing in drugs. They just became common criminals. I speak of the Milperra incident. It was just about common criminals. The Milperra incident happened in 1984. Seven people were killed in 1984 and 28 were injured.

These laws have been too long coming. As parliamentarians, members on both sides have been asleep for 20 years on this issue. The laws have been too long coming. I must congratulate Jarrod on what he has done. In 1974 there was a movie called *Stone* about bikie gangs, police et cetera.

Mr Mander: I saw it at the drive-in.

Mr RICKUSS: That is right. It was not a bad movie but it glamorised the violence of organised crime. That is what it comes down to: it is organised crime. Members should consider some of the details in this issue. The Bandidos’ secretary Bernard Podgorski turned Queen’s evidence in the Milperra incident. That is the sort of detail that is in this legislation. They will turn because they will not want to do 20 years in jail. They definitely will turn.

The good, common bikies such as the Ulysses motor club, which is the group of older bikies that has been mentioned previously in the chamber, and the blokes who just love motorbikes are not a problem as they are not organised crime. This is not about motorbikes; it is about organised crime. That is where this mob opposite seems to have missed the point. The simple fact is that the mafia laws that were mentioned previously, the New South Wales laws—the racketeering influenced corrupt organisation laws—as the minister said, are there are on the internet. The Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organisation Act is there on the internet. It is pretty easy to look it up, yet some of the Independent members up the back are so lazy that they cannot type a name into a computer. I just cannot believe how they have let this sort of thing go. They are all over the shop. I listened to the member for Inala, the Leader of the Opposition, speak for 50 minutes and then say that she is going to support the bill. She spoke for 50 minutes before she said she was going to support the bill.

Mr Hopper interjected.

Mr RICKUSS: I hear some barking buffoon up the back making a bit of noise. I honestly cannot believe that this bill will not be supported, because it is about organised crime.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! Member for Lockyer, the term that you used before in describing members was unparliamentary and I ask you to withdraw that.

Mr RICKUSS: I will withdraw that, but he is still barking.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, I ask for an unqualified withdrawal. I warn you under standing order 253A for ignoring my instruction.

Mr RICKUSS: I will withdraw.

Mr Hopper interjected.

Mr RICKUSS: I am getting a bit of harassment from across the chamber. It is important that these laws be looked at for what they are: criminal law. It is about criminal law.

Mr Hopper interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members at the back and all members in the chamber, it will help the debate if the member on his feet is able to be heard. I call the member for Lockyer.

Mr RICKUSS: I highlight again that this is about criminal law. Tattoo parlours have been hotbeds of criminal association for absolute eons. It is said that 95 per cent are attached to bikie gangs. The prostitution and the drug running are about criminal law. It is not about motorbikes; that is just a side issue. The real issue is criminal law, and that is what we are cracking down on here. It is about criminal law. I fully support the legislation.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (10.47 pm): I have to say that tonight is a very proud night for me in this House in terms of this legislation coming in and hopefully being passed. I have been talking on this matter for many years. I have given numerous accounts here in the parliament

about this budding problem from the years in opposition to now that I am part of the government that is addressing this matter. It is addressing the matter in a very, very tough and finite manner that I believe will be the answer to this longstanding problem which has been occurring in my backyard.

The Mermaid Beach area, which encompasses Broadbeach as well, has been the focus for these groups as they have grown over the years mainly because it is a magnificent area in which to live but also because the many tourists we have in the area and the many young people enjoying the entertainment precincts of the area are very susceptible to the tacky trade that they peddle. So these people have thrived in an unmitigated manner because of previous laws that were not enforced and were, to be honest, weak in the matter in delivering an outcome for the greater percentage of our community.

These guys call themselves the 'one percenters' of our community. That is not one per cent of the good guys; they are very proud of being the one per cent of the bad guys. They publish that and they use intimidation and any other tactic they can to present an image that is totally against what society expects of its community. Their behaviour is abhorrent. Their threatening demeanour is unacceptable to modern society. The violence and the code of conduct that they live by and conduct their clubs by are totally unacceptable to our modern communities. I can assure honourable members that it has been a long road in trying to bring this matter to the attention of the House, to the law-makers from both sides of parliament, to make something happen with regard to these criminal bikie gangs.

We have had other incidents over the past few years such as the spraying of former tattoo parlours with bullets. I have been on about tattoo parlours in this House and when that incident happened around the corner from me in Mermaid Beach, I said to the ABC Radio station that everyone thinks it is okay and it is just bikies playing amongst themselves, but there will be collateral damage one day. Sure enough, the next day after I gave that interview a woman was shot in the leg at the Robina Town Centre after an exchange between two idiot bikies who were shooting it out in a very busy public shopping centre at Robina with not enough brains to separate themselves. So it has been as a result of their actions in taking over a restaurant in Broadbeach on the evening of Friday, 27 September, that this matter has been brought to a head and received national attention.

I can assure the House that the millions of dollars that both the council and the government spend in promoting tourism in greater Australia and internationally is just washed down the toilet when you see activity such as that in a main entertainment precinct on a Friday night. Men, women and children were ducking for cover, and the police were screaming for help to overcome these threatening criminal gang members. The police had been surrounded and cornered, and they were screaming for backup to address this terrible situation which occurred in Broadbeach.

The Premier has understood the importance of curtailing the growth of lawlessness by these groups. He has directed and taken on board the skills of the police minister and the Attorney-General to address this matter in the toughest possible manner. He has put the financial muscle of the Queensland taxpayer to the tune of \$20 million behind a program to eradicate these criminal motorcycle groups—and I mean get rid of them completely—from the Gold Coast in particular and Queensland in general.

The laws that we are passing tonight will hopefully be with the support of all members of parliament, because I think all members should recognise that these bills go beyond politics. These bills are about addressing the major problem in Queensland of drug peddlers, because that is where these criminal gangs get most of their funding from. They run major networks of contacts and legitimate businesses behind which their money is laundered and young people can become affected and caught up in drug distribution outlets. On a number of occasions in this chamber I have highlighted the fact that a lot of money is being made out of drugs, intimidation and loan collection, and all of these sorts of nefarious activities are part of their modus operandi.

The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill—VLAD for short—the Tattoo Parlours Bill and the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013 will give law enforcement agencies and our judicial system the power to curtail the activity of these criminal motorcycle gangs. This is an incredible night for me, members of parliament, because it is the culmination of a long campaign. They have brought this attention on themselves by being out there flaunting the thin blue line and saying, 'We are stronger than the law. We can intimidate the police at Southport Police Station. When they try and enforce the law, we can intimidate a small group of police men when they try to break up a fight right in the main heart of the Broadbeach entertainment

precinct.’ I congratulate the Attorney-General on his wonderful effort. He has put considerable determination and hours of effort into producing this legislation for the House to address this major problem. I can assure members that I have heard nothing but support for the fact that somebody has finally started to address the outlaw criminal gangs that have been running unchecked for many, many years and building their empires.

This is the first step in breaking down those empires, but there is a long way to go. There will be High Court challenges. These gangs are well funded and are prepared to go to the best solicitors. Unfortunately, these solicitors are prepared to accept drug money and take their cases all the way to the High Court. It will not be easy to bring about an end to these illegal criminal gangs, but we need to support this on behalf of the 99 per cent of the community who expect us to go forward with the best of their interests at heart. I am hoping that the opposition will put aside short-term politicking to support the government to rid the state of these criminal elements.

There are many methods that I would like to see employed to address the eradication of these groups, and one that I think could particularly assist is the recurrent deployment of sniffer dogs throughout the entertainment and nightclub precincts of the Gold Coast. I am sure that the relevant ministers and police authorities will take these messages on board. This will stop people supplying drugs in these areas and will cut off their supply of money. This is all about money and a way of life. It is all about them building a great, well-funded lifestyle in a fairly easy atmosphere of law enforcement, and we have to address that at every opportunity.

There is no doubt that a lot of the petty theft and break and enters on the Gold Coast are attributed to people looking for drug money. We have had court cases in recent times where people have been thrown off of balconies over drug deals. Someone was stabbed the other day in the middle of Broadbeach, and I am sure there are drug deals going wrong left, right and centre. Such activities send the worst possible message about our suburbs on the Gold Coast, but they are the best places in the world to live, relax, play and work. It sends the message that schoolies are not safe when they come to the Gold Coast, and that is a major event that we have been supporting for many years. It sends the message that international visitors are not safe when they come to the Gold Coast, and we have to make sure that that message is not sustained.

We have to make the Gold Coast the safest place. It is a family entertainment area. It is a wonderful place to visit, and this legislation will go a long, long way to putting it back on track again and making it part of this great state with great opportunities. I congratulate the Attorney-General and the police minister on this matter. I congratulate the Premier and the Treasurer for giving us the money, and I look forward to success and not seeing bikies in my back yard on the Gold Coast.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.00 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to this debate. I was not going to speak in this debate; however, I think it is important to note that this process has not allowed quite a few things to be put on the record. It has not allowed much divergence of opinion—or any opinions, for that matter. I will let the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Rockhampton stand as the opposition’s position on these bills. As people are aware, we will not be opposing these bills. Given the process that has seen these bills rushed through faster than many other bills I have ever seen, we need to have at least some suggestion of a legal opinion on the record. I will read into *Hansard* an opinion by Peter Callaghan SC, President of the Law and Justice Institute of Queensland, to ensure that we have on the parliamentary record at least one legal opinion—certainly not the opinion of the Attorney-General or someone who has been involved in the legislative drafting process. Mr Peter Callaghan SC states—

All Queenslanders should be concerned about a brazen gang that is emboldened by a pack mentality and flexing its power, with regard for the concerns of others. We might also be concerned about the bikies.

Unlike the bikies, the first group is certain to get its own way. The “Vicious Lawless Associates Disestablishment Bill” will be passed by Parliament. The measures contained in this Bill might be necessary or not. We could comment if we were allowed to see it in advance. But the process by which it will pass into law is alarming. It will, apparently, become part of our law without disclosure, without public consultation, without input from people who could actually help make it work, and after completely bypassing the parliamentary committee process. This is good for lawyers—when governments make laws in this fashion, they create work for those who have to interpret and apply them. But it is a disaster for democracy.

These laws are urgently needed, we are told, because this is nothing less than a war on bikies. As in any war, truth is the first casualty. And it falls early, with the very exciting title of the Bill. This title is being used to disguise content with implications far beyond anything to do with bikies. For example, it contains more provision for mandatory imprisonment—yet another attack on the concept of judicial discretion. A responsible debate would involve questions about respect for the separation of powers, evidence proving the need for such a provision, and whether any appeals against the inadequacy of sentences imposed on bikies have been lost.

Why are we not going to have such a debate? At first, it might seem mysterious that the passage of this Bill should be attended by such subterfuge, arrogance and hubris. After all, given the size of the government's majority, we know they will get what they want. But perhaps it is not so surprising after all. The prevailing attitude towards dissent and debate in Queensland has all the characteristics of bullying. As in the case of many bullies, there is always the suspicion that they are actually driven by fear and ignorance. And it is not fear of bikies—this is the behaviour of those who are afraid even to understand anything that might clash with their own agenda. And it is the ignorance of those so insecure that they choose to avoid hearing any suggestion that they might be wrong.

Those are the words of Peter Callaghan SC. At least there is currently on the parliamentary record an opinion—an opportunity that was denied—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr PITT: Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting. The Manager of Opposition Business has the call.

Mr PITT: We have time and time again explained that the opposition—

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease the crossfire across the chamber.

Mr PITT: The Attorney-General may not wish to listen to anyone else—he likes to hear the sound of his own voice—but let us be clear here: we are not opposing the bill. All we are suggesting—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr PITT: Mr Deputy Speaker, all we are suggesting is that this process—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting. Attorney-General!

Mr PITT: This process has been shortened. There has not been adequate time to allow any divergence of opinion—whether we in this House agree with that opinion or not. This is about process. It is about having respect for creating laws that we all hope will withstand any legal challenge. That is the importance of having legal opinion, or non-legal opinion for that matter—having opinion from community members who may wish to have their say. This is the people's parliament but, I have to tell you, sometimes it really does not feel like it.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (11.04 pm): I rise this evening to speak in support of the Newman government's suite of reforms that will be targeting criminal motorcycle gangs. Earlier today the honourable the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice introduced into this House three bills that we are now debating cognately. At the outset I commend the Attorney-General, the Premier and the police minister for their work on this particular suite of legislation.

The core objective of these reforms is very clear. We want to rid our state of criminal motorcycle gangs. The events of 2½ weeks ago in Broadbeach were absolutely unacceptable. A line has been drawn in the sand. I stand here this evening very proud to tell Queenslanders and residents of my electorate of Broadwater on the Gold Coast that the Newman government is fully committed to ridding Queensland of these criminal organisations. We have made absolutely clear to criminal motorcycle gangs over the past fortnight that they have no home in Queensland, and our counterparts in the federal government and other state governments have made very clear that criminal motorcycle gangs have no home in Australia.

We have made clear to the people of Queensland that their communities and their streets belong not to the criminal motorcycle gangs who seek to claim them but to the hardworking Queenslanders who seek not to live a life of crime, terror and intimidation but to live a life free of it. I would also like to make very clear at the outset that it is not the intention of this legislation or this government to persecute law-abiding motorcycle enthusiasts. There is much contained in this suite of reforms announced by the Attorney-General in recent days that will allow us to be rid of these gangs—these gangs that are a scourge on our society.

The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, otherwise known as VLAD, introduces a new punishment regime that will severely punish members of criminal gangs. A key component of sentencing is deterrence. Indeed, it is highlighted in the Penalties and Sentences Act. And I strongly

believe that the addition of 15 years imprisonment for a member of a gang or 25 years imprisonment for an executive member of a criminal motorcycle gang will be a sufficient deterrent. This move will drive at the core of these gangs. This is exactly what we need to do.

I think it is also important to note that the declaration that an offender is a vicious lawless associate is a question for a jury and that there are defences available. I believe that this will ensure due process in our judicial system is followed. We have also said that those who are declared vicious lawless offenders will be able to seek an early release if they are in a position to provide evidence to the Queensland Police Service that leads to a conviction. I, too, believe that this is a key component of our being able to drive criminals out of Queensland, and I strongly believe that this is something our communities want. We hear time and time again in this House and across our communities that Queenslanders are increasingly frustrated with the lax sentences that are imposed on people who commit wrongs in our society, and for us to impose such severe penalties sends an incredibly strong message. What we need to do is make it uncomfortable for these gangs to operate in Queensland. What we are doing is making it uncomfortable for these gangs to operate in Queensland.

One of the other pieces of legislation relates to tattoo parlours. I highlight that the legislation we have introduced tonight with regard to a licensing regime is similar to that in place in other jurisdictions around Australia. I highlight in particular that of New South Wales. I believe that this will allow us to make sure those who are running these enterprises and these businesses are fit and proper people. I have no doubt that those who are running legitimate tattoo parlours, who have no criminal bone in their body, would have no objection whatsoever to a licensing regime in their industry, because it will protect them and it will protect the name of their industry.

It is also important to note that we will stop members of criminal motorcycle gangs from wearing their colours inside licensed premises. One of the problems that we have had on the Gold Coast is that criminal motorcycle gangs feel that it is okay for them to walk the streets and walk into licensed premises and act like they own the joint, and that is absolutely not acceptable. There are many people who enjoy licensed venues right across the Gold Coast and right across Queensland and it is not acceptable that they would ever be in a position where their safety is compromised because of the presence of patched criminal motorcycle gang members. It is also important to note that the changes that we will make with regard to the licensing regime for body art tattoo parlours will ensure that we can stop these criminal organisations from laundering and trafficking money.

The third tranche of this regime is the all-important catch-all, and that is the criminal gangs disruption element. This will allow us to include criminal organisations by regulation to the definition in the Criminal Organisation Act. What is really important about this is that it allows us to act quickly and it allows us to respond to changes in gang names, and that is particularly important given some of the alliances that gangs are making with other gangs. Again, it is also important to note that there is a process here. We are not looking to subvert the authority of the judiciary. We are not simply asking it to be a rubber stamp to our decision. We are looking to work with the judiciary to make sure that our communities are safe and that they are protected from criminal motorcycle gangs and from members and associates.

I note that organisations will be able to avail themselves of a defence that their association is not a criminal organisation. I have no issue with the fact that we will be stopping gang members gathering in groups of three or more. I appreciate that there are motorcycle enthusiasts who are concerned about persecution, but again I reiterate that there is no such intention of this government to persecute any law-abiding citizen. If you have done nothing wrong, you have nothing to fear. There is just as much chance of me being pulled over for an RBT in my electorate as I am driving past one of the schools, as there is of me driving past a speed camera van, as there is of me being pulled over for a random roadworthy check. It is part of being a driver on our roads. If you want to drive on our roads, you need to accept that there are some responsibilities that come with your licence. I have met with members of motorcycle clubs who are concerned about this, but I have assured them that if they have done nothing wrong then they have nothing to fear, because it is the intention of this government to drive criminal motorcycle gangs out of our society so that enthusiasts do not get a bad name because a component of people who ride motorcycles are doing the wrong thing.

I also note that where we prescribe an organisation through a regulation as a criminal organisation we will also be able to stop them from going to specific locations that are prescribed by regulation. That gives us an opportunity to prescribe the location of their clubhouse, for example, and stop them from being able to meet there. It is also important that we are going to be able to stop them from promoting their organisation or recruiting other members to it. We have said that we will cancel

the licences of criminal motorcycle gang members for related offences. Importantly, we have also said that there will be a presumption against bail. I appreciate that this is a contentious issue. Whenever there is a presumption against bail, there are many people who are concerned about the liberties of those who are seeking bail. What I would say to those people is that I believe that bikies should face jail and not receive bail because it is important that we protect the community. When we talk about the liberties and the freedoms and the safety of people in our community, we have to strike a balance. I personally believe that the safety of my community and the safety of the people who live on the Gold Coast and the safety of those 18- and 19-year-olds who might want to go to Cavill Mall or those families who want to go to dinner at Broadbeach is absolutely paramount and it outweighs any concern that people might have for the liberties of criminals.

I have absolutely no concern whatsoever with the presumption against bail. I think it is an incredibly important element of this particular suite of legislation, and I note that before we introduced this legislation the Chief Magistrate himself recommended to his colleagues that they should have in their minds a presumption against bail because the liberties and the protections of our community are so much more important than the liberties of criminals. We have also announced that we will be working with the Crime and Misconduct Commission to ensure that it has the necessary powers and the appropriate jurisdiction and we will be increasing the penalties for criminal motorcycle gangs that seriously assault and evade police.

It is also important to note that this is just one part of what we are doing. We are working with our federal colleagues, which is incredibly important. We need a national response to this, and it is important that Queensland has within its own laws a very strong response. It is also very important that we use our recently strengthened unexplained wealth laws, and I have no doubt that they will complement the laws that we are hopefully going to pass tonight.

I note that the member for Dalrymple spoke about serious violations of liberties. What I would say to the member for Dalrymple is think about people in your community. Think about those law-abiding citizens in your community who just want to go down to the local pub for dinner. Why should we value their liberties and their safety and their freedom any less than that of someone who is running a criminal organisation, who thinks that it is okay to peddle drugs, who thinks that it is okay to launder and traffic money, and who thinks that it is okay to intimidate businesses and members of our community? I would suggest to the member for Dalrymple that whilst he may not have a particular concern in his community it is important as a member of this House that he thinks not only of the people of Dalrymple but also of the people of Queensland.

Mr Hopper interjected.

Miss BARTON: He is very privileged to be one of 89 members who sits in this House and I would very much encourage him to think of the liberties of the Queenslanders who—

Mr Hopper interjected.

Miss BARTON: I would very much encourage him to think of the liberties—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! Members will cease interjecting. The member is not taking interjections and the member has the call.

Miss BARTON: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. Perhaps the member for Condamine might also like to think of the liberties of his community—the community that he absolutely betrayed when he defected last year. It is incredibly important that we protect our communities, and the legislation that we are introducing, and that we will hopefully pass with the unanimous support of this House tonight, will ensure that we protect and strengthen our communities. There has also been much debate about the need for urgency in this particular debate and I would say—

Mr Hopper interjected.

Miss BARTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, if the member for Condamine wishes to contribute to the debate, he is able to. As you have already indicated, I am not taking his interjections.

Mr Hopper interjected.

Miss BARTON: As I have indicated, we have a very important role to play as members of parliament.

Mr Hopper interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Condamine, you are constantly interjecting and I will soon be warning you under standing order 253A. The member for Broadwater has the call.

Miss BARTON: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have no doubt that if Stuart Copeland were the member for Condamine he would be standing up for the people of Queensland and he would be standing up for the rights and the liberties and the freedoms of law-abiding citizens of this state, something—

Mr HOPPER: I rise to a point of order. I find that totally offensive. It is beyond belief and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Miss BARTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I made no personal reflection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Condamine, I did not hear any direct comment made that insinuated anything towards you.

Mr HOPPER: I found it personally offensive and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Miss BARTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I maintain, with all due respect, that I made no personal reflection about the current member for Condamine. I simply made reference to a former member of this House.

Mr HOPPER: I rise to a point of order. That was a reflection on my representation as a member of this chamber. I find it offensive and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Attorney-General, you do not need to enter the debate. Member for Broadwater, I did not specifically hear anything that seemed offensive. However, it would help the House, seeing as the member for Condamine has taken offence at something, if you would withdraw.

Miss BARTON: I withdraw. I have no doubt that former members of this House, including Stuart Copeland, would stand up for their communities. I think it is incumbent on us to make sure that we represent well our communities' freedoms, their protection and their rights. That is why it is particularly important that this legislation is debated urgently this evening.

Over the past 2½ weeks I have received much feedback from members of my community. They have wanted to know how quickly we can get something done. We have drawn a line in the sand. We have declared a war on bikies. Queenslanders want us to do something. Action needs to be taken and it is being taken. It has taken this government to stand up and introduce the right suite of legislation that we need to put a stop to these criminal motorcycle gangs.

The other point that needs to be highlighted, particularly with regard to the Gold Coast, is the importance of the tourism industry. I received feedback from one of my constituents who was dining at that restaurant in Broadbeach on the night of the brawl. They were with a friend from Melbourne. It was their friend's first trip to the Gold Coast. They arrived that Friday and they were supposed to be staying for seven nights. They took the first flight home to Melbourne on Saturday and vowed to never return to the Gold Coast. It is absolutely unacceptable that a criminal motorcycle gang can have such an influence on our economy and such an influence on our community.

I would hope that all members of this House would stand up for Queenslanders and their freedoms and their safety. I would encourage all members of this House to unanimously support this suite of legislation. It is what needs to be done. I thank the Attorney-General, the Minister for Police and Community Safety and the Premier for having the fortitude to introduce this legislation.

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (11.21 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate and speak in favour of this legislation before the House that deals with criminal motorcycle gangs and organisations. In the words of the former US President Dwight D Eisenhower, peace and justice are two sides of the same coin. In recent weeks, Queenslanders have been exposed to the seedy world of gangland violence. This is not a television show. It is not some slick production that glorifies bkie gangs and criminal organisations. It is real life and in open view of local families and tourists. I can only begin to imagine the disappointment that our fellow Queenslanders must feel when they see their streets on the evening news associated with such disgraceful acts by the criminal underworld.

As a government and as members of the community we cannot stand by idly as these organisations flout the law and pose a clear and present danger to the peaceful nature of our communities and try to turn our streets into a battleground. We need to adopt a zero tolerance crackdown on criminal gangs and provide the additional resources that are necessary to the

Queensland Police Service and other crime-fighting units to combat these parasites. To secure peace for millions of Queenslanders, we must be tough and unflinching when administering justice over the small minority who seek to destroy the good standing of Queensland.

Some will call this legislation too tough or draconian. An individual has nothing to fear if they are not breaching the law. Law-abiding citizens are not the targets. I must stress that, if you are not affiliated with or associated with a criminal motorcycle gang and you enjoy riding a motorcycle, you will not be the target. I have ridden with the Patriot Guard welcoming home returned servicemen. I have ridden with motorcycle clubs delivering toys for tots. These are people who do not demand protection money from businesses or who start brawls in family hot spots or entertainment zones.

Mr Rickuss: It's about criminals; it's not about motorcyclists.

Mr PUCCI: I take that interjection from the member for Lockyer. This legislation is about criminals; it is not about motorcyclists. The civil libertarian approach to criminal justice makes a laughing-stock of our legal system. Until the election of the LNP government, offenders would just laugh at the revolving door policy that was adopted by the Labor government. That government's eagerness to appease special interest groups put our safety at risk. This is not the time to hold hands and sing *Kumbaya*. Now is the time for action.

The former government spent more time protecting offenders and creating legal loopholes, allowing criminals organisations to walk free, than it did in properly resourcing our Police Service and other crime-fighting agencies. For too long the Queensland Police Service and the justice system have been combating these criminal elements with their hands tied behind their backs whilst hopping on one leg. For 20 years as these cells festered on the streets, the former government sat by idly. For 20 years Labor denied that bikie gangs were forming. It is fair to say that the biggest obstacle in tackling such criminal elements for the past 20 years has been indeed those members who are now in opposition. Their weak stance on crime and lack of support for the Queensland Police Service can be seen through their consistent opposition to laws that empower our Police Service to more efficiently and effectively serve the community.

The opposition members cannot stand there and say that they are representing the best interests of the community when on multiple occasions since May last year they have voted against legislation that protects our police officers and the communities they serve. These bikie gangs are a cancer on our society. They are a disease that is eating away at the core that forms the social fabric of our community. For the survival of our communities, we must remove this cancer. We must sweep it off our streets and into the corrective system where they belong. We must show that not only is this sort of activity not welcome in our state but also it will not be tolerated.

This reform will see a new era in combating the lawlessness on our streets. Our government is enabling the Queensland Police Service and the CMC to deal effectively with the threat. Locking up gang members addresses only one part of the issue. Taking away their ability to maintain operations and recruit members is another important facet in combating these outlaws. This legislation will insert a number of new offences and create new circumstances of aggravation for existing offences to target the participation of individuals and criminal organisations. This legislation will also see the destruction of any gang members' vehicle by being confiscated and crushed if used before, during or after an offence has been committed. The penalty for the offence of affray will increase from a maximum of one year imprisonment to up to seven years. This legislation will also see those offenders who brawled in a local restaurant several weeks ago receive punishment for their actions. Under the LNP government, the sentence will meet the severity of the crime. The *Kumbaya* approach of the ALP to dealing with offenders is over. The days of the soft approach to hard crime have come to an end.

This legislation will take these offenders off the street in more ways than one, with an automatic licence disqualification period of no less than three months being handed down to convicted members. We will also see the creation of three new offences punishable with a maximum sentence of three years and a minimum sentence of six months. These new offences include knowingly gathering in groups of three or more members of criminal organisations in a public place; going to banned locations as prescribed by regulations, such as clubhouses; and promoting or recruiting for an illegal organisation. These new offences will drive a significant wedge into these organisations.

Like a military campaign, we will take away the enemy's ability to wage war. Then they will understand that Queensland will no longer serve as the base for these organisations to peddle their filth and be a threat to our local communities. Our strong and firm commitment to tackle crime is not new. It is not a fad or some trend that ebbs and flows; it is a firm commitment that has been present

since this state overwhelmingly elected an LNP government in March 2012. Every item of legislation dealing with crime that this LNP government has introduced over the past 18 months has been in the best interests of Queenslanders and the security of our communities for generations to come.

I commend the honourable Premier, the honourable Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and the honourable Minister for Police and Community Safety for their firm resolve in tackling these pressing matters. The hard work of these honourable ministers commenced after they inherited 20 years of weak legislation and policies left behind by an apathetic Labor government that was more concerned with upside down elephants and fake Tahitian princes. I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the ministerial and departmental staff as well the chair, committee members and support staff of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for their ongoing efforts in working towards a safer future for all Queenslanders. I am proud to be a member of a government that puts community safety ahead of appeasing the union movement. I am proud to be a member of a government that is protecting the people of Queensland. I support this bill and recommend it to the House.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—UAP) (11.28 pm): Outlaw criminal motorcycle gangs have a dreadful history in Queensland and people are sick of them. But to ram these three bills through in cognate in a late-night session makes a mockery of how parliaments work, especially when the legislation is about a headline rather than a solution. These bills have been delivered here in a haste that is disproportionate to need, when it is the government that needs information about how best to confront the issue that is facing it. We were asked to vote on legislation with an incomplete briefing in the absence of even having a copy of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013 at a time when the internet was not working. It appears that the Attorney-General was not informed of that, but we were trying to tell him.

We were given copies of the explanatory notes and used them to make do initially. We were told that one hour would be sufficient and we only got through one bill. We were given three hours to consider 160 pages of a very complex bill, yet the Premier says here today that he was compelled to do something urgent here tonight after what happened in Broadbeach two weeks ago. Frankly, if the Premier only understood what the severity was at this stage then he is not very observant. This OMCG problem has been a problem for a very long time but they have been especially active in the last 18 months.

Whilst the Premier and LNP were distracted by their own personal journeys, the opposition and I have been telling the public and the government, both in the parliamentary and the public forum, that they have to do something about it. I was routinely ridiculed by the Premier and the Attorney-General when I said that their attention needed to be focused on this and the variety of mechanisms that were used to try to control it. I note that the Premier has stated here tonight in his speech that he does not say one thing and then do another, but the reality is that both the Premier and the member for Kawana, the Attorney-General, are on the record as doing exactly the opposite—that is, saying one thing and doing another. This is politically convenient, populist hypocrisy. The Leader of the Opposition correctly pointed out the details of this earlier.

The reality of the present situation is that the Premier and the LNP were going to be belted if they dithered any longer. That is why this legislation has come on suddenly here tonight. Before rushing in on anything it is reasonable to allow fellow parliamentarians, even opposition and crossbench members, time to consider whatever steps are being considered. There have been all sorts of discussions here tonight, telling us that we were not supposed to be informed, by members who do not understand the role of parliamentarians. This is especially the case when legislation is being propelled through parliament and it is not being modelled on existing legislation elsewhere. I acknowledge that the tattoo parlour legislation does mirror the New South Wales legislation and that is for the obvious reason that there is a similarity and a cross-border issue. There has been far too much chest beating and a description of what the government is going to do. In general terms you do not discuss what you are going to do, you go ahead and you do it, particularly when you are dealing with people who are looking for information as to what might happen.

The indecent haste with which this bill has come on has probably led to all sorts of things that will have unintended consequences. I do not necessarily know what they will be, but I would think in the next few months we will see the results of that. We in the UAP intend to support the legislation. I see that the opposition has clearly indicated that it will support the legislation. I urge members to understand that the outlaw criminal motorcycle gangs only account for 20 per cent of drug related crime in Queensland. They have built this over the last 18 months from possibly a 10 per cent base,

but the greatest increase has occurred in the last 18 months. The reasons for this have been publicly stated. It is because we took our eyes off the ball and they got into making ice. In other words, we are only dealing with a percentage of the crime and we are still going to have significant criminal behaviour being performed by other people, but possibly the bikies will be very handicapped by the legislation.

We are proposing two small amendments, one which was outlined earlier: to acknowledge a schedule of law-abiding recreational motorcycle clubs and to identify those people within the legislation so that they do not have a problem.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Dr DOUGLAS: Then a further amendment—

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order! Member for Lockyer, the member for Gaven has not been taking your interjections. The member for Gaven has the call.

Dr DOUGLAS: And a further review of the legislation in 12 months' time. What we have ended up with is a debate about politics and not about governing. I know that the Premier is on the record in a variety of places stating that the second term would be all about politics. The reality is that this is about a particular problem and we have to face it in a very detailed way which leads to the best result. When you rush through legislation, ram it through on a night like this and you do not discuss it, you make mistakes. The unintended consequences of some of those simple mistakes can lead to massive problems. As I say, we support the legislation, but I think the amendments should go through supported.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (11.34 pm): I rise to speak in this cognate debate and in doing so again put on the record my concern that there has been a limited amount of time to understand what are significant powers to be conferred both on the CMC and on police. Nobody in the debate so far has, I believe, if I recollect properly, argued with the point that the motorcycle gangs are causing problems and that it has escalated over the last few years. I think some gangs in particular have become particularly violent and particularly brutal and therefore a response is necessary. The debate today has been about the opportunity for members who may not have the resources of government or the opposition to be able to understand these bills and the extent to which the powers will be increased.

I thank the minister for the briefing this afternoon. Whilst there were some challenges during that briefing, not the least of which was that we did not have all of the bills, I do appreciate the time that the staff invested in that briefing and thank the minister for it. The Tattoo Parlours Bill will introduce a licensing regime for body art tattoo parlours and tattooists. Over the years we have debated a number of bills to do with tattooing in relation to the age of people who are able to freely and without parental consent get tattoos. It is an issue that has been on the floor in terms of actual behaviours of tattooists. This bill will also amend legislation to prohibit members of criminal motorcycle gangs from wearing colours inside licensed premises and within areas prescribed by regulation. It will also introduce the licensing regime to commence on 1 January 2014. The prohibition on criminal motorcycle gangs wearing colours inside licensed premises I think will have a dampening effect on the influence of groups of people going into facilities when they have relied on that gang mentality to be able to gain, if you like, the fear of entering that premises.

I will move now to the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill. I have noticed in the last little while we have had some rather interesting bill titles. It started about 12 or 18 months ago and it has got progressively more interesting. This bill will authorise the CMC to hold immediate response interviews. I am interested in receiving clarification from the minister. It has been talked about in this chamber that the CMC will be additionally resourced for this extra workload, bearing in mind that we have this criminal gang legislation coming in and also the unexplained wealth legislation that is coming into force. Over the past nine to 12 months the CMC has been under significant pressure to respond to investigations and hearings that both the PCMC and others have been involved in in terms of oversight of the CMC and also investigation of its processes. It is going to need additional resourcing. Initially I thought that the allocation was \$7 million. What was clarified today is that it is up to \$7 million and the CMC will be required to indicate what resources it will need.

To some extent, it will be difficult for them to quantify what they will need because the reach of the legislation is unknown and the workload that it will create can be only guessed at. Therefore, I ask the Attorney-General to clarify how flexible the opportunity will be for the CMC to come back to the government if it needs additional resources.

In our briefing this afternoon we had a discussion about the mandatory incarceration. The advisers brought to our attention the fact that the Youth Justice Act precludes mandatory sentencing for juveniles. That was welcomed by many in the briefing. In the debate tonight there was discussion about triads, the Crips and other youth gang organisations and whether this legislation would have reach over those groups. I ask the Attorney-General to clarify if there is any overlap or if there is any overriding of the Youth Justice Act. I think that some in the community think that some young people overuse youth as a defence against being incarcerated and that there are young people who deserve custodial sentences because of their actions. I would be interested in hearing the minister's response.

I express some concern about the mandatory disqualification of licences irrespective of whether a vehicle was involved in the offence. I would be interested in the minister's reasoning for placing in the legislation a mandatory disqualification for a period of not less than three months even though the vehicle may not have been involved in the commissioning of an offence.

In the briefing we discussed the policing and the implementation of this legislation. The police will be the major implementers along with, I assume, the CMC in its role. During the briefing it became apparent that, when interpreting this legislation, the focus will be on the motive behind the offending. On that basis I have some questions, particularly in relation to the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013. I understand and accept the huge community concern about the actions of the Bandidos on the Gold Coast several weeks ago. More particularly, the community was incensed that, as the police had taken several members of the gang into custody, the gang then presented itself at the police station and demanded their release. I think that as much as anything indicated the sense of ownership that those gangs have of not only the community but also the police in the south-east corner.

However, my community has put it to me that they need peace of mind that, in the quiet enjoyment of their hobby—and that hobby will be riding a motorcycle—people will not be unnecessarily drafted into the implications of this bill. They want to know that they will be able to ride. The most significant example is the Ulysses motorcycle group. I do not believe that the Ulysses members in my area are a gang. Some of them have had pretty hard lives and they look pretty weatherworn. It could be easy to misinterpret them and their role in the community. I would like to know that the police will not be acting on the basis of appearance, but that they will be required to act on the basis of reasonable suspicion. If that is the case, then some of those people in the community who may look as if they have enjoyed a hard life will perhaps feel more confident once this legislation is brought into being.

The other question that I have is a practical one. These bills talk about criminal association and people who associate. This was a debate that we had also on the Criminal Organisation Bill 2009. A question that I would like clarified is this: these people are going to be targeted if they associate in groups of more than three. This may be a puerile question, but it is a genuine question on my part. Say there is a family get-together including several people who belong to motorcycle gangs, although they are not there as gang members but as family members. Will those kinds of events be vulnerable to being intercepted as well? That is a practical question. As I said, all of us have family members who perhaps look like they have enjoyed or experienced a hard life. It would be very easy to make assumptions based on appearance only.

Finally, I would seek clarification on the schedule in relation to offences under the Criminal Code. I struggle to understand how that small number of offences is included in this type of legislation. I understand why they are in legislation that is administered by the police, but I do not understand why they are in a criminal association bill. They include the dangerous operation of a vehicle and assaults in the interference with freedom of trade or work. I understand if those assaults are carried out by outlaw gangs, but does this preclude physical action or physical interaction that could be deemed by police to be assaults by trade unions, and I am talking about things such as picket lines? Punishment for or of unlawful stalking: again, I can understand why that could be included because of gang membership, but it is not qualified. Attempted robbery is not qualified. Receiving tainted property is not qualified. Somebody could receive tainted property without realising that it is the proceeds of gangs that are targeted by this legislation. I ask this question because the penalties are very severe. I would seek clarification from the Attorney-General on those matters.

I look forward to the debate in consideration in detail, because I think the community still has concerns about the reach of this legislation. I believe the minister and the government are intending specifically to address the type of extreme action that we have seen carried out by what used to be called outlaw motorcycle gangs. However, in achieving that goal it would be a travesty if law-abiding honest Queenslanders are significantly and unnecessarily affected.

 **Mr HOPPER** (Condamine—KAP) (11.48 pm): The bills before the House tonight are good legislation and we will be supporting them. The member for Yeerongpilly will be moving an amendment on behalf of the block of backbenchers, who met today and worked out that amendment. Let us consider a person who lives on the Gold Coast, where this issue came to a head, and who was in the restaurant on the night a mob of thugs came in and did what they did. That is the most disgusting thing that any family could witness. Small children would have been present as would have honest, decent and faithful staff. Those men have the audacity to think that they can take the law into their own hands—

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order, member for Lockyer! Member for Condamine, please take your seat. Member for Lockyer, you have continually interrupted the House tonight. You have already been warned under standing order 253A. I ask that you withdraw from the chamber for one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Lockyer withdrew from the chamber at 11.49 pm.

Mr HOPPER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I certainly appreciate your protection in the House. I have sat here tonight and taken abuse from this member all night. I thank you for your protection as a member of this chamber. It is a credit to you as Deputy Speaker. Well done.

As I was saying to the House, families would have been sitting in that restaurant. As the Premier said tonight—and it was a very good speech by the Premier—for a group of people in a community, whoever they are, to think they are above the law to the extent that they could do what they did is not right. As the member for Gladstone and a few other members explained, they then went to the police station. Our police are the law-makers of this state. They deserve the respect of the community. These people obviously thought they were above the law that night.

What we have seen is the Attorney-General move suddenly to capitalise on what is in the media at the moment. While it is fresh in people's minds the Attorney-General has capitalised on this and moved this legislation. In his speech the member for Nicklin summed up what happened today very well. We have seen this legislation brought forward and rushed through. It has not gone to a committee for due process. That is why we have 20 minutes each to speak and why it will be such a long night tonight. Maybe this will go on for a lot longer. This legislation has been seriously rushed through.

The debate certainly could have waited until the next sitting. A committee could have had a good look at the legislation and we could certainly have had a decent briefing. I thank the staff, who are in the chamber tonight, who gave us the briefing today. It was not the fault of the staff that members were upset. Some members wanted to go through all three bills. We certainly did not have enough time to do that. An order came through from the Attorney-General's office to shut that briefing down.

Earlier the member for Dalrymple spoke about our amendment. The Attorney-General said that he would chuck it out. He had not even seen the amendment. The arrogance of the Attorney-General to not even take our amendment on board—

Mr Bleijje interjected.

Mr HOPPER: You had not even seen it at that stage. There is no way in the world you had seen it at stage.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for Condamine will speak through the chair. The Attorney-General will cease interjecting.

Mr HOPPER: There is no way in the world the Attorney had seen the amendment at that stage. I know for a fact that he had not seen it. He said that he would chuck it out. That is a perfect example of the arrogance of this government.

Let us get back to the bills before the House. We are talking about bikies who are a law unto themselves. We have to seriously look at the assets that these people have. We have been talking about the tattoo industry as well. I know that there are a lot of other industries where they are certainly laundering money. Someone mentioned bakeries before.

This bill will certainly target bkie gangs. I have very dear friends who ride motorbikes. Today we heard members in the House speak of how they ride motorbikes and are members of clubs. We will put an amendment forward to try to recognise those members. We have bkie gangs on the list and yet we have clubs comprising members who want to ride bikes and are good, law-abiding citizens who are good to their communities. They are out there every weekend. They go for weekends away. We would like to see those clubs recognised as comprising law-abiding citizens. That is certainly one of the things that we are worried about. We have to recognise the good recreational clubs.

We heard the Premier talk about \$7 million that has been allocated to the CMC. Some \$7,000,000 is being allocated to specifically target bkie gangs. Ten people would be employed for \$1 million. Are we going to employ 70 people in the CMC to look at bkie gangs?

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr HOPPER: Those opposite might laugh.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr HOPPER: If the member for Coomera wants to interject—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coomera and the member for Condamine will cease firing across the chamber at each other. The member for Condamine has the call.

Mr HOPPER: If the member would like to talk about the shares he owned when he was elected to this place he might like to interject on me. Let me get back to the bkie bill. Some \$7 million has been allocated to the CMC. How can we police that that is dedicated towards looking at bkie gangs? That is a lot of money. We must make sure that it goes towards making sure the activities of these people are policed.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Condamine, if you could resume your seat. Member for Coomera what is your point of order?

Mr CRANDON: There was an inference in a comment the member just made against me that suggests that there is some dishonesty in something. I would like the member to withdraw the comment because I find it offensive.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Condamine, you have been asked to withdraw.

Mr HOPPER: I withdraw. I will get back to the bill.

We are talking about a special prison for bkie members. What we will see then is all the bikies locked up together in the special prison. We have to seriously look at the ramification of this actually happening. We are going to lock them up to deter them from doing what they were doing. The member for Ipswich spoke about this. I certainly respect the member for Ipswich. Every contribution he makes in this House is very good. He is very qualified in the law. I wonder whether it is healthy locking these people up together in the same place. They are locked up to deter them from continuing their activity. The point the member for Ipswich was making is that after 10 or 15 years there is no doubt they would be deterred from continuing the activities of their past life. If we lock them all up together in the same prison all they will talk about is their past life. They will come out reinvigorated and still bikies. Personally, I am not sure whether that is such a good idea.

What we see highlighted in this legislation is bkie gangs. How are we going to stop police officers targeting a mob of bikers who are away on a weekend? Can they still wear their colours, such as the Ulysses colours? We do not want them targeted. There are a lot of good people out there who do like to wear the colours of their club and they are certainly not gangs. On the back bench we are very concerned about that. We do not want police targeting those people. We have to be very careful about that.

There are 150 pages in these bills. We certainly did not have the time to go through them all. I think this is seriously rushed legislation. The government is trying to keep it alive while the bashings on the Gold Coast are still in the media. We will be supporting this bill. As backbenchers we will be moving amendments en bloc.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (11.58 pm): I rise tonight to speak in support of the legislation introduced as part of the Newman government's criminal motorcycle gang reforms. Our government's response to this issue has been unprecedented and sends a very clear, strong message to all those associated with criminal gangs and motorcycle gangs. On behalf of my constituents, I congratulate the Premier and the Attorney-General on their commitment to the safety of Queenslanders and their commitment to the promise we made as a government 18 months ago to get tough on crime in this state.

Earlier this evening we heard the Leader of the Opposition's attempt to compare our government's dealings with criminal gangs to our youth justice boot camps. The member for Inala said we cannot even hold two kids in a boot camp as if that was some credible basis for attacking our proposals for dealing with serious criminal activities. Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition has no idea about the difference between dealing with young people who have come from significantly disadvantaged backgrounds and serious organised criminals.

As a father of four sons I understand all too well the delicacies and intricacies of raising boys. It is challenging for any parent in this complicated, fast paced, modern world of ours. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest there is even a remote similarity between youth justice and dealing with serious crime is not only delusional but simply appalling. Youth justice is about working with young people, providing programs to help change their thinking, supporting those who are receptive with monitors, giving them hope and helping them to develop new patterns of thinking and fundamentally keeping them out of jail. There is no similarity; there is no comparison between how we should deal with badly behaved young people and how we should deal with serious criminals and organised crime. The former government, the government which the member for Inala served in as both a member and a minister, was soft on financial management, soft on economic reform and soft on crime.

The Gold Coast has had enough of this issue. We have had enough of the escalating violence and we have had enough of the intimidation and scaremongering. The Gold Coast's reputation is being tarnished by a lawless minority and it is time to put a stop to this madness. Tonight we have heard from the member for Nicklin, the member for Gaven and the member for Condamine who have all gone to great lengths to talk about how we are rushing this through, how we have no respect for the process and how it is inappropriate to be pushing these reforms through. Can I say as someone who has sat on the end of a phone call at two o'clock in the morning and received threats from someone who said, 'I know where you live, I know where your kids go to school and I'm coming after you,' it is no comfort to me and it is certainly no comfort to the families on the Gold Coast that we go slow on this issue. It was only thanks to the quick action of the Broadbeach police at that time back in 2007 that they were able to trace that call, and on that occasion the perpetrator was actually caught and dealt with. But it is not a great experience for a father of young boys to hear that sort of threat made over the telephone. So, as far as I am concerned, these reforms and these laws and this action by this government cannot come fast enough.

The legislation introduced today by the Attorney-General is unlike any that we have seen in Australia. This is not a short-term fix; it is a long-term solution to ridding our society of these groups. We will make the changes the former government did not when the criminal motorcycle gangs began seizing power in Queensland. A senior Gold Coast policeman approached me at Ashmore City last Saturday morning. He spoke to me about the government's response to this issue and how he and other officers were motivated by the Premier's statements in the aftermath of the Broadbeach incident. He actually asked me to pass on his congratulations and thanks to the Premier, the police minister and the Attorney-General for their swift action and their strong stance. He said that our government's support for the officers on the front line, dealing with the violence and criminal activity linked to these motorcycle gangs, has been especially empowering and encouraging. In fact, he said that the recent statements of the Premier and the Attorney-General had actually inspired many officers who for some time had become quite depressed and despondent about the lack of action from the previous government when some of these matters arose a number of years ago.

The former government dropped the ball on these issues. These tough new laws signal a fresh approach. Our government has had enough. I want to congratulate the Attorney-General on these and the many other reforms we have already seen in our term of government in respect of sex offenders, child protection, drug offences and the proceeds of criminal activity.

The most recent response from Gold Coast police has been absolutely outstanding, and it is very pleasing to see that Jim Keogh is back on the coast. He was fantastic in his previous role. His return has restored a great deal of confidence and I know that the public can rest assured knowing that the fight against these gangs is being led by someone as experienced as Superintendent Jim Keogh.

Since being elected to represent the people of Southport, I have developed a very close relationship with the Southport Police Station, the officer in charge Ray Vine and the district officer Paul Ziebarth. They have done a fantastic job of keeping the Southport community safe and calm during the last few weeks when media interest has created an increased sense of fear and intimidation. I must remind the House this evening that the officer in charge Ray Vine is the first permanent appointment at Southport after many years of temporary appointments by the previous government. Again, I must pass on my thanks to Minister Dempsey and the Police Commissioner for giving one of Queensland's busiest police stations a permanent person in charge and for treating the team on the ground and the community with respect, unlike the opposition who have fiddle-faddled over these staff appointments in the past, just like they fiddle-faddled over serious crime on the Gold Coast.

The Gold Coast is, however, by and large a fairly safe place to live thanks to the wonderful services of our front-line police. It has always been known as a great place for families. Since being elected as the member for Southport, I have made the safety of my community a top priority.

Mr Johnson: Didn't Paul Wilson start some great work?

Mr MOLHOEK: Absolutely he did. I take that interjection. Criminal activity, however, linked to motorcycle gangs cannot be tolerated. We are looking at tougher laws, on top of those we have already put in place. The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill will see members of criminal organisations receive severe punishments for committing serious offences. The bill will deter individuals from participating in these criminal organisations, encourage those involved in these organisations to cooperate with the law and, most importantly, break the morale of members of criminal motorcycle gangs.

The regime will apply to a person who commits an offence while participating in the affairs of an association. Such an offender will be considered a 'vicious lawless associate' and subject to extra punishment beyond that which would normally apply for the offence—a further 15 years added to their sentence. If the associate was at the time of the offence a leader in the group, they will also receive an additional 10 years, on top of the 15 years imprisonment, and all of that on top of the original sentence.

We are not stopping there. If the offence was violent, a further 10 years imprisonment will be added to their sentence. This bill makes it clear that extra punishment is mandatory and cannot be reduced by the court. I, for one, am pleased to see that these measures are being put in place. I think all of us are fed up with hearing many occasions where the judiciary has let down the people of Queensland, where serious offenders have been let off on short terms or suspended sentences or been let out far too early on parole and to such a large extent have begun to make a mockery of the system. The Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill is the first of its kind in Australia and will see the Gold Coast and Queensland become a safer place for families and visitors.

Many of my constituents might be surprised to learn that an estimated 80 per cent of tattoo parlours in Queensland are run by criminal motorcycle gangs. Phase 1 of the Tattoo Parlours Bill introduces a licensing regime for body art, tattoo parlours and tattooists. The bill will see members of criminal organisations banned for owning, operating or working in these parlours, ensuring only fit and proper persons are able to hold licences. The bill will also amend legislation to prohibit criminal motorcycle gang members from wearing club colours inside licensed venues. Licence applications will start being received from 1 January. Compliance with unlicensed trading will start from 1 July next year. Prohibition of criminal motorcycle gang members wearing club colours will commence on assent to this bill.

We are wasting no time in the effort to put an end to this nonsense. Phase 2 will see the Criminal Organisation Act 2009 amended so that many other licences may be refused to individuals who the Queensland Police Service advises are members of criminal motorcycle gangs. This bill will make it very difficult for members of criminal motorcycle gangs to do business in our community, and I

think that is a good thing. The Criminal Code will be amended with the insertion of a number of new offences and the creation of new circumstances of aggravation for existing offences. These amendments will target those involved in criminal organisations to help clean up the streets of the Gold Coast.

A criminal organisation is already defined in section 1 of the Criminal Code to mean, firstly, an organisation of three or more people who predominantly gather for the purpose of engaging in serious criminal activity and who present as a risk to the safety, welfare and order of the community. Secondly, it is defined as an organisation declared under the Criminal Organisation Act. Additionally, it is proposed that another arm be added to this definition to include criminal organisations that are prescribed by regulation. These new offences that will be added to the Criminal Code will incur a maximum of three years imprisonment and mandatory minimum six months imprisonment as well as confiscation and crushing of any vehicle used before, during or after the offence. The offences include knowingly gathering in groups of three or more members in a public place, going to banned locations such as clubhouses as prescribed by legislation and/or promoting or recruiting for the organisation.

The current maximum penalty for affray is one year which, under these amendments, will be increased to seven years. Furthermore, a mandatory one year imprisonment will apply for serious assaults on police if committed by members of criminal motorcycle gangs. Mandatory disqualification of a driver's licence for three months for criminal motorcycle gangs will also apply. There will also be changes to the Bail Act regarding any offence, and this is an important reform. These will include presumption against bail for criminal motorcycle gang members as well as mandatory passport surrender as a condition of bail.

Amendments will also see additional powers given to the CMC. This will make it an offence to withhold evidence from the CMC even if you fear retribution and are a member or an associate of a criminal motorcycle gang. There will also be mandatory imprisonment for first contempt offences, 2½ years for second offences and five years for third offences. This legislation is ground breaking. We will take away their money. We will take away their bikes. We will take away their assets. We will stop them gathering in groups. We will stop them from recruiting new members. We will put these criminals in jail where they belong.

When I ran for parliament I heard from many people in Ashmore, Southport and Parkwood and other parts of the electorate, particularly elderly people, just how concerned they were for their own safety. Gang violence, drug dealers, drug dealers' disputes, and break and enter offences had dominated our local news bulletins for far too long. However, this is not just about my local community; this is about our city's image. This is about our tourism and development industries. This is about jobs and opportunity. Queensland and the Gold Coast do not need the negative publicity generated by the kind of behaviours we saw in Broadbeach recently. This is not the image of the Gold Coast that we want potential visitors to see on their TV screens in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth. We do not want them changing their holiday plans. We do not want them worrying about the safety of their families.

There are so many great things happening right now on the Gold Coast and in Southport that it would be a shame to undo all the good work that has occurred in the 18 months since this government came to power. So it is important that we send the right message interstate and overseas. That is why I cannot commend the Premier enough for the strong message that he is sending to Queenslanders and our nation through these legislative changes. Next year our state will host the G20 and the Pan Pacs and in just a few years time the Commonwealth Games will place the Gold Coast and Queensland on the world stage. It is just so fundamentally important that we undertake these measures and do everything we can not only to clean up our image but to make our streets and our cities safer.

This issue is threatening the secure future for our families and our state. It is threatening the secure future for our city and it needs to be addressed. I am pleased to stand here tonight as a proud member of this government in support of the Premier, the Attorney-General and our police minister in support of this legislation.

 **Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—UAP) (12.12 am): I rise to make a brief contribution. The hour is obviously late and a lot has been said already. I concur with the opposition and their statements, with the crossbench and most of the members opposite in the government.

The problem that we have today with this legislation is that we are 18 months into a term of government. There has been a lady shot at Robina, and the Premier acknowledged that in his speech. Back in 1997 there was a shooting on the Mackay bridge between bikies. This is not a new issue. It has been a serious issue for a long time. The government has introduced the bill tonight and says that it is acting suddenly to deal with an emerging crime; however, it has been a massive crime for a long time.

The bottom line is that this legislation should have been brought forward in a fashion such that it could have been properly considered, referred to a committee, got right and then be brought into the House and been amended as necessary. Quite frankly, the way it has been drip-fed to the media has raised concern with the good people in the community. Legislation should meet community expectations. During the contribution to the debate many members have raised the issue of the good people in their electorates expressing concern. If members are here to represent their electorate—and we would hope that they are—we would ask them to support the amendments that we are putting forward because they are about addressing the concerns of the people within their electorate. We have indicated that we will support the government's bill. However, at the same time this is a place for adult conversation and debate and people in here should behave like adults, and they should acknowledge the concerns of people within their communities and support the amendments that the crossbench is putting forward.

Being perceived as a criminal organisation is a real concern in the community. Right or wrong, it is a real concern in the community and the concerns of good people who feel that way should matter. Perception matters. An amendment is proposed on behalf of such people who simply seek for this legislation to meet community expectations. To not support the proposed amendment is to not respect your community.

 **Mrs OSTAPOVITCH** (Stretton—LNP) (12.16 am): I rise to make a small contribution to the debate on the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013. I have been listening to the comments so far and I would like to point out to the members of the opposition that a good member of parliament is able to change their viewpoint when faced with strong evidence and indeed should. Gone are the days of a Labor government and their bloody-minded stubbornness. The horrific events of 27 September and then the storming of the police station a few days later have made us all sit up and realise that something had to be done or our country would soon turn into another America with people pulling their guns and shooting someone for looking at them the wrong way. Yet again a police officer has been shot and is lucky to be alive.

A lot of objection seems to be centred around concerns that legitimate bike riders would be targeted and pulled over and questioned. So what if they are? Seriously, who has not been pulled over for a random breath test when they have not even had a drink? How is this any different? Most people are willing to experience some inconvenience for the greater good of a safer society, and we should not forget that legitimate law-abiding bike riders are as affected by the potential violence of a criminal bikie as the rest of society—perhaps even more so. Has anybody seen the comedy movie *Wild Hogs*? Criminal bikers are not nice to each other, either. After all, it is not a birdwatching club. I am sure most people understand completely. Just last Saturday a constituent who has had a Harvey-Davidson for 30 years said he commended the Premier and the Attorney-General for the tough stand that they have taken. He commented that he had no problem with being pulled over because he understood that, unfortunately, his hobby associated him with the perception that the public has always had about those who ride bikes.

Like the member for Burleigh, I too used to—and still occasionally do—ride a motorbike. It was my very first mode of transport because, at 17, I could get a bike licence three months sooner than a car licence. I went from a little Yamaha dirt bike to a Kawasaki 250 with roll bars. I took road trips with other bikies, just like the members of the 450 or so other legitimate clubs around Queensland do.

This is certainly not about targeting people who ride bikes. It is about stopping criminals who endanger innocent lives. These criminals are businesspeople; make no mistake about that. However, they are businesspeople who have guns and the rest of us do not. Quite frankly, I say good on the Attorney-General and the Premier for having the guts to take on these mongrels and hit them where it hurts: the hip pocket, their precious bikes and their freedom. If 20 years of boredom in a cell without a TV or gym equipment does not turn them from their violent criminal lifestyle, then there is nothing that will, except perhaps a gun in the hands of a rival gang member which will stop them dead.

For those civil libertarians who say we have gone too far, I say we are probably saving these people's lives or the lives of their families. After all, if you live by the gun you have to be prepared to die by the gun. However, this legislation is all about protecting Queenslanders now. There is no need to take months to pore over the legislation and give criminals time to reinvent their businesses or go underground.

In regards to the Tattoo Parlour Bill, the acting president of the Tattoosists Guild today wrote to the minister commending the Attorney-General's commitment and agreeing that tattoo parlours are often used as fronts for organised criminal activity by criminal motorcycle gangs. To his credit, he offered some suggestions that might be helpful. All in all, I believe that Queenslanders will support these tough laws, and I am personally very proud of my government for passing laws that have the best chance to make a difference that we have ever been given. I say well done.

 **Mr KAYE** (Greenslopes—LNP) (12.20 am): I rise in the House tonight to make a short contribution to the Criminal Motorcycle Gang reform legislation. This submission is based on some personal experiences along with a bit of a history lesson. I too used to be a biker. As most in the House would be aware, I spent 23 years prior to being elected as an operational police officer. Throughout those years I dealt many, many times with members of criminal motorcycle gangs in Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Beenleigh-Logan areas, the north coast and out west. I have dealt firsthand with the types of people that we are addressing in this legislation.

I have heard several arguments over the past couple of weeks, one of which is that criminal motorcycle gangs are responsible for only one per cent of the crime in Queensland. I dispute that figure. Even if it were one per cent, we are talking about offences involving drugs, firearms, extortion, protection rackets and murder—just to name a few. I am sure members of the House would agree that these are not minor offences. The other well documented fact is that some of these offences contribute to other offences occurring, for example, drug distribution. Drug users often commit a vast number of other offences to feed their habit. For every illegal firearm sold, there are potentially further serious offences committed. So in my opinion, it is not one per cent.

Yes, there may be some minor inconvenience to members of social motorcycle clubs or groups of riders. That inconvenience will be short lived. Also from my experience it is not difficult to distinguish between criminal motorcycle members and law-abiding citizens after a very short period of time at a traffic stop. Quite simply, social clubs or friends going for a ride are not members of criminal motorcycle gangs. This is no more inconvenient than being stopped for a random breath test or a licence check. As a government, we have a responsibility to provide a safe environment for our communities. People should be able to go to a restaurant without fear of a riot or worse. People should be able to operate a business without fear of having to provide protection money to simply carry out their day-to-day business.

As a government we also need to support our police. Many former police and colleagues over the years have been assaulted or threatened by members of criminal motorcycle gangs. When members of a criminal motorcycle gang enter a police station as they did at Southport, demand the release of their members and proclaim that they are in control of the Gold Coast and not the police, surely that should be a warning to all. Throughout all the years of my policing service, my former colleagues and I were desperate for adequate laws to address the problem of criminal motorcycle gangs; however, under the previous government this was not forthcoming despite perhaps the best intentions. I draw to the attention of the House instances that have occurred in the past in this country involving criminal motorcycle gangs. The Milperra bikie massacre, also known as the Father's Day Massacre, occurred in Milperra, New South Wales, on 2 September 1984 between the Comancheros and the Bandidos. This massacre, involving firearms, bats, machetes and other weapons, resulted in the deaths of six club members and an innocent 14-year-old bystander Leanne Walters, who was shot in the face with a stray .357 calibre bullet. In addition to that, 28 people were also wounded.

This type of occurrence can easily happen again. If we did nothing, how would members of this House explain themselves to the families of innocent victims? In more recent times in Queensland and across the country you do not have to look too hard to locate a countless number of serious offences linked to criminal motorcycle gangs and associates. Shootings, stabbings, arsons, attempted murders, assaults, drugs—and the list goes on. I know the vast majority of the members of my community have had enough. There is no justification whatsoever for criminal motorcycle gangs to be

tolerated or allowed to exist. What did the former on-again, off-again former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd have to say when questioned in March 2009 after bikies bashed a man to death at Sydney Airport on a Sunday afternoon? He said—

This sort of behaviour by bikies and others engaged in organised criminal activity is unacceptable in Australia, absolutely unacceptable.

He then went on to say that he would have a zero tolerance approach. I am not too sure what happened there.

Yes, of course alleged offenders do have rights, and those rights are protected under our robust judicial system. During my time in the Police Service, about 20 years of that was under Labor governments. It became the topic of daily conversation with both my former colleagues and members of the community. They felt that the rights of offenders were placed before the rights of victims, with some police feeling that they should not even bother. Indeed, I know many former police who resigned and that was one of the contributing circumstances. If there are any members of this House who do not think the majority of the Queensland community have had enough of criminal gang behaviour, then I would suggest that they need to get out of their offices.

Participating in a charity ride or delivering toys to a children's hospital does not excuse somebody from being involved in a criminal organisation. Yes, this legislation is tough, but it is tough legislation to deal with a very serious issue that must be addressed. This is not a problem that will simply go away if it is ignored. We have already seen what happens when a government does that. If left unchecked, criminal motorcycle gangs will expand and dominate criminal activities in this state more than they already do. I certainly make no apologies for supporting this legislation, and I congratulate the Attorney-General for bringing this legislation before the House.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.25 am), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the important debate tonight on the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, the Tattoo Parlours Bill and the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations) Disruption Amendment Bill 2013. I think it has been a great debate, and we are making history tonight with some of the toughest laws to hunt, track down, find, locate, target, disrupt and destroy the most violent and vicious offenders that we have in our communities; that is, criminal motorcycle gang members and other organised crime members.

It was interesting when I watched the news last night. One of the lawyers representing a criminal motorcycle gang member who had been charged with an offence essentially said that these people are just misunderstood and they want to contribute positively to society. They have to stop fooling people. The time is up. This government has drawn a very firm line in the sand and we have said enough is enough. Not only will we crush the enterprise of the criminal motorcycle gangs, but we will crush their associations and their protection rackets. We will crush the morale of these individuals, and we will crush their businesses and enterprises. The only way we can do it is with a tough package of reforms.

But make no mistake, colleagues: this is phase 1. I would fully expect that in the next two sittings of parliament we will be debating more tough measures as criminal motorcycle gang members respond to these laws. As they come up out of the ground from where they are hidden at the moment, we will have to introduce more laws targeting criminal motorcycle gang members, because I have indicated that this is phase 1. When I talk about phase 2, I am talking about the Tattoo Parlours Bill. The reason we are doing that tonight is that we do not licence tattoo parlours at the moment, but we would look at implementing the same definition of fit and proper person under the Tattoo Parlours Bill for the likes of the security industry, the second-hand motor dealers industry and the gym industry. If there are criminal motorcycle gang members profiteering, promoting, working, associating with or being the proprietor of these other businesses, then we will crush them too.

We are unapologetic in relation to making sure that we have the net cast as far and as wide as possible to catch these individuals and rid them from our streets. If they do not want to be rid of the streets of Queensland, then they will end up in the tough new jail facility that we are going to re-establish at Woodford. Some of the tough measures that we are going to put into the jails include no TVs, limited non-contact time of one hour per week and no phone calls other than from legal representatives which will be censored and under surveillance at all times.

I turn to the debate at hand and will address the contributions made by honourable members. I will start with that of the opposition leader. The opposition leader had 60 minutes in which to speak this evening. In the 48th minute of her speech we finally found out that the opposition would be

supporting the legislation. Despite attacking the government and despite attacking these provisions, in the 48th minute of 60 minutes we found out that the Labor Party would be supporting these tough laws. That is surprising, given comments made by members of the Labor Party in the past and particularly in the past 10 days.

The opposition leader has been all over the place with respect to criminal motorcycle gangs. I suspect it has something to do with the fact that the Labor Party Peel Street organisation would be pressuring Labor parliamentarians to support these tough measures because the community certainly supports these tough measures. But I suspect that the member for South Brisbane does not support these measures. What will be very interesting is to see whether the member for South Brisbane votes on this bill if it goes to a division. I know that those in the Labor Party detest mandatory sentencing—she is not objecting to that?—but will support our reforms implementing the biggest range of mandatory sentencing this state has ever seen. That makes me think one of two things: either we have had such a great debate tonight that we have convinced the opposition to support these tough measures or those in the Labor Party are terribly frightened of their communities if they vote against this legislation. I suspect it is the latter. I suspect that even the member for Bundamba could not go to the next election and sell to her constituents, ‘I voted against these tough measures but still vote for me.’ I can hear the laughter of the member for Bundamba. I suspect that is where we are going with these measures, which, surprisingly, Labor Party members will endorse this evening—surprise but welcome support from the Labor Party.

The opposition leader talked about how the Labor Party tackled organised crime in this state and about how the best way to tackle organised crime is through a piece of legislation called the Criminal Organisation Act 2009. That was the Labor Party’s way of dealing with organised crime. I note that all of the Labor Party members were bragging about this great law they introduced. None of them mentioned how many times this law has been effectively used, because the answer is nil. No criminal organisation in this state has been declared a criminal organisation because of the Labor Party legislation.

It is one thing to have legislation on the statute books; it is another thing for it to actually work. We have had concerns with and criticisms of the Criminal Organisation Act all along. My concerns are still there in terms of having on the statute books an act that has not actually achieved anything. And the process for the legislation to achieve anything is cumbersome. It can take up to 12 months before any punishments or penalties are dished out to criminal members because of the process involved. At the start intelligence has to be gathered. Then they have to ask the Supreme Court for a criminal organisation declaration. Having achieved that, they then have to get a control order. Then, of course, an organisation has to breach the control order before there are any punishments. And the punishments are not worth the paper they are written on. We need severe, deterrent punishment. That is what this bill is all about.

The opposition leader also tried to fool Queenslanders by saying that criminal organisations in Queensland have only cropped up in the past 18 months, under this government. Criminal organisations were not there 18 months ago; they have just come since March 2012! Considering they said in 2009 they had the toughest and best piece of legislation dealing with criminal organisations, I suspect that is a mistruth. They have certainly been economical with the truth in this debate.

The opposition leader talked about my criticism of the Criminal Organisation Act.

Ms Palaszczuk: We loved that, yes.

Mr BLEIJIE: I loved it as well. Again, this piece of legislation has not worked. I cannot understand how the Labor Party can hold up the Criminal Organisation Act and say, ‘We are solving the problems of criminal organisations in Queensland,’ because no-one has been declared under it. Nothing has happened. All that has happened is that an application has been made.

What the Labor Party did not say—it did not quote from our speeches at the time—is that a more effective way of dealing with criminal organisations is through unexplained wealth laws. One of the first pieces of legislation introduced in the first 12 months of our government related to unexplained wealth. We also introduced serious drug-trafficking declarations, whereby all of the assets of the drug trafficker could be seized by the state and then sold. Also, offenders now have to serve 80 per cent of their sentences.

We said that there was a better way to deal with criminal gangs. We have done that with respect to unexplained wealth laws and serious drug-trafficking declarations. I remind the opposition leader that in the past 12 months the honourable Minister for Police has introduced the toughest firearms legislation, which provides for mandatory sentencing in relation to illegal firearms.

In 20 years in government those opposite came up with the Criminal Organisation Act, which has achieved nothing. It has taken no criminal motorcycle gangs off the streets and has not rid the state of any criminal motorcycle gangs. In the short space of 12 months we have introduced the toughest and best unexplained wealth laws in the country. We have also increased the penalties for serious assaults on police officers from seven years imprisonment to 14 years imprisonment to protect our front-line police officers. We have also introduced mandatory sentencing for carrying illegal weapons to deal with criminal motorcycle gangs. We have also increased a range of penalties for offences such as murdering a police officer.

The opposition leader would have Queenslanders believe that nothing has happened in this space over the past 18 months. More has happened under the Newman government in 18 months in terms of criminal motorcycle gang legislation than happened in 20 years under the Labor Party. All those opposite came up with in 20 years—

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will get to the CMC and the member for Bundamba in a second. In 20 years, all they came up with was one bill dealing with criminal motorcycle gangs. We have had a range of legislative reform in the past 18 months, and these bills complement our existing tough approach to criminal motorcycle gangs in this state.

For 48 minutes the opposition leader talked about how great the Criminal Organisation Act was—despite the fact that it has never been used, that the Labor Party—

Ms Palaszczuk: Put on record your hypocrisy.

Mr BLEIJIE: I put on the record tonight that the Labor Party's view is that the best way to address criminal motorcycle gangs is through a piece of legislation that has not yet been used. That is what those in the Labor Party believe. Again, they are in a corner. They reject everything. They philosophically reject this legislation, but they are forced to support it tonight. Even the member—

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. If the member for Bundamba does not feel that she is forced then she ought vote against the legislation. If she hates the legislation, if she is repulsed by mandatory sentencing, then she ought vote against the legislation. She ought vote against the legislation if she finds it that repulsive.

I want to deal with the member for Rockhampton. It took the opposition leader 48 minutes to say that she was supporting the bill; it took the member for Rockhampton 30 seconds. I refer honourable members to a debate in this House on 27 November 2012. This is what the member for Rockhampton said in *Hansard* on the Weapons and Other Legislation Amendment Bill—

Our position is pretty simple. Our position has been stated by our members in this House numerous times, and the LNP has not listened to our warnings and has ignored the experts in the field such as the Law Society and numerous academics, having dedicated their lives to understanding crime and punishment—

and here is the punchline, colleagues—

who have pointed out the shortcomings of mandatory terms of imprisonment. We wish for our opposition to be recorded not only in terms of this bill but also in relation to all future bills that may be contemplated by those opposite incorporating mandatory sentencing.

Was the member for Rockhampton misleading the House tonight when he said that on 27 November 2012, and I repeat it for the opposition leader—

We wish for our opposition to be recorded not only in terms of this bill but also in relation to all future bills that may be contemplated by those opposite—

that is, the LNP government—

incorporating mandatory sentencing.

Hypocrisy has many definitions, but when we look at the ALP and Labor in Queensland there is only one succinct definition. We should recall that the member for Rockhampton is in fact the shadow police minister. The shadow police minister—if you did not know that he is the shadow police

minister—said in November that those opposite oppose all future bills with mandatory sentencing and then 30 seconds into the debate tonight he said that they support this bill. What has changed? We come into this place and we debate laws. We have toughened the laws because we have a philosophical objection to offenders in this community. We said that we were going to rebalance the scales of justice in favour of the victims in these instances, and we have done that all along in the 18 months we have been in government. We have a position and we have stood by our position and our values. Nothing shows more contempt for the people of Queensland than when you have to chop and change your values for the political landscape of the day.

I turn now to the member for South Brisbane. I can imagine the shadow cabinet room debate on whether they support these bills or not. I see the opposition leader smiling because she knows that I know exactly what went on in the shadow cabinet room. When the opposition leader said, 'We just need to support this. It's going to kill us politically if we don't support this,' the member for South Brisbane would have been riled. The member for South Brisbane would have been ropeable. Tonight I call on the opposition leader to let this go to a division. Let these bills go to a vote so that we can see where they really stand on these tough measures, where they really stand on mandatory sentencing, because the things that they have said about this bill and mandatory sentencing no doubt—and Queenslanders ought be warned—will flip and change with the next bill that we have in this place. The opposition leader, in a couple of hours time if the debate is still going, will put out a press release and she will say, 'We're supporting tough measures.' But 10 days ago the opposition leader said that these measures that we are introducing tonight would bring back a police state in Queensland. Is the opposition leader still supporting those comments that she herself made?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order. The Attorney is deliberately misleading and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): You find the comments offensive?

Ms PALASZCZUK: My comments were about the vision on the television. It was not about these—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposition leader, are you saying you find the comments offensive?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, if you would withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. The opposition leader was quoted—in fact, it was the vision that I saw on the news—saying that this state is becoming a police state. It was in response to the tough measures that the Premier and I announced with respect to these laws—these tough measures contained in the bills that we are debating tonight.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My Deputy Speaker, I find the comments offensive. He is repeating the comments. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you have been asked to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw, but I also—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unconditionally, Attorney.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw unconditionally. I will give notice that I at some stage this parliamentary sitting week will produce the video footage of the opposition leader in her own words saying that this state is becoming a police state. That is a quote from the opposition leader. I will tweet it out so the world at large can see that she is now trying to backtrack from those comments she made on the news. I can see the hypocrisy. We will go all through the last two weeks. The opposition leader has been on side with the reforms, rejected the reforms, said they are police state reforms, on side with the reforms. Tonight at this point in time—at a quarter to one in the morning—I believe that she is on side with the reforms, but we will see when the vote on the second reading takes place.

The opposition's answer in the last two weeks to this vexed question about what to do with criminal motorcycle gangs was to set up a group of people at the Gold Coast to talk about the issues—a summit. It was going to set up a committee. It was going to set up a talkfest. What it was effectively going to do with this committee is outsource the responsibilities of the state—outsource the responsibilities to a talkfest!

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Bundamba laughs about it, but this is Labor Party policy. This is Labor Party policy. If the opposition leader laughs, maybe the member for Bundamba missed the press release from the Leader of the Opposition—‘Labor will host Gold Coast crime summit’, and I table a copy. If an attendant could give that to the member for Bundamba, she might find it interesting Labor Party policy reading.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 30 September 2013, by Mr Tim Mulherin MP titled ‘Labor Will Host Gold Coast Crime Summit’ [\[3748\]](#).

I thank the Premier for his continued support in ensuring that we get these tough measures through the parliament and for having it on the government agenda to continue our line that we want to rid Queensland of criminal motorcycle gangs. I thank my colleague the police minister for his support over the last two weeks. Colleagues will know the effort that one puts into these types of reforms, and I want to pay tribute to all government staff and public servants who have drafted this legislation, and I can assure members it has been day and night as we have drafted the legislation. To all staff in the Public Service and also ministerial and government staff members, I do thank them because this has been a mammoth effort. We believe this is right and we believe this is what is needed, and the opposition leader and opposition members come in here again asking what is so urgent about this. It is not so urgent for them, as they can afford the time to have a crime summit and a talkfest. We do not believe in talkfests and crime summits; we believe in action. We believe in direct action to go to the heart and soul and break the morale of criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland.

Has the opposition leader wondered why the criminal motorcycle gangs have gone underground for the last few days wondering what all this legislation is about? Has the opposition leader wondered if criminal motorcycle gang members actually may be worried about their enterprise and these laws and what these reforms will mean for their enterprise? We make no mistake: this is about crushing their enterprise. It is about getting rid of these criminal motorcycle gangs from Queensland, and the position is clear. The position has been made quite clear by the Premier: get a real job. If they do not want to go to jail, get a real job. Get out of these clubs, and that is why through the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill we are creating major penalties. This will be the heavy-handed approach with respect to getting informants out of the system to make sure that we get everyone possible caught up in this vast net of criminal motorcycle gangs. It is important to note that the vicious lawless associates may not necessarily be caught up in criminal motorcycle gangs. The definition is sufficiently broad enough to go after paedophile rings in Queensland and support our tough new laws on paedophiles and two-strike policies we have in this state and to look at other gangs in Queensland that are not criminal motorcycle gangs but organised crime gangs. That bill is sufficiently broad enough to make sure that we can go after as many of these organised crimes as we can.

The opposition leader also talked about the CMC. This side of the House is restructuring the CMC. We are restructuring the CMC because we believe the priorities of the CMC have been wrong for many years.

Clearly, the Labor Party, with its performance this morning over the CMC and potential matters before CMC, has not learned the lesson as to why it is important to restructure and reprioritise the efforts of the CMC. Not only will we reprioritise the efforts of the CMC to put the ‘Crime’ back in the Crime and Misconduct Commission, we will invest resources to ensure that, with these new and expanded powers, the CMC—

Mrs Miller: How much? How much?

Mr BLEIJIE: The member obviously does not read the newspapers, because we have announced—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for Bundamba will cease interjecting.

Mr BLEIJIE: We have announced up to \$7 million—

Mrs Miller: How much?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I now warn the member for Bundamba under standing order 253A.

Mr BLEIJIE: Up to \$7 million. This government is working with the CMC through the acting chair, Dr Ken Levy. We will work out the resources that are required by the CMC with the CMC—in consultation with the CMC—through proper cabinet budget review committee processes to ensure

that Dr Ken Levy and the CMC crime-fighting team have what it needs to enable the extra coercive hearings, to make sure that they have in place the adequate resources and people resources to tackle the issue.

Not only that, we have also said that up to \$20 million is available to the Police Service to make sure that it can tackle this issue. We have also announced up to \$5 million so that Queenslanders can be part of the solution. Queenslanders can do in these bikies. As the Premier has announced, if things lead to successful prosecutions for serious crime, the benefits to Queenslanders can be upwards of \$20,000 and \$1,000 for information that leads to successful raids on criminal motorcycle gang premises.

We are serious about tackling organised crime. Make no mistake: this is not something that was dreamt up. This is in addition to the tough laws that we have already introduced in the past 18 months, particularly the unexplained wealth laws. There are not many jurisdictions in Australia that have unexplained wealth laws. Queensland is one of two or possibly three jurisdictions—but I think it is two—that have unexplained wealth laws. Queensland would not have unexplained wealth laws today if the Labor Party was still in power. The member for Nicklin gave one of his—

Mr Newman: Rants?

Mr BLEIJIE: Rants and usual contributions to the debate. I interjected, because the member for Nicklin was talking about briefings that were afforded. I did afford the member for Nicklin—and all crossbenchers—a briefing. I afforded the opposition a briefing at three o'clock. The reason I ordered the shutdown of the briefing was that I was getting reports from my staff in that briefing that the member for Nicklin's objectionable behaviour and unruly behaviour to public servants and ministerial staffers without my presence was shameful. That is why I sent in my chief of staff to shut down the briefing. They had one hour and 20 minutes of a briefing. It was a sufficient, broad—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, it would help the House if you withdraw. The member found the comments offensive.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. In talking about the briefing that was provided to the member for Nicklin, maybe he will have the same courtesy to the same departmental staff and my policy advisers and withdraw his unruly behaviour at a later time. An apology would be nice. I was getting those reports. That is why I sent in my chief of staff after one hour and 20 minutes—because the member for Nicklin was getting agitated because my staff did not have the anti-racketeering legislation of the United States of America.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, the member has found those comments offensive. If you would withdraw—

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. At the briefing the member for Nicklin got upset because my staff did not have the United States of America anti-racketeering legislation on hand for his perusal. He got upset because my staff did not have the New South Wales tattoo parlour legislation. We are not the US government. We are not the United States—

Mr WELLINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I find those comments offensive and not accurately reflecting what happened at the committee meeting. I ask that they be withdrawn. They do not accurately reflect what happened at the meeting and I ask that they be withdrawn. I find those comments offensive.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, the member has found those comments offensive and asks for them to be withdrawn.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw and I will move on. Perhaps I should have one of the—

Mr Newman interjected.

Mr WELLINGTON: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I find the comments from the Premier offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear anything from the Premier. Member for Nicklin, I did not hear anything from here at all.

Mr JUDGE: I actually heard it from here.

Madam SPEAKER: I did not hear anything from the Premier. I have no reason to think that the Premier said anything. Can the Premier just clarify for the sake of the record if the Premier has not said anything?

Mr NEWMAN: If the member is offended by anything that I have said or done I withdraw.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier.

Mr BLEIJIE: I need not remind the member for Nicklin of the laws with respect to misleading this House. If I feel it necessary, then I will have a staff member lodge a statutory declaration of the member's attitude. Then if he wishes to object to that and if he thinks that he did not display that disgraceful attitude towards the departmental staff, then let him stand in this place. But I remind him of the serious penalties applicable to misleading the House.

While we are on the subject of the member for Nicklin, he talked about the CMC. We are investing up to \$7 million in the CMC. I want to point out to honourable members that the member for Nicklin has been very vocal in newspapers such as the *Sunshine Coast Daily* with respect to allegations of government attacks on the CMC. He has been very vocal. Every time we talk about the CMC he attacks us for even mentioning it. But last year the opposition leader put out a press release saying that she was going to undertake one of the most fundamental reforms of the CMC and split the CMC. The member for Nicklin remained silent. There was no word from the member for Nicklin in this place. There was no word from the member for Nicklin. We know that the member for Nicklin is the mouthpiece for the Labor Party on one day, the mouthpiece for Katter on another day, or the mouthpiece for Clive Palmer—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, the comments have been found offensive.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. I thank all honourable members for their contributions. We heard woeful speeches from the member for Nicklin and the member for Dalrymple. I rose on points of order on five occasions, but I still do not think the member for Dalrymple spoke to the bill. I think he mentioned bats somewhere—

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Was that me? The member for Dalrymple gave a 10-minute diatribe of everything that is not associated with the bill. We are talking about a bill that deals with association. The member for Dalrymple did not quite get the point of the legislation.

This is clear: we want to rid the state of criminal motorcycle gangs. We want to crush their bikes, we want to crush their enterprise, we want to protect our front-line service men and women—the Police Service. We want to bolster the CMC's powers and resources to deal with these vicious, violent thugs.

This bill is to disestablish these organisations, to drive them out of Queensland so Queenslanders can go to a shopping mall without fear of being shot, so Queenslanders can have a cup of coffee at Broadbeach or anywhere in Queensland without the fear of retribution from these criminal motorcycle gang members. I commend the bill to the House.

Question put—That the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Tattoo Parlours Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Division: Question put—That the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill be now read a second time.

Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 108.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—



Mr BLEIJIE (1.06 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 16 (Refusal of bail))

Page 11, lines 26 and 27—

omit, insert—

organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or

I table the explanatory notes for the amendments.

Tabled paper: Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [3749].

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—



Ms PALASZCZUK (1.08 am): In relation to this clause I seek further clarification from the Attorney. This clause amends the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001 to allow the reference committee to authorise the commission to undertake a specific intelligence operation including holding hearings. The Crime and Misconduct Act amendments will allow the CMC to hold hearings for intelligence gathering in relation to criminal organisations only or a person engaged in misconduct to support or help a criminal organisation. The amendments will also allow information gleaned during a star chamber interrogation to be used in confiscation proceedings. I would like some further clarification in relation to this matter.

Previously police had to exhaust their avenues before the CMC could conduct the inquiries. The opposition holds some concerns about these changes and would like the Attorney to explain why these changes were necessary and what protections are provided.

Mr BLEIJIE: The amendments are required because there is a legal obstacle for the CMC at present. The opposition leader has rightfully pointed out that one of the legal obstacles is with respect to this crime reference group. Currently, the police have to exhaust all evidentiary material, they have to have an investigation, it then may go to the crime reference group. The incident that happened at Broadbeach on Friday two weeks ago dealt with the issue of affray, which most people were charged with, which carries a one year maximum sentence. Under the definition in the Crime and Misconduct Act they were not able to take those people in for coercive hearings because it did not attract a penalty of seven or above years. The amendments mean that the CMC, after an incident such as Friday night that involved criminal motorcycle gang members, will be able to drag those people down for a coercive hearing without having to go through the crime reference committee and the police not having had to exhaust all investigative opportunities. It is mainly for criminal intelligence gathering. This was requested by the CMC, and we support it, as they want to strike while the iron is hot, particularly with respect to intelligence gathering after an incident such as happened on Friday night.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Just a further clarification: can the Attorney confirm that the Law Society and the Bar Association have not been consulted in relation to this?

Mr BLEIJIE: I have not had direct conversations with the Law Society, but no doubt by now they have read the legislation and they have seen the press over the past couple of weeks, so they are briefed.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—



Ms PALASZCZUK (1.11 am): Clause 16 relates to an arrest warrant application. Once again I am seeking some clarification from the Attorney-General. I note that, as it stands, the section requires an application for an arrest warrant to be made to a Supreme Court judge. This amendment

now allows the application to be made to a magistrate. Would the Attorney-General please explain why this change was considered necessary, how many warrants are issued every year under this section, is it particularly onerous on the court and was the Chief Justice consulted before this change was made?

Mr BLEIJIE: We believe the clause has been sufficiently dealt with and is able to be dealt with by magistrates.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I still have not had clarification. It is being moved from a Supreme Court judge down to a magistrate. I want to know who was consulted in relation to this. Is the Chief Justice satisfied that it is going to be moving from a higher court down to a lower court? Has the Attorney been given any advice from the magistrates in relation to this issue? Is this just an internal agreement that cabinet has decided upon rather than consulting with the legal profession?

Mr BLEIJIE: This is not question time. This is a debate on the clauses of the bill. It says it is a magistrate. As I have said, magistrates are quite capable of dealing with these matters. If the opposition leader wants to know who I talked to and who I did not talk to so that she can build a profile or a case against me, she can ask me in question time tomorrow.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The opposition is entirely entitled to ask questions of the minister. In fact, I refer to the Queensland government website, *Governing Queensland*, and the government's *Parliamentary Procedures Handbook*. For the information of the Attorney-General, I refer to 7.10, Debate in Committee of the Whole House, that is, consideration in detail. I will read it out so that the Attorney is very clear about our right in relation to consideration in detail. It states—

This stage also affords Members, particularly the Opposition, further opportunity to probe the Minister (or Member responsible for the Bill) for explanations about the operation of the Bill and the interpretation of clauses.

I can recall sitting in this chamber when members opposite were in opposition and on numerous occasions they rose and asked questions of ministers. You are the Attorney-General of this state and these are your laws that are being rushed through. You can at least explain to the House and the people of Queensland who you consulted with. You can at least explain the detail of the questions that we are asking. I do not think Queenslanders deserve any less.

Mr BLEIJIE: I feel sufficiently questioned by the opposition leader with respect to this. It is a clause that omits one word and inserts one word. I do not think it requires too much debate. I feel sufficiently probed by the opposition on this question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! To clarify, Leader of the Opposition, you can ask any question that you like on the clause. Attorney-General, you can answer it in any way that you see fit.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I have listened to the Attorney-General's response and it is not just a word changing for a word. Maybe 'judge' and 'magistrate' is a word changing for a word, but it is a significant difference in terms of the seniority or experience or jurisdiction from a Supreme Court judge to a magistrate. One would expect a lot more import to be given to a warrant decision given by a Supreme Court judge as opposed to a magistrate; otherwise, why do we have all these different levels of jurisdiction? Is the Attorney-General saying that for all the years that a Supreme Court judge has been required to issue the arrest warrant a magistrate would have been sufficiently qualified?

Mr BLEIJIE: For the benefit of the Independent member for Gladstone I can say that it is going to be less onerous to get a magistrate to issue the warrant. It was a request by the CMC. The qualifications required to be a magistrate or Supreme Court justice are the same. As I said, we have complete faith in the Chief Magistrate and his magistrates that they will be able to deal with these matters appropriately at the magistrate level. It was a request by the CMC and it is going to be a far less onerous and a quicker process for the CMC to deal with.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 38, as read, agreed to.

Clause 39—



Mr BLEIJIE (1.17 am): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 39 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 32, line 34—

omit, insert—

organisation in any other way;
but does not include a lawyer acting in a professional capacity.

It includes in the definition 'but does not include a lawyer acting in a professional capacity' to ensure that the opposition leader's concern with respect to lawyers acting for clients is not caught up in the association realm.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want to address this issue. I thank the Attorney-General for taking on board the opposition's concerns which were raised in relation to this bill. I point out to members of this House that not only are we having these laws rushed through but also we now have an amendment by the Attorney-General on the laws—

Mr Bleijie: You asked for it.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; yes, I did ask for it. However, if this issue has been raised by us then I am sure that there are countless issues that the Law Society may have wanted to raise and the Bar Association may have wanted to raise. Already the Attorney-General has admitted that lawyers—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, the opposition leader is misleading the House. I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The opposition leader will resume her seat. Attorney-General, what is your point of order?

Mr BLEIJIE: My point of order is that the opposition leader is misleading the House. I am simply moving an amendment. I made no omission.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you find it offensive?

Mr BLEIJIE: I find it completely offensive and irresponsible. I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The opposition leader has been asked to withdraw.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I withdraw. For clarification, the Attorney has suggested that he has taken on board our concerns which were raised about the issue of association and if the association was with a legal representative. I am pleased to see that the government has actually fixed this up. My point very clearly is that the laws are being rushed through and already we have an amendment that has been introduced by the Attorney. These are the ironclad laws that the government was going to rush through without scrutiny and already they have found a mistake.

The amendment that has been circulated and moved fixes up a problem that the government realised existed because we raised it. It relates to how lawyers would now be captured by these new association laws. But did they consult the Law Society to get the views of the lawyers out there? No. Did they consult the Bar Association of Queensland? No. Did they ask for the views of the Chief Justice? No. Did they ask for the views of the relevant committees of this state—the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee and the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee? No.

Already we have the first blunder by the Attorney-General. The first blunder has happened at 1.20 am and before the law has been assented to. Because these questions were raised in the briefing and because these questions were raised on the floor of the parliament, the Attorney-General has suddenly realised that there has been a mistake.

Mrs Miller: A major one.

Ms PALASZCZUK: A major mistake which would have had the unintended consequence of capturing the legal profession in relation to their association laws. This is a bungle. We all know this Attorney-General—

Mrs Miller interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the interjection. Lawyers could have gone to jail. It is a mandatory sentence. They could have gone to jail.

Ms Trad: For fulfilling their professional duties.

Ms PALASZCZUK: For fulfilling their professional duties. But I digress. I will let this amendment speak for itself. We have already seen a major blunder, a major bungle because this government failed to have these laws scrutinised through the legislative process. It was entirely up to the government to do this. They failed to do it. They want to rush the legislation through. This is mistake No. 1.

I think we will be back time and time again to amend your laws because we are going to find more and more mistakes. I look forward to hearing the views of the Law Society of Queensland, the Bar Association, the Chief Justice and the Queensland Police Union. I am quite sure other people in this state also have views in relation to this legislation that is being rushed through. Here is the first blunder. The legislation has not even been passed and we have already got amendments being moved by the Attorney-General. It is a major embarrassment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 39, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 40 and 41, as read, agreed to.

Clause 42—



Mr BLEIJIE (1.24 am): I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 42 (Insertion of new ss 60A–60C)

Page 34, lines 20 to 22—

omit, insert—

organisation is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in,

4 Clause 42 (Insertion of new ss 60A–60C)

Page 35, line 11—

omit, insert—

organisation in any other way;

but does not include a lawyer acting in a professional capacity.

5 Clause 42 (Insertion of new ss 60A–60C)

Page 36, lines 4 to 6—

omit, insert—

organisation is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in,

6 Clause 42 (Insertion of new ss 60A–60C)

Page 36, lines 27 to 29—

omit, insert—

organisation is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in,

Again, one of the amendments deals with the issue just raised by the opposition leader. I note what the opposition leader said before. I was advised that opposition staff raised this in the briefing this afternoon. I do not think it is a problem. I do not think it would create any issues for lawyers. But in the abundance of caution I have agreed to put the opposition leader's suggestion in the bill. I thought she would have congratulated us for that. In hindsight, I should have left the amendment out because we do not think there is an issue. But to throw the doggy a bone and to appease the Labor Party, I thought we would give them an amendment.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I find that offensive and ask it to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The comments are unparliamentary and have caused offence. I ask the Attorney-General to withdraw.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, I have ruled that it was unparliamentary and the opposition leader has found it offensive so I have asked the Attorney-General to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: Withdrawn. Amendments Nos 3 to 6 deal with the previous issue but also seek to make it abundantly clear with respect to the defence of when an organisation or a person involved in an organisation is not a criminal organisation for conducting the purpose of criminal activity. It is there for clarity to make the intent of the bill very much known.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I welcome the Attorney's amendment; I do indeed. I think it is great that he has actually listened to reason and the rational argument that has been put forward by the opposition. I noticed he used the words 'abundance of caution'. I say to the Attorney-General that I do not think I would describe it as an abundance of caution but a bungle of the first degree.

Mr JUDGE: The Attorney-General has indicated that he could remove the amendment and that it is not required. Is it not the case that if you are making legislation it has to have a purpose? If it has no purpose, why does he not remove it?

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 42, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 43—

Mr BLEIJIE (1.27 am): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 43 (Amendment of s 72 (Affray))

Page 37, lines 26 and 27—

omit, insert—

organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or

It has the same particulars as before.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 43, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 44—

Mr BLEIJIE (1.28 am): I move the following amendment—

8 Clause 44 (Amendment of s 92A (Misconduct in relation to public office))

Page 38, lines 16 and 17—

omit, insert—

that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to

I make the point to honourable members that the same words are in each of these amendments but they are just amending different clauses.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 44, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 45—

Mr BLEIJIE (1.28 am): I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 45 (Amendment of s 320 (Grievous bodily harm))

Page 39, lines 2 and 3—

omit, insert—

that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 45, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 46—

Mr BLEIJIE (1.29 am): I move the following amendment—

10 Clause 46 (Amendment of s 340 (Serious assaults))

Page 39, lines 21 and 22—

omit, insert—

that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, 46, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 47—

Mr BLEIJIE (1.29 am): I move the following amendment—

11 Clause 47 (Amendment of s 408D (Obtaining or dealing with identification information))

Page 40, lines 10 and 11—

omit, insert—

organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 47, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 72, as read, agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Tattoo Parlours Bill

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Mr JUDGE (1.30 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2A

Page 6, after line 7—

insert—

2A Object

- (1) The object of this Act is to provide for the licensing and regulation of body art and tattooing businesses, and the persons who are employed in the businesses, for the purposes of eliminating and preventing the criminal infiltration of the Queensland tattoo industry, particularly by criminal motorcycle gangs.
- (2) This Act is not intended to prevent members of legitimate associations that are recognised and accepted by the general community, including recreational motorcycle clubs, from carrying on lawful body art tattooing businesses or being employed in the businesses.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Are you going to speak to it or table explanatory notes, member?

Mr JUDGE: I will speak to it. This amendment inserts clause 2A, 'Object', which states—

- (1) The object of this Act is to provide for the licensing and regulation of body art and tattooing businesses, and the persons who are employed in the businesses, for the purposes of eliminating and preventing the criminal infiltration of the Queensland tattoo industry, particularly by criminal motorcycle gangs.
- (2) This Act is not intended to prevent members of legitimate associations that are recognised and accepted by the general community, including recreational motorcycle clubs, from carrying on lawful body art tattooing businesses or being employed in the businesses.

As I said earlier during the debate, legislation should meet community expectations. Many members during their contributions to the debate, including members of the government, indicated that the good people in their electorates have been expressing concern about being perceived as a criminal organisation, and probably recreational motorcycle groups are in that category, among others. Their concern about perception matters, and an amendment is proposed on behalf of such people—good people of the community—who simply seek for this legislation to meet community expectations. The amendment has that purpose. To not support the proposed amendment is to not respect your community.

Mr BLEIJIE: The government will not be supporting the amendment because in the Tattoo Parlours Bill, which we are dealing with, we have made it abundantly clear in every contribution government members have made and the Premier and I have made publicly that none of this legislation is targeted at law-abiding citizens. The fact is that there will be a licensing regime set up. If the person is a fit and proper person, they will be able to have a tattoo licence. So as long as they are not a criminal motorcycle gang member and an associate of a criminal motorcycle gang member, then they will be able to have a tattooing licence and nothing will change. We do not need to put it in legislation; it is abundantly clear. In making sure we stamp them out of the tattoo industry, criminal motorcycle gang members will be appropriately dealt with and law-abiding good proprietors of businesses who are not associated with criminal motorcycle gangs will not be caught up in the legislation as it stands. Therefore, the amendment is not necessary.

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

AYES, 14—Byrne, Cunningham, Hopper, Katter, Knuth, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Douglas, Judge

NOES, 69—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, 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

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Judge) negated.

Clauses 3 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (1.44 am): This clause states that a tattoo business must not operate without a licence. I understand from the second reading speech of the Attorney-General that he believes tattoos are part of the intimidation employed by bikies. So part of the reasoning behind these laws is to prevent the easy access of members to tattooing services that may be operated by their club. What guarantee is there that certain businesses will not simply go underground and no longer trade for a fee or award to avoid being captured by this new licensing regime? Since the industry has the potential to give rise to a number of serious health issues as a result of lax practices—for example, the improper sterilisation of tattoo needles could spread different diseases—would driving certain parts of the industry underground not pose a potential public health risk? I seek a clarification.

Mr BLEIJIE: The point is that if you are a fit and proper person you will be able to have a tattoo licence in Queensland. If you are not a fit and proper person you will not be able to obtain a licence. That is going to be based on evidentiary advice from the Commissioner of Police. The Office of Fair Trading will issue the licences. As part of their normal probity checks, like we do with security providers, pawnbroking licences, second-hand dealing licences and motor dealers licences, we do lots of criminal checks and probity checks. We then seek the advice of the police. If the police come back and say that there are issues of an evidentiary nature that suggest this person is not a fit and proper person because they may be associated with criminal motorcycle gangs, then the Office of Fair Trading and the licensing officer will not issue the licence.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (1.46 am): There is a provision in that clause that refers to a fee required to lodge an application. Can the Attorney-General advise the House what the fees for an application will be for operators and individuals?

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, I can advise in a short period when the information comes over to me. The reason we are obviously issuing the fees for the licences is that most fees attract licences. We have achieved two objectives with the legislation.

Mr Seeney: Licences attract fees, I think you meant.

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, most licences attract fees. I have the information to hand so I can stop filibustering. Regarding the proposed fee schedule, for the benefit of the opposition how about I just table the documentation? Then they can have all the information they require.

Tabled paper: Proposed fee schedule—Tattoo Parlours Regulation [\[3750\]](#).

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (1.48 am): Clause 14 deals with the destruction of fingerprints and palm prints. I understand that these are to be retained and used for intelligence purposes, even after the licensee surrenders their licence. We are not opposed to this, but I want some clarification about the circumstances in which these prints will be retained. Could they be used in unrelated matters such as criminal proceedings or unrelated investigations?

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, clause 14 deals with the destruction of the fingerprints and palm prints. It sets out quite substantially in seven subclauses that a person who formerly held a licence but is not currently a licensee may apply to the commissioner to have the person's fingerprints or palm prints obtained under section 13 and any copies of the prints destroyed. It does not talk in these particular provisions with respect to retaining; this is about destruction of the fingerprints. If the commissioner decides to refuse application, the commissioner must give the applicant notice of the decision. Subclause 14(5) states that, if the application for a licence is withdrawn or refused, the chief executive must ask the commissioner to ensure the applicant's fingerprints or palm prints obtained under

section 13 and copies of the prints are destroyed as soon as practicable after the application is withdrawn or refused. This section is all about destruction and destroying fingerprints, not keeping them.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 35, as read, agreed to.

Clause 36—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (1.50 am): This is in relation to the keeping of records, and in particular a tattooing procedures log. I would just like some further clarification from the Attorney, if I may. In relation to the particular log, I want to ask whether the type of tattoo given to a customer will be recorded in this log. Will that information be able to be accessed by the police, and could they inspect the records to attempt to identify an individual wanted in relation to alleged criminal activity? Basically what I want to know is just some simple clarification in relation to whether it is the keeping of the record or the type and kind of tattoo that the person is getting and also subsequently the use of that information by police.

Mr BLEIJIE: I can assure the honourable opposition leader that she can go down to a tattoo parlour next week and the government will not have files on the type of tattoo that she decides to have or the locations on the body part. The government does not want to know about that. I recall the member for Mermaid Beach at some stage in his life calling for a tattoo register. This is not what this is about. This is not a tattoo register. We want to know if they are a criminal motorcycle gang operating the business; we do not want to know where they are tattooing people or what they are tattooing on people.

Clause 36, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 37 to 70, as read, agreed to.

Clause 71—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (1.52 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 71 (Act to be reviewed)

Page 52, line 6, '3 years'—

omit, insert—

1 year

I table the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Tattoo Parlours Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Ms Annastacia Palaszczuk's amendments [\[3751\]](#).

This is a very simple amendment. This clause requires that a review of the act be held at the moment within three years. The Criminal Organisation Act 2009 requires a review of the act after five years. This means that the review is actually due next year in 2014. I believe that it makes good sense that this bill should be included as part of that review, so essentially it would mean that the acts would be reviewed at the same time. This amendment to the clause simply requires that the review be conducted after one year instead of three years so it can be reviewed together with the Criminal Organisation Act 2009.

Mr BLEIJIE: The only thing that would come out of the review of the Criminal Organisation Act is how bad and ineffective it has been at declaring anyone a criminal organisation. The point for the Leader of the Opposition here is we have a three-year review, as we have on all of the three bills that I introduced today. The Leader of the Opposition wants to make it one year. Hello! Big problem, ladies and gentlemen, because the licensing regime starts on 1 January—that is when people can start getting a licence, on 1 January—and 30 June next year is the date by which all tattoo proprietors and employees have to be licensed. If I put one year, that will mean they will start operating on 1 July, and we have to do the statutory review within two months of them starting the licensing regime. It is not going to work. It is ineffective. That is why we have got to have the three years.

Non-government amendment (Ms Palaszczuk) negated.

Clause 71, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 72 to 85, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—



Mr JUDGE (1.55 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2 (Objects)

Page 4, after line 14—

insert—

- (1A) To remove any doubt, it is declared that the objects of this Act do not include disestablishing legitimate associations that are recognised and accepted by the general community, including recreational motorcycle clubs.

The amendment is to remove any doubt, identical to the last amendment. The clause would read—

It is declared that the objects of this Act do not include disestablishing legitimate associations that are recognised and accepted by the general community, including recreational motorcycle clubs.

Again, to not support the proposed amendment is to not respect your community.

Mr KNUTH: I also support this amendment. Basically it says—

... to remove any doubt, it is declared that the objects of this Act do not include disestablishing legitimate associations that are recognised and accepted by the greater community, including recreational motorcycle clubs.

This is exactly what I was talking about previously where we have motorcycle clubs that have expressed great concern about what they consider to be draconian laws that are being put in place. Every Sunday on the Tablelands we see motorcycle clubs that go to coffee shops, more than three of those clubs spend \$1,000, and they are concerned that they will be victimised under these new laws. It is the same during the poker runs when they are raising funds for spina bifida and when the Millionaire Hogs Club go up to the Hervey's Range Tea House. This amendment legitimises their association and ensures that these recreational bikers and law-abiding citizens are not victimised by the Attorney's tough new fast-track laws.

Mr HOPPER: A group of us met today to put this amendment in place, and the member for Yeerongpilly has put this amendment forward because a lot of us have had people contacting us who are very, very concerned about the bill that is before the House tonight. I know that we understand in this place who is—

An honourable member interjected.

Mr HOPPER: You are a disgusting little man. Mr Speaker, this bill before the House—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! Member for Condamine, that is unparliamentary and I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr HOPPER: I withdraw. This bill before the House is about bikie gangs, and legitimate bike riders are worried. People who form a club like the Ulysses, the returned vets—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr HOPPER: Do you want to laugh at the returned vets, member for Nanango? Do you want to laugh at the returned vets who get together and ride motorcycles at the weekend? That is the sort of reason that this amendment has been put forward. We hear the LNP and the member for Nanango laughing at the returned vets who get together and go for a ride. I can answer an interjection, and I have done that. This amendment has been moved because the genuine motorcycle riders are very concerned that they will be put in this category. We want to make it very clear that this legislation does not target them. That is what this amendment is about.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: There are just a couple of things I need to clarify. During the second reading debate there was reference to the crossbenchers meeting and preparing this as a bloc. I was not included. I could feel offended—I could feel all sorts of things—but I was not part of that arrangement. Having said that, I would have to concur with comments that have been made. There has been disquiet amongst groups. I know that the bill talks about associations that have as one of their purposes illegal activity. That is clear. However, people are uncertain. There has been a lot of talk about the way the legislation will be framed without people accessing the information. To borrow a phrase from the Attorney-General, out of an abundance of caution I will be supporting the

amendment, simply because if it gives a small amount of comfort to those who enjoy motorcycle riding but are a bull's roar from being part of an outlaw motorcycle gang or any other inappropriate organisation it is worthwhile having it inserted in the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank members for their contributions. I cannot even remember what the amendment is about; we had a few speakers on it. I think it was about recreational riders in line with community expectations. Out of an abundance of caution I will make the point again. We have made this abundantly clear. In case the members in the corner, excluding the member for Gladstone, did not understand it the 30th time I said it, I will say it again. These laws are not targeting law-abiding riding citizens. They target organised crime gangs, criminal motorcycle gangs. The Ulysses or other law-abiding citizens will never pass the test of a vicious lawless associate under the VLAD legislation. They will never pass that test.

Front-line police will target the criminal motorcycle gang. Therefore, we do not think the amendment is necessary. We have made a commitment to law-abiding citizens that they have nothing to worry about with this legislation. However, I acknowledge that there will be a level of inconvenience—particularly over the past two weeks—for all riding citizens, just as there is a level of inconvenience when police close the Bruce Highway and breath-test every driver, just as there is a level of inconvenience when we go to an airport and get security checked and bomb tested.

There are certain rights that we as a society have lost for the benefit of the broader community. I think genuine riders understand that. I certainly saw commentary in the media this week of genuine riders understanding that criminal motorcycle gangs give them a bad name, unfortunately. But we want to make sure they fully appreciate that the government understands that and that this is certainly not targeting anyone but the criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland. Therefore, we oppose the amendment moved by the member for Yeerongpilly.

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

AYES, 14—Byrne, Cunningham, Hopper, Katter, Knuth, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Douglas, Judge

NOES, 69—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, 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

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Judge) negated.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—



Mr BLEIJIE (2.11 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 5 (Meaning of vicious lawless associate)

Page 6, lines 17 to 20—

omit, insert—

- (2) However, a person is not a vicious lawless associate if the person proves that the relevant association is not an association that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in, declared offences.

The amendment I have circulated deals with the meaning of vicious lawless associates, particularly with respect to the defence. It is aligning with the defence provision that we have already amended in the gangs disruption bill. I table the explanatory notes for members of the House.

Tabled paper: Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, explanatory notes for Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [\[3752\]](#).

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want a clarification on clause 5. Very briefly, can the Attorney-General inform the House if this means that a person who commits any of the declared offences for their own benefit—not associated with gang activity—will escape the 15 or 25 years extra punishment and that the onus of proof is on the Crown to prove that the participant was committing the offence for the purpose of the relevant criminal association to the standard beyond a reasonable doubt?

Mr BLEIJIE: What will happen is this: a person will be charged with, for instance, grievous bodily harm, which carries a maximum penalty of 14 years. If the sentencing judge convicts the person of five years at the time of going to the jury to determine guilt or innocence, the jury will also be called upon to determine if this person is a vicious lawless associate. Upon receiving a declaration from the jury of being a vicious lawless associate, the judge will sentence the person appropriately. The judge may give, for instance, five years out of a maximum 14 years, but having been deemed a vicious lawless associate the judge will also apply the 15 years mandatory sentence. If they are also an office-bearer, like a sergeant-at-arms or president, they will also attract a further 10 years. The defence available to them is to show that one of the purposes of the association that they deal with is not a criminal activity but being for the association. If they can prove that, it is a complete defence and they will only possibly be sentenced on the original charge and the additional penalties and mandatory sentences will not apply.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I have a follow-up question on the answer that the Attorney-General has just given. In a previous debate we had on mandatory sentencing there was an issue raised as to what extent there would be a risk that a magistrate or a judge would discount the person's initial sentence, particularly where there was add-on mandatory sentencing, to take into account the nature of the mandatory sentencing. Has the Attorney-General turned his mind to the potential for that to happen in this circumstance where you have a 15 or 25 mandatory to add on if the person qualifies in those categories? Is there a risk that the original sentence will be discounted?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for the question. Yes, we did consider it. It may very well be that the sentencing judge may reduce, at their discretion, the normal charge. If I use the example I just used of grievous bodily harm, it carries a maximum penalty. The judge, for instance, may sentence a person to two years under GBH rather than what the judge may ordinarily say is a seven-year precedent offence. But it does not matter, because upon conviction and upon being declared a vicious lawless associate the mandatory sentences will apply. If there is a penalty, for instance, of murder, murder is a mandatory life imprisonment but we have increased the non-parole period to 20 years. If a person commits murder but they are also a vicious lawless associate, what will happen is that they will go to prison. They will serve their life imprisonment for murder. They will be eligible for parole in 20 years. If, for instance, they get parole after 20 years, they will likely walk out of the prison and walk straight back into the prison and start serving their further 15 years mandatory imprisonment cumulatively and then the 10 years will be added on top if they are an office-bearer. This is about long-term imprisonment. It is about jail, not bail, and it is about putting these people in a high-security facility such as Woodford, because the best way that we can keep the community safe from these thugs is to have them behind bars away from the community.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—



Mr BLEIJIE (2.16 am): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 6 (Proof person is an office bearer of an association)

Page 6, line 27—

omit, insert—

association; or

(c) exercises or purports to exercise authority in the affairs of the association;

What I have included here, based on late advice from the Solicitor-General in my discussion this afternoon, is an insertion of subsection (c) which talks about the office-bearers. We have had definitions of (a) and (b) in terms of a president and a sergeant-at-arms. We are including (c), which says 'exercises or purports to exercise authority in the affairs of the association'. So it is someone who makes out to have some authority in the association or purports to be in charge of the affairs of the association. That way we will better trigger some action under that provision. It is broader, but that will of course be based on evidence and we have to prove it.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I ask for some further clarification. I understand what the Attorney said about office-bearers, but I was not clear on his explanation about anyone. Is it anyone who purports to have a position of influence, and how would that be determined? Did the Solicitor-General give you any further explanation?

Mr BLEIJIE: It is very similar to the member for South Brisbane purporting to have influence over the leadership of the Labor Party in Queensland, no doubt, but not having actually achieved that main objective of the official position of opposition leader. So it is very similar. If I applied it to a bikie criminal situation, you may have a president of an association and you may have another member of the association but not necessarily in an elected position but who is doing the work on or on behalf of the president. So they may go rough a couple of people up and they say upon roughing the couple of people up in businesses or tattoo parlours, 'I'm here on behalf of the president.' Therefore, the president has vested the power in them to rough them up and therefore they purport to have some level of authority in exercising that authority within the association because of the president's referral of that power whilst not necessarily holding an elected position of power.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—

 **Mr RICKUSS** (2.19 am): Owing to the seriousness of the charges, will this legislation have any detrimental effect on Legal Aid? Will it really stretch the Legal Aid facilities of the Queensland government?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Lockyer for the question. I think the member for Lockyer is referring to the matter of Dietrich in the High Court with respect to legal aid for defendants, which everyone is entitled to under our law. Our laws in Queensland are simple. If you cannot afford a lawyer, a lawyer will be provided to you. However, upon application to Legal Aid, one has to satisfy a threshold criteria. I doubt that criminal motorcycle gang members will satisfy the threshold for legal representation.

If members had been watching the news over the past 10 days they would know that criminal motorcycle gang members have a team of lawyers. They are well cashed and they are well resourced. I do not think that it will put unnecessary strain on Legal Aid, because I do not think that they will get Legal Aid. In our free society we have the belief in the right to a fair trial and the right to be legally represented. When you cannot afford a lawyer, one will be provided. However, I do not think that criminal motorcycle gangs will be able to satisfy that test, because they are well and truly resourced and cashed up.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: During the second reading debate there were a number of questions that I sought clarification on from the Attorney-General. Sadly, because the Attorney-General did not provide the answers in his reply in relation to some offences in schedule 1, it makes me more concerned about the mandatory nature of the sentencing in clause 7.

The maximum mandatory sentence of 25 years is a long time to spend behind bars. I for one moment do not believe that anyone in my electorate would argue that criminal motorcycle gangs and the worst offenders in those gangs deserve significant jail time and significant punishment. I do not think that there is anyone in my electorate who would argue with that. But there is always the 'but'—but what if? Whilst I am not going to raise questions that I have about the schedule, because I will do that during the consideration of the schedules, the way I read clause 7 there is no flexibility, there is no option given to the sentencing justice to not apply this mandatory sentencing. Indeed, clause 7(2) states—

A further sentence—

- (a) must not be mitigated or reduced under any other Act or law; and
- (b) must be ordered to be served cumulatively with the base sentence imposed.

Again, if it applies to those serious offenders—the people who organise murders, who commit murders, who run brothels, who run organisations that harm children—I can understand and justify it. But there is no discretion to consider somebody's competence and whether in the future perhaps people, who may not understand what they are being appointed to, will be appointed as figureheads. There is no discretion in this sentencing regime. As I said, in the absence of some information on the questions that I asked in relation to the schedule of offences, the mandatory nature of the offence is more concerning—not for those violent offenders but for those people who will inevitably be caught.

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Gladstone for the question. I apologise that in my response I did not get to answer her fully. Unfortunately, I had taken the time to deal with the insane representation by the member for Nicklin and his outbursts. So I apologise that that took the time in dealing with the contribution to the debate and I did not get to answer the member's questions.

The point is this: if a person has a head sentence for one of those prescribed offences and they are a vicious lawless associate, they will go to jail for a very, very long time. We are not apologetic about that. But—and we are not quite there yet because it is in clause 9—there is provision for the sentencing judge to reduce the sentence. The only time the sentencing judge can reduce the sentence imposed on the individual in terms of a mandatory sentence is if they cooperate with law enforcement agencies. This is about getting the informants. So if we had—and the member used this example—a young offender who has been convinced to do X, Y and Z, if the young offender gives information that may lead to successful prosecutions or successful trials of bigger members and the heads of organisations, then the sentencing judge has the discretion to reduce the mandatory sentence. It will not be a mandatory sentence—a 15-year or a 10-year sentence—but that is the only way.

I say to the member for Gladstone that we have to do that because we have to have a big stick for these criminal motorcycle gang members. If we continue down the same path, they will thumb their nose at the law. We want them to question whether it is even worth being a member of a criminal organisation. Under these laws, the answer to that is categorically no.

Division: Question put—That clause 7, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 77—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 5—Hopper, Judge, Katter. Tellers: Cunningham, Douglas

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—



Ms PALASZCZUK (2.32 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 11 (Act to be reviewed)

Page 10, line 13, '3 years'—

omit, insert—

1 year

I table the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Ms Anastacia Palaszczuk's amendments [\[3753\]](#).

This amendment, as mentioned with the previous bill, was to review the act in one year rather than three years. I seek clarification from the Attorney. I may have misheard him and he may be able to clarify this quite briefly. When I moved a similar amendment to clause 71 of the Tattoo Parlours Bill I thought the Attorney said that there was a similar review requirement in all three bills being debated tonight. I understand that it was in the previous bill and it is in this bill. Could the Attorney clarify that there was the review provision in the first bill, because I think that is what I heard?

Mr Bleijie: We dealt with that four hours ago. Get on with your job.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney will cease interjecting.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am asking for clarification. I thought you said that all three bills being debated tonight would have a similar review requirement. My question is do all three have a similar requirement or is it just the two that I just mentioned? We have had members of the government say that these are the toughest laws in Australia. I think we have even had ministers say these are the toughest laws in Australia. They have not gone through any committee process. They have not had any scrutiny by external agencies. I would have thought that one year was, in fact, reasonable for a review considering those extreme circumstances.

Mr BLEIJIE: That you are supporting. We are not supporting the one year amendment. This type of legislation will need this particular time. The police need the legislative resources from next week to deal with these criminal motorcycle gangs. We are determined to rid the state of criminal motorcycle gangs. We think that three years is satisfactory in terms of review. I note Labor Party

legislation generally puts a five-year review in. It is less than what most Labor Party reviews are. Dealing with this particular piece of legislation, clause 11 is sufficient. We are not agreeing to the amendment because we think three years is a sufficient time.

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

AYES, 12—Byrne, Douglas, Hopper, Judge, Katter, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

NOES, 70—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, 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

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Ms Palaszczuk) negated.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Schedule—

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (2.42 am): I have a couple of questions of clarification for the minister. There are a number of offences under several acts and codes that by this schedule will be declared offences. Many of them are clearly abhorrent to the community, such as the indecent treatment of children under 16 and permitting the abuse of children. There is quite a lengthy list of offences that would be more than objectionable. I say that because there are more extreme and unparliamentary words that one could call these offences.

There is an offence of having an interest in premises used for prostitution. Again, that is not qualified. Many superannuation funds invest in property. What protection would there be for an inadvertent interest in premises used for prostitution? The dangerous operation of a vehicle: that charge is laid. I know of some tragic circumstances where people in a vehicle have been killed and the driver has been charged. Assaults in the interference with freedom of trade or work: my question on the section 346 offence is whether that will be directed in any way in the future towards trade unions or demonstrations in relation to picket lines. I am interested in the context of the punishment for unlawful stalking and also the context of attempted robbery, because to my mind that stretches from something that a gang would be involved in to robbing somebody at an ATM. It is the same with receiving tainted property. In my second reading speech I said that somebody could inadvertently receive tainted property without realising its providence or its history. I seek some clarification on how what the Attorney-General is calling declared offences are going to be differentiated.

Mr BLEIJIE: The list is a broad list because, as I said earlier in the debate, we are dealing not only with criminal motorcycle gangs under the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill; we are also dealing with paedophile rings and other criminal gangs that are not patched and motorcycle riders. That is why it has to be such an extensive list. That is why we have listed most of the child exploitation and abuses against children offences.

The member for Gladstone asks whether a trade union is going to be caught under these provisions. If one of the purposes of a trade union is to conduct illegal activity under one of the prescribed offences, then possibly. However, I do not think that is going to be the case. It is not the case. For trade unions, the purpose of their business or their enterprise is not criminal activity.

There are a lot of tests that one has to go through. Firstly, they have to be an association. For instance, the Bandidos might be categorised as the association. Secondly, they have to be an associate and a relevant person to the association. Thirdly, they have to be convicted as a vicious lawless associate and it is all about their conduct in terms of doing the association's work in terms of the criminal activity. I do not think the examples the member for Gladstone used would come under these provisions. These provisions are simply taken from the codes and legislation that exist. That was done in consultation with the Queensland Police Service. The intention and the aim of this legislation is criminal gangs in Queensland. There may be instances where, if you look under limb 1, which is the definition of 'association', it may be very broad and may take in a lot of associations, but golf clubs and bowls clubs will never satisfy the second, third and fourth elements so they will never be affected unless, in the course of the daily life of the organisation, their whole purpose is the committal of criminal activity. I do not think they are going to be caught under what the member has described.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.47 am): I move—

That the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.47 am): I move—

That the Tattoo Parlours Bill be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Tattoo Parlours Bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.48 am): I move—

That the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.48 am): I move—

That the long title of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.49 am): I move—

That the long title of the Tattoo Parlours Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Tattoo Parlours Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.49 am): I move—

That the long title of the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (2.50 am): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Vietnam Veterans

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (2.50 am): In recent months I have had the privilege of attending a number of gatherings of Vietnam Veterans in my local area. I was honoured to be a guest of the 1st Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment's annual reunion held in Rockhampton. Many of the men present had fought at the Battle of Fire Support Base Coral. I also attended a Vietnam Veterans Day service at the Cockscomb Veterans Bush Retreat as a guest speaker. I would like to thank the secretary, Bill Stephen, and the executive for the opportunity to address the veterans and their families. The theme of my address was the battle of Coral-Balmoral, and this year marks the 45th anniversary. Many ex-soldiers in this House would have served with Vietnam Veterans during their time in the Army. The 1st Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment is closely associated with Coral while the 3rd Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment is associated with Balmoral. These were both fire support bases in Vietnam in 1968.

It is historically a matter of chalk and cheese to compare some of the battles in Vietnam to the worst of contemporary operations. It is enough to say that at times Vietnam presented a whole different level of combat intensity. 1968 was the decisive year in determining the outcome of the Vietnam War. It was the year of the Tet Offensive. The collective battles known as Coral-Balmoral were part of the Australian task force response to the second offensive mounted by the communists. I do not have the time to go into all the tactical details. I will just focus on Coral. Phase 3 of the operation started on 12 May 1968. The known enemy situation consisted of two regiments, the 7th North Vietnamese Army Division and the 85th Independent Regiment of the North Vietnamese Army, and some infiltration groups. The Fire Support Base Coral contained the battalion headquarters and some supporting elements.

Just after midnight on 13 May reconnaissance probes of the Australian mortar position commenced. At around 1.45 am the base received a battalion group attack. This enemy assault was supported by mortar fire and rocket barrage, and the core of the enemy force was identified as 275th North Vietnamese Army Infiltration Group. The ground assault was closely coordinated behind enemy fire support and overran the mortar position and one of the nearby artillery positions. The members of the mortar platoon were told to stay below ground while heavy fire was brought on their position. This evening is recognised as the critical date for Coral, as nine Australians were killed and 28 were wounded. It is a historical fact that the battle of Coral-Balmoral was the first time Australian forces engaged the North Vietnamese Army in what can only be described as battle group conventional combat. During my military career, I met many men who had served in either the 1st or 3rd battalions during 1968. We all owe those men a debt as their endeavours will always be marked by—

(Time expired)

Cerebral Palsy League

 **Mr DAVIES** (Capalaba—LNP) (2.53 am): I rise this morning to highlight the great work of the Cerebral Palsy League in Capalaba. The Cerebral Palsy League was started in 1948 in Brisbane by a group of concerned parents of children with cerebral palsy who felt they were not receiving the services they needed and imagined a better world for their children, and from this vision this vital organisation was born. Today the Cerebral Palsy League operates in over 29 locations and provides essential services such as school support programs, home support and respite programs, therapy and health services, and employment services.

I have had the great pleasure of attending a number of amazing events at the Capalaba centre. One word springs to mind to describe the vibe of this place, and that is vivacious. It is a place full of hope and expectancy. A beautiful garden built on a vacant block next door has kindly been donated for use by a local businessman. This garden is amazing. There are fruit trees, vegetables, myriad flower varieties, an aviary and even a native honey bee hive to pollenate the plants. While the garden has a real wow factor, the real strength of the Cerebral Palsy League is its staff and volunteers: committed, passionate, caring people who go beyond the call of duty for their clients—actually, more than clients; their friends. But the truly amazing thing about the Cerebral Palsy League is its clients. These people are overcoming what can only be described as a very tough hand in life, dealing with challenges that most of us can never dream of. But the hope and vigour for life I experienced at the Cerebral Palsy League at Capalaba is truly something to behold.

One such case is John Rynn, a 50-something-year-old gentleman with what can only be described as severe cerebral palsy. But what John lacks in motor skills he certainly makes up for in intellect and a lust for life. While John finds it difficult to verbally communicate, he finds no such issue in writing. With support from a friend, John recently released his first book, cheekily titled *You Only Want Me for My Mind*. It is a humorous and often heartbreaking insight into the life of someone trapped in a disobedient body. I will close with a poem from John's book called *Mind Over Body*—

My mind is at war with my disabled body.

My mind has an idea.

My body takes a long time to do anything.

Then my mind gets mad with my body.

My mind tries to make my body do things quickly.

My mind should know my body cannot do anything quickly.

This war goes on and on.

It will stop when I die.

I commend the great work of the Cerebral Palsy League and I commend this book, *You Only Want Me for My Mind*.

Murrumba Electorate

 **Mr GULLEY** (Murrumba—LNP) (2.56 am): I speak tonight on behalf of Murrumba, which is Aboriginal for 'good place'. I wish to thank the local delegates for their contribution to the Queensland Plan: from Murrumba, Alicia Wright from No Permit No Park; Sam Te Rure, the 2012 Deception Bay State High School captain; Adam White, from Deception Bay Little Athletics; from Redcliffe, Shane Newcombe, from Our Village Foundation; Nick Tzimas, from the Commerce and Industry Redcliffe Peninsula; and Becky Clark and Alison Grady, both teachers who shared one of the three Redcliffe spots.

Speaking of Redcliffe, I believe Redcliffe deserves an active member of parliament. I wish to compliment Michael Connolly, a widely respected local and Aboriginal artist. I thank Michael for organising last Saturday's rally, which called on Scott Driscoll to resign. Michael and his organising committee should be acknowledged for this peaceful demonstration and for the opportunity for Redcliffe locals to meet, heal and map a way forward. Mr Driscoll has lost all credibility and if he had one ounce of decency he would have resigned in shame by now. I again call on Scott Driscoll to resign and do the right thing by his community.

I wish to thank the Minister for Energy and Water Supply, Mark McArdle, for attending a business round table in my electorate that I hosted with my good friend the member for Kallangur. Minister McArdle met with local businesses in an open forum to discuss energy and water prices, including how the LNP government will work with them into the future. Since the last sitting, the seat of Petrie has been formally declared, with Luke Howarth narrowly being elected as the new federal member for Petrie. I have known Luke for nearly a decade and know him as a man of ability and integrity. I believe he will be a strong voice for our area. Luke grew up in the local area, is a successful local businessman and knows the issues that face our local community. I look forward to working closely with Luke to deliver better services and infrastructure for the good people of Murrumba. I would also like to thank Yvette D'Ath for her contribution over the past six years. While Yvette and I have had political differences at times, I acknowledge the work that she and her staff have conducted on behalf of the Petrie community. I wish Yvette, her family and staff all the best for the future.

I would like to commend the Attorney-General for passing this morning the tough new antibiotic laws—laws that redress the balance in favour of innocent, law-abiding citizens rather than pandering to the so-called civil liberties of criminal thugs who engage in violence and extortion and who peddle pain, suffering and fear.

We live in a great state with great opportunities. Sometimes in our position we meet some great individuals. On the weekend I met Mertle Savage from my birthplace of Gayndah. Mertle is 92 and not out. She has a sharp mind and shared her childhood story of growing up on her father's farm. Murrumba is a great place.

Gold Coast, Bus Services

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—UAP) (2.59 am): I rise to express my concerns over the new bus timetable and routes on the Gold Coast to start in January, in particular the feeder services which are inadequate for our population. I agree with transport advocate Steven Jamieson, who lives in my electorate, that there is a justified perception that public transport does not exist after dark and cannot be relied upon to get one home. Mr Jamieson is the Gold Coast regional spokesperson for RAIL Back On Track and uses public transport extensively to get to work. He is an astute analyst when it comes to public transport.

A closer look at the timetable shows that some feeder services barely exist even after the 3 pm school finish time, let alone standard business or retail trading hours or later into the evening. Without these later services, the market for public transport will be adversely affected, even if those late-night services are not operating at anywhere near capacity. I table Mr Jamieson's document, which is 69 pages long, analysing the new services.

Tabled paper: Document titled '2014 Gold Coast Bus Network Changes—An Appraisal', dated 11 October 2013, by Steven Jamieson, Gold Coast Spokesperson, RAIL: Back On Track [3754].

He says that the connective system is impossible because poor feeder services do not exist to enable the connections, notwithstanding the route alignments. Sadly, the feeder services do not meet the needs of a large number of the community, including those travelling home from Brisbane by train, traditional nine to five workers and anyone who needs to return home later in the evening than 5 pm, which is really not all that late. Further, if these are not improved, they will have significant consequences on the viability of the trunk services and the light rail system which is opening next year. Honourable members should remember that that does not connect to heavy rail.

The services which replace routes 20 and 20A, which are the heaviest carrying routes on the western side of the Gold Coast, will mean many residents will often have to walk further to catch a bus. Route 743 travels along Spencer Road and part of Lawrence Drive, which is the busiest part of Nerang, Cozens Way, Jabiluka Drive, Hamersley Way and part of Explorers Way, Billabirra Crescent loop, Crusader Way and Short Street, Nerang. These streets will no longer be serviced and hours need to be longer to allow existing travellers to continue to access public transport after hours, particularly to allow for connections to train services after the afternoon peak. Services should operate until 8 pm or 9 pm at a minimum. It is a heavy demand area. I remember coming from Nerang station. I remember a lot of people coming down from Brisbane and tourists as well.

New route 735 means there is no direct access to Southport from the southern and western parts of Nerang. Once again, the feeder services need to have longer hours to preserve the current evening and late-night access between Southport and most of Nerang. This is a problem because Southport is going to return to being a massive CBD. New route 736 sees reduced hours and no direct connection to Southport, combined with terminating short of Nerang Railway Station. It needs to extend to the station to form a common hub and to have increased hours.

It is not all bad news. New route 739 means there will be a direct connection to Griffith University and the Gold Coast University Hospital for Nerang. I am sure my community will applaud that. Unfortunately, there are some problems with the feeder services and they need to be corrected.

SeniorNet

 **Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (3.02 am): On the day before yesterday, Monday, 14 October 2013, it was my pleasure to attend the 17th annual general meeting of the SeniorNet Association Inc. SeniorNet was established in Ipswich in 1995 to offer training in communication and computer skills to Ipswich seniors and provide a forum for social interaction. SeniorNet offers training in three streams at two training locations. Introductory training is offered at the Broadband for Seniors internet kiosk. This was offered to all senior citizens for free. They can learn how to use a computer, access the internet and communicate with friends and family via email. There are also training courses for SeniorNet members which teach the basics of the computer and of commonly used applications. There are also workshop sessions, which are stand-alone classes on a wide range of topics. For a modest annual fee of \$30, members can access any or all of the 21 courses and workshops in everything from basic computer skills, utilising the range of programs in the Microsoft Office suite, digital photography and using Photoshop. Recently added courses include using iPad and Android tablet devices.

In 2012-13, the 26-strong training team, all of whom are volunteers, have conducted 88 courses and workshops providing over 2,200 hours of teaching to more than 550 trainees. I have been told that Ipswich seniors are rapidly embracing tablet technology. These new courses have proven to be very popular and have drawn in many new members, taking current membership to 242. It is hoped that, as the word gets out, membership will continue to grow.

It is not just our grey-haired tech-heads who have signed on. SeniorNet also provides opportunities to members for regular social interaction, including a monthly program of pub lunches and group visits to local events. Sponsors of SeniorNet include the Ipswich City Council, the University of Queensland and the Queensland government through the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services.

I wish to acknowledge the contributions of the management committee, some of whom have been with the organisation for upwards of 15 years, for the valuable community service they provide to the seniors of Ipswich. I would like to thank Ken Curwen, Gordon Timbs, Lesley Burrows, Errol Elliott, Jenny Greaves, Vi Jorgensen, Joan Mackenzie, Colleen Freeman, Barbara Bottonberg, Graham Parsons and Barry Gartside. I particularly note the contribution of retiring treasurer Lesley Burrows, who has served in the role for nearly 10 years. SeniorNet is a fantastic Ipswich organisation that provides a valuable community service to the seniors of Ipswich. I wish them all the best in the years to come as they surf, skype and stream.

Kids Connect

 **Mr DILLAWAY** (Bulimba—LNP) (3.04 am): A challenge that people my age or older often face is the constantly evolving face of technology. How many honourable members can relate to the experience of having to ask your kids or the younger generation to get your computer to work or how to do something on your phone? I can assure honourable members that we are in very safe hands.

On 26 and 27 August I attended the Kids Connect 2013 event at The Edge, part of the State Library of Queensland. Kids Connect is a two-day technology based conference run by kids for kids. This year, the year 7s of St Thomas' Catholic Primary School in Camp Hill, which is in the Bulimba electorate, ran the show, acting as the Kids Connect organising committee. I was honoured to be invited to attend part of the workshop as a sponsor and was more than impressed with the way that the year 7s of St Thomas' conducted themselves and engaged and connected with other students. Seventeen other schools from across Queensland participated in the two-day event, which incorporated a range of activities with the theme 'Tech on the Edge', reflecting their aim to take technology to the limit and push it to 'the edge'. It is very fitting given the venue's name. The students explored new, fun and exciting technological skills through breakout activities such as movie making, creating and using games to improve learning, creating a virtual tour of Southbank for tourists and creating a magazine. One of the activities was called 'Breaking "Edge" Gadget Design' where they explored what technology on the edge actually means. Students were amused by the thought that pencil and paper was once technology on the edge. For many of my colleagues in the chamber it was. Students were given the opportunity to explore the amazing facilities in the vicinity such as QPAC, GoMA, the Queensland Art Gallery, the Sciencentre and the Queensland Museum. As technology becomes increasingly integrated into our work, home and lifestyle and is continuously growing and changing face, education programs like Kids Connect are of paramount importance.

With the 17 schools represented from across the Brisbane and Gold Coast regions, so many of my colleagues would be aware of the fantastic program these year 7s were able to be involved in. They say that you learn 90 per cent of what you teach. So teaching, discussing and sharing knowledge is one of the best ways to firmly grasp and retain concepts. Attending this event provided me with a great perspective in the wake of the Queensland Plan. I experienced just how much education has transformed over the years with the evolution of technology. Learning methods and strategies have expanded and there is more of a focus on self-directed learning, which I believe is vital for giving our next generation the skills they need for the real world.

I would like to take this opportunity to once again congratulate the year 7s of St Thomas' for their hard work, passion and enthusiasm for learning. It was truly inspiring to see a group of bright, young students sharing their knowledge and interacting so well with other students from different schools.

Walton Construction; Nambour Museum

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (3.07 am): This morning when I questioned the Minister for Housing and Public Works about the state government's response to the failure of Walton Construction, which has left many law-abiding Queenslanders in the process of being destroyed, we heard how the state government is undertaking ongoing investigations and inquiries into the effects that the collapse of Walton Construction has had on subcontractors. I take this opportunity to ask on behalf of many of the people affected by the failure of this company: will the minister meet with representatives of many of the people affected by this business collapse? I have a detailed submission, summary and a series of questions for the benefit of the minister and his departmental staff to look into which touch on many of the matters that the representatives are keen to explore with the government. I will not table this material in parliament because of a request that some of the names of affected subcontractors be kept confidential. So I will send all of the material to the minister under cover of letter this morning.

I understand some of these matters may cross state and federal jurisdictional boundaries, but this is no reason to delay acting. Earlier today we saw how the new laws were rushed into parliament to deal with motorcycle gang behaviours. We saw how the state and federal ministers were able to quickly get together, find the necessary money to fund investigations and work to bring people before the courts. Tonight I ask the government to use the same vigour to protect and try to help law-abiding people who have been affected by the failure of Walton Construction.

Whilst I am on my feet I would also like to thank the Minister for Housing and Public Works for his personal intervention in having withdrawn a bill of \$1,600 issued to the Nambour museum by the state government for the costs of renewing the lease of the museum site. The Nambour museum is run on the smell of an oily rag, if I can put it that bluntly, by a team of volunteers, many of whom are elderly and aged. They were devastated when they received the account from the state government. I can say they are ecstatic and overjoyed with the minister's intervention in having this bill of \$1,600 withdrawn. Thank you very much, Minister, for your intervention.

Pumicestone Electorate, Road Infrastructure

 **Mrs FRANCE** (Pumicestone—LNP) (3.09 am): I would like to take this opportunity to thank Minister Emerson, who is in the House this evening, and the wonderful team at TMR for the work that they are doing in Pumicestone electorate at the moment. The electorate has received a lot of attention lately. My constituents are extremely happy with what is going on.

Bribie bridge turns 50 this weekend. Although it is not getting a duplication, it certainly is getting a lot of maintenance at the moment. I am looking forward to seeing the feasibility study that is coming out later this year. Earlier this year we undertook the diving study, which was looking at the structural integrity of the bridge. So far the verbal report has come back that the integrity of the bridge is not under question. However, it will still continue to be No. 1 on my wish list for Bribie for duplication for a second access and I will continue to badger the poor minister on this.

Regarding the painting of the bridge, we have looked into this and, unfortunately, given that it is in a marine location we would be required encapsulate the whole bridge in order to give it a paint job. So at this stage it is not feasible to look at painting. The initial cost estimate for painting the bridge came in at around \$25 million.

An honourable member: Just to paint?

Mrs FRANCE: Yes, to paint it. I take that interjection. We all gasped when we heard that one. Because it does need to be encapsulated and it is a marine environment it is looking like it will not get a paint job any time soon. Once the paint would be blasted off the bridge. Unfortunately, it would need to be primed and repainted and traffic management is required. So this is not going to be happening any time soon.

Mr Crandon: What about wallpaper?

Mrs FRANCE: I thank the member for that interjection. I think that is probably not going to be considered in the feasibility study.

Some of the other initiatives that are undertaken at the moment by TMR in the Pumicestone electorate have been the fantastic realignment of the old Toorbul Road northern section and the Pumicestone Road interchange. At a cost of \$71 million, this raising of the crossing of the Bruce Highway is certainly welcome in the area. Also, the dropping of the speed limit around the old Toorbul Point Road intersection and the service station to 80 kilometres has been welcomed by users of that

intersection. The fantastic amount of vegetation clearing, mowing and shoulder realignment that has been going on on the main Bribie Island-Caboolture Road has certainly made a difference to users of that road, myself included, as I had my windscreen smashed by a falling tree there. Also, there is the clearing of the culverts and drains of the flood plain that runs through the middle of my electorate. I certainly look forward to the upcoming wet season and the fact that now our stormwater will be able to drain away from the area a lot quicker and, hopefully, we will not have our road cut. I encourage anyone who is around Bribie this weekend to come over for the Bribie bridge 50th birthday celebrations. I thank TMR and Minister Emerson.

North-West Queensland, Drought Assistance; Garde, Councillor E

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (3.12 am): I would like to draw the attention of the House to the terrible state we find our cattle industry in in North Queensland and over most of Western Queensland at the moment. I draw the attention of members to the plight of a couple in Winton. They are on a stock route and they look like they have to move off. They have been out there for three months. They have probably about 1,000 head of their breeder herd left there. They said that if they are told to go off they will just leave the cattle there, because there is no feed left on their station and there is no agistment left for them. The cattle are not marketable and they are in no state to travel. So they will just leave them there, presumably to perish. They are in the hands of the council now. Their story is not an isolated one. There are a lot of people in that position. It is a diabolical position for many of those people to be in.

At the moment, the issue is not the drought. In 2010 the average debt level on farms around Australia was \$700,000. That debt level is now \$1.4 million and rising. In 2009 the MLA undertook a survey of beef producers in the northern cattle grazing industry. Back then, the return on their assets was 0.3 per cent to two per cent. They said that it was the worst conditions since the 1970s. That was before the live export ban. That was before significant rises in costs and deterioration in market conditions.

The industry is in a parlous state and needs a big effort to rescue it. The trapeze wire has been cut and it needs a safety net. It was a very commendable effort by the minister to open up the national parks. That saved about 40 graziers who are on those parks until 31 December. That is an issue that will have to be looked at if there is no rain in November. It will all be in vain if they have to get off the national parks in December and there is no rain. But we are very grateful for the position that the minister took with that matter. He has probably saved the livelihoods of at least 40 graziers. It was tremendous that he was able to do that.

In terms of a rescue package, I think most people out there would recognise that the ARDB—the Australian Reconstruction and Development Board—would be the best answer that everyone needs. In the past it used to act as a safety net—as a way of getting cheap finance to get people through these tough times. I think that needs to be looked at in the long run. Another issue that also needs to be considered is the declaration of this drought as a natural disaster.

I will use the time left to me to make mention of the passing of a very well-respected person, Councillor Eddie Garde from Croydon, who tragically crashed his plane with his son a couple of weeks ago. It is important that this House acknowledges the contribution he made in developing that area around Croydon in north-west Queensland. He will be sadly missed.

Pine Rivers Electorate, Emergency Services

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (3.15 am): I would like to take this opportunity in the middle of Get Ready Week to encourage the residents and business owners of the Pine Rivers electorate to do exactly that: to get ready for the summer ahead. I think this is a fantastic initiative and an opportune time for us to prepare for whatever this summer might have in store for us.

Like many parts of Queensland, in recent years the Pine Rivers electorate has been hit hard by natural disasters. In January 2011, many parts of Queensland experienced flooding. The township of Dayboro experienced flash flooding. A lot of the township went under water. On that same day, the South Pine River system and the North Pine River system and many of the other waterways in the area caused some severe flooding in the area and, of course, led to the damage and eventual demolition of the AJ Wyllie Bridge. Last year many households and businesses in my area suffered from the storms on Australia Day and only this last week there has been a grassfire at Kurwongbah, which is a timely reminder for people to be prepared for what this summer might have in store.

My electorate has fantastic emergency services and emergency volunteers. I would like to thank them for that. Last week the member for Kallangur, the Assistant Minister for Emergency Volunteers and I had the pleasure to be at the Petrie SES to officially hand over a new \$51,000 flood boat. It was fantastic to be able to catch up with the volunteers and to hear that they are already indeed all ready for the summer ahead.

Recently, it was also great to catch up with the rural fire brigades in my electorate at Ocean View, Dayboro, Kobble Creek and Clear Mountain. It is certainly great to talk to those crews and hear about their preparations for whatever might happen in summer. It has certainly been a pleasure to support them today, as my colleagues have, by wearing the yellow ribbon in parliament.

As good as our emergency services and our emergency volunteers are, we cannot leave it up to them to be responsible for the preparations for summer. I encourage all residents and business owners in the Pine Rivers electorate, as the campaign says, to get ready and be prepared for whatever this summer has in store.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.19 am (Wednesday).

ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, 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