



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 26 August 2014

Subject	Page
PRESENTATION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS	2621
ASSENT TO BILLS	2621
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 26 August 2014, from His Excellency the Governor, advising of assent to bills on 15 August 2014	2621
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	2622
Palmer United Party, Resignation of Member	2622
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 18 August 2014, from the member for Gaven, Dr Alex Douglas MP, formally notifying the Speaker of his resignation from the Palmer United Party.....	2622
Hansard, Sesquicentenary	2622
PETITIONS.....	2622
TABLED PAPERS.....	2623
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2625
Australian Red Cross Centenary, Motion to Take Note	2625
Education, Achievements.....	2626
Galilee Basin State Development Area	2627
Education, Funding.....	2627
Education, Teacher Performance.....	2628
NOTICE OF MOTION	2629
Federal Government, Budget	2629
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	2629
School Group Tours.....	2629
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2629
Strong Choices.....	2629
Electricity Prices	2630
Education, Pumicestone Electorate.....	2630

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 26 August 2014

Unemployment	2631
Morayfield Electorate, Education	2632
Sale of Public Assets	2632
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Sydney Morning Herald, dated 26 August 2014, titled 'Aurizon cuts up to 480 jobs in Qld'.....</i>	2632
Toowoomba North Electorate, Education	2633
Moreton Bay Regional Council, Draft Planning Scheme	2634
Kallangur Electorate, Education.....	2634
Warrego Highway	2635
Waterford Electorate, Education	2636
Police Service, Parliamentary Committees.....	2637
Coomera Electorate, Education.....	2637
Biofuels Report.....	2638
Whitsunday Electorate, Education	2638
Gold Coast, Cruise Ship Terminal	2639
Albert Electorate, Education.....	2640
Malanda-Upper Barron Road, Upgrade	2640
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	2641
Strong Choices.....	2641
Electricity Prices	2642
Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative	2643
Gladstone Electorate, Crime Statistics	2644
Democracy.....	2645
Unemployment	2646
North Stradbroke Island, Economic Transition Group.....	2647
Royalties for the Regions	2648
Workplace Health and Safety; Cultural Diversity	2649
Charlton Wellcamp Industrial Estate	2650
Whitsunday Electorate, International Airport	2651
QUEENSLAND PLAN BILL.....	2652
Introduction	2652
<i>Tabled paper: Queensland Plan Bill 2014.....</i>	2652
<i>Tabled paper: Queensland Plan Bill 2014, explanatory notes.....</i>	2652
<i>Tabled paper: Queensland government document titled The Queensland Plan: Queenslanders' 30-year vision.....</i>	2652
First Reading	2653
Referral to the Finance and Administration Committee.....	2653
MAJOR EVENTS BILL.....	2653
Introduction	2653
<i>Tabled paper: Major Events Bill 2014.....</i>	2653
<i>Tabled paper: Major Events Bill 2014, explanatory notes.....</i>	2653
First Reading	2654
Referral to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee	2654
SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2655
Second Reading	2655
<i>Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 70—Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response.....</i>	2655
EDUCATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2663
Introduction	2663
<i>Tabled paper: Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014.....</i>	2663
<i>Tabled paper: Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes.....</i>	2663
First Reading	2666
Referral to the Education and Innovation Committee	2666
SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2666
Second Reading	2666
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.....	2672
Comments by Member for Gaven.....	2672
SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2673
Second Reading	2673
MOTION	2694
Federal Government, Budget.....	2694
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	2704
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2704
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	2704
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2704
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	2704
Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates	2704

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 26 August 2014

SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2705
Second Reading.....	2705
<i>Tabled paper: Parliamentary Library research brief, dated 15 August 2014, regarding sobriety tags in other jurisdictions.</i>	2718
<i>Tabled paper: Department of the Premier and Cabinet report titled 'Drink Safe Precincts, evaluation summary report'.....</i>	2733
<i>Tabled paper: Department of the Premier and Cabinet report titled 'Drink Safe Precincts, final evaluation: 24 months of the trial'</i>	2733
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	2735
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2735
Consideration in Detail	2735
Clause 1, as read, agreed to.....	2735
Clause 2 postponed.....	2735
Clauses 3 to 124—	2735
<i>Tabled paper: Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.</i>	2754
Clauses 3 to 124, as amended, agreed to.	2754
Clause 125—.....	2754
<i>Tabled paper: Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Mr Wellington's amendments.....</i>	2754
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	2755
Resolved in the negative.	2755
Non-government amendment (Mr Wellington) negated.	2755
Clause 125, as read, agreed to.....	2755
Clauses 126 to 133—	2755
Amendments agreed to.	2756
Clauses 126 to 133, as amended, agreed to.....	2756
Clause 2—	2756
Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.	2758
Third Reading.....	2758
Long Title.....	2758
ADJOURNMENT.....	2758
<i>Hendra State School, Sesquicentenary</i>	2758
<i>Somerset Hills State School, Groundskeeper</i>	2759
<i>Lees, Mr D.....</i>	2760
<i>Aspley Electorate, Seniors Week</i>	2760
<i>Banking Industry</i>	2761
<i>Charlton Wellcamp Industrial Estate</i>	2761
<i>Tabled paper: Statements about Charlton Wellcamp industrial estate.....</i>	2761
<i>Tabled paper: Australian Securities and Investments Commission and Department of Natural Resources documents regarding Charlton Industrial Pty Ltd.....</i>	2761
<i>Mansfield Electorate, Queensland Day</i>	2762
<i>Mudgeeraba Electorate, School Captains</i>	2762
<i>Australian Reconstruction and Development Board</i>	2763
<i>Sandgate Electorate, All About Living</i>	2764
ATTENDANCE	2764

TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 2014

 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.

PRESENTATION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that on Friday, 15 August 2014 I presented to His Excellency the Governor the Appropriation Bill and the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill for the royal assent and that the Governor was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Messenger admitted to the House and presented to the Speaker a message from His Excellency the Governor.

 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the Governor informs the Legislative Assembly that the following bills have 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 15 August 2014: Appropriation Act 2014, Appropriation (Parliament) Act 2014, Criminal Law Amendment Act 2014, State Development Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 and Forestry and Another Act Amendment Act 2014. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the records of parliament. I table the message for the information of members.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
QUEENSLAND

Message

The Governor informs the Legislative Assembly that Bills intituled:

"A Bill for An Act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for departments for the financial years starting 1 July 2014 and 1 July 2015"

"A Bill for An Act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for the Legislative Assembly and parliamentary service for the financial years starting 1 July 2014 and 1 July 2015"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the Bail Act 1980, the Crime and Corruption Act 2001, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002, the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, the Director of Public Prosecutions Act 1984, the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, the Evidence Act 1977, the Justices Act 1886, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Economic Development Act 2012, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Fisheries Act 1994, the Gasfields Commission Act 2013, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Queensland Industry Participation Policy Act 2011, the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014, the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971, the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and the Water Act 2000 for particular purposes, to repeal the Clean Coal Technology Special Agreement Act 2007, the Eagle Farm Racecourse Act 1998, the Gurulgundi Secure Landfill Agreement Act 1992, the Racing Venues Development Act 1982 and the Wild Rivers Act 2005, and to make minor, consequential and other amendments to the legislation mentioned in schedule 1"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Forestry Act 1959 and the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 for particular purposes and to make minor and consequential amendments to the Act mentioned in schedule 1",

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 15 August 2014.

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.

GOVERNOR

(sgd)

26 August 2014

Tabled paper: Message, dated 26 August 2014, from His Excellency the Governor, advising of assent to bills on 15 August 2014 [5683].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Palmer United Party, Resignation of Member

Madam SPEAKER: I have received correspondence from the member for Gaven dated 18 August 2014 formally notifying me of his resignation from the Palmer United Party. For the information of the House, I table the correspondence.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 18 August 2014, from the member for Gaven, Dr Alex Douglas MP, formally notifying the Speaker of his resignation from the Palmer United Party [[5684](#)].

Hansard, Sesquicentenary

Madam SPEAKER: Yesterday marked 150 years since the Queensland parliament voted to allocate a budget to fund the wages and then printing costs to produce the first volume of the parliament's official record of debates, or *Hansard*. Queensland is believed to be the third parliament in the world to establish an official *Hansard* record, following the parliaments of Nova Scotia in Canada and then South Australia. Our *Hansard* was established 45 years prior to the British parliament employing parliamentary reporters to publish official records of its debates. We also have the distinction of being the first jurisdiction in the world to publish a daily *Hansard* record when the parliament commenced doing this in 1876.

Given that, it seems fitting to take a moment to acknowledge our *Hansard* staff. You are the silent transcribers of history and we recognise the work you do to ensure that the people of Queensland have an accurate representation of the deliberations of their elected representatives. We thank you for your diligence and professionalism.

I also want to acknowledge those who made speeches to honour the work of *Hansard* last night: Professor Roly Sussex OAM; former Premier, the Hon. Russell Cooper AM; president of the media gallery and state political editor of the *Courier-Mail* and *Sunday Mail*, Steven Wardill; and the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Neil Laurie. I shall later be tabling their speeches for the information of the House.

I advise members that the display created for the 150th anniversary of *Hansard* is on display in the red chamber for your viewing and is a remarkable telling of the journey of our parliament and its debates.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, lodged by the honourable member indicated—

Labrador-Paradise Point-Runaway Bay, Bus Route

Ms Barton from 149 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate bus routes which travel from Labrador, Paradise Point and Runaway Bay directly into southern suburbs that the light rail will service and lengthen the operation hours of these bus routes [[5685](#)].

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

Motor Sporting Venues

From 17,731 petitioners, requesting the House to save Queensland's motor sporting venues from severe restrictions or forced closure as a result of demands from the occupants of newer residential developments [[5686](#), [5687](#)].

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

Edmonton, Mill Road, Land Acquisition

150 petitioners, requesting the House to retain the parcel of land at Mill Road, Edmonton which has been strategically acquired for the provision of future hospital health and services for the greater Cairns area [[5688](#)].

Tablelands Regional Council

21 petitioners, requesting the House to immediately dismiss the Tablelands Regional Council, appoint an interim administrator and advisory committee and make regulatory provisions for the administrator and advisory committee to serve until the next quadrennial elections in March 2016 [[5689](#)].

Local Government Regulation 2012, Sections 132 and 134

22 petitioners, requesting the House to amend sections 132 and 134 of the Local Government Regulation 2012 and remove the conflict with common law [[5690](#)].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

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

8 August 2014—

- [5665](#) Screen Queensland—Annual Report 2012-13
- [5666](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 46—Subordinate legislation tabled between 12 February 2014 and 20 May 2014
- [5667](#) Public Trustee Act 1978: Public Trustee (Fees and Charges Notice) (No. 1) 2014
- [5668](#) Public Trustee Act 1978: Public Trustee (Fees and Charges Notice) (No. 1) 2014, Explanatory Notes
- [5669](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 53—Auditor-General's Report to Parliament No. 17 for 2013-14—Queensland Ambulance Service performance
- [5670](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 52—Erratum to Report No. 52—2014-15 Budget Estimates, August 2014
- [5671](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 54—Subordinate legislation tabled between 2 April 2014 and 6 May 2014
- [5672](#) Letter, dated 16 July 2014, from the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to the Speaker, regarding treaties tabled on 19 March and 13 May 2014
- [5673](#) Letter, dated 16 July 2014, from the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to the Speaker, regarding treaties tabled on 14 and 15 July 2014
- [5674](#) Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia—Joint Standing Committee on Treaties—Report No. 141: Treaties tabled on 19 March and 13 May 2014

11 August 2014—

- [5675](#) Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 44—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land (Providing Freehold) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

14 August 2014—

- [5676](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 8—Inquiry into the Motorcycle Licensing process in Queensland 2012: Queensland Government Implementation Update

18 August 2014—

- [5677](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 70—Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [5678](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 49—Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [5679](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 50—Local Government Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

20 August 2014—

- [5680](#) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land (Providing Freehold) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014: Erratum to Explanatory Notes
- [5681](#) Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 45—Consideration of Department of the Premier and Cabinet Annual Report 2012-13—government response

22 August 2014—

- [5682](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to an ePetition (2232-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 417 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a public register of child sex offenders to track their whereabouts and provide notification to the public of the presence of a child sex offender in their community

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Water Act 2000—

- [5691](#) Water Resource (Georgina and Diamantina) Plan (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2014, No. 167
- [5692](#) Water Resource (Georgina and Diamantina) Plan (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2014, No. 167, explanatory notes

Criminal Code Act 1899—

- [5693](#) Criminal Code (Criminal Organisations) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 168
- [5694](#) Criminal Code (Criminal Organisations) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 168, explanatory notes

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

- [5695](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2014, No. 169
- [5696](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2014, No. 169, explanatory notes

Stock Act 1915—

- [5697](#) Stock Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 170
- [5698](#) Stock Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 170, explanatory notes

Vegetation Management Act 1999—

[5699](#) Vegetation Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 171

[5700](#) Vegetation Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 171, explanatory notes

Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008—

[5701](#) Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 172

[5702](#) Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 172, explanatory notes

Water Act 2000—

[5703](#) Water Resource (Pioneer Valley) Plan (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2014, No. 173

[5704](#) Water Resource (Pioneer Valley) Plan (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2014, No. 173, explanatory notes

Water Act 2000—

[5705](#) Water Resource (Barron) Plan (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2014, No. 174

[5706](#) Water Resource (Barron) Plan (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2014, No. 174, explanatory notes

South Bank Corporation Act 1989—

[5707](#) South Bank Corporation Regulation 2014, No. 175

[5708](#) South Bank Corporation Regulation 2014, No. 175, explanatory notes

South Bank Corporation Act 1989—

[5709](#) South Bank Corporation By-law 2014, No. 176

[5710](#) South Bank Corporation By-law 2014, No. 176, explanatory notes

State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999—

[5711](#) State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, No. 177

[5712](#) State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, No. 177, explanatory notes

Cremations Act 2003—

[5713](#) Cremations Regulation 2014, No. 178

[5714](#) Cremations Regulation 2014, No. 178, explanatory notes

Education (Overseas Students) Act 1996—

[5715](#) Education (Overseas Students) Regulation 2014, No. 179

[5716](#) Education (Overseas Students) Regulation 2014, No. 179, explanatory notes

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

[5717](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2014, No. 180

[5718](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2014, No. 180, explanatory notes

Acquisition of Land Act 1967—

[5719](#) Acquisition of Land Regulation 2014, No. 181

[5720](#) Acquisition of Land Regulation 2014, No. 181, explanatory notes

Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Act 2003—

[5721](#) Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Regulation 2014, No. 182

[5722](#) Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Regulation 2014, No. 182, explanatory notes

Surveyors Act 2003—

[5723](#) Surveyors Regulation 2014, No. 183

[5724](#) Surveyors Regulation 2014, No. 183, explanatory notes

Water Act 2000—

[5725](#) Water Resource (Burnett Basin) Plan 2014, No. 184

[5726](#) Water Resource (Burnett Basin) Plan 2014, No. 184, explanatory notes

Public Records Act 2002—

[5727](#) Public Records Regulation 2014, No. 185

[5728](#) Public Records Regulation 2014, No. 185, explanatory notes

MEMBERS' PAPERS TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Algester (Mr Shorten)—

5729 Letter, dated 15 August 2014, from the Member for Algester, Mr Shorten MP to the Clerk of the Parliament correcting the record in relation to the Transport, Local Government and Public Works Estimate Report debate on 7 August 2014

Member for Inala (Ms Palaszczuk)—

5730 Letter, dated 19 August 2014, from the Leader of the Opposition (Ms Palaszczuk) to the Integrity Commissioner (Mr Bingham) regarding meetings with registered lobbyists during the month of June 2014

5731 Opposition Diary—Leader of the Opposition, 1 June 2014—30 June 2014

Member for Gaven (Dr Douglas)—

5732 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Member for Gaven (Dr Douglas) to Boston Massachusetts, United States of America, 30 June 2014 to 14 July 2014

Member for Nanango (Mrs Frecklington)—

5733 Non-conforming petition relating to a boundary change from the South Burnett Regional Council to Toowoomba Regional Council

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Australian Red Cross Centenary, Motion to Take Note

 Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.37 am): On 13 August 1914, nine days after the outbreak of World War I, the Australian branch of the British Red Cross Society was established. This month the Australian Red Cross celebrates its centenary. This is a significant milestone in the social history of our nation and commemorates 100 years of humanitarian service to the people of Australia. I acknowledge here in the gallery the following officials from the Australian Red Cross: Mr Robert Tickner, Chief Executive Officer; Mr Kevin Keeffe, Executive Director; Mr John Pinnery AM, Chair, Queensland Divisional Advisory Board; and Mrs Win Smith, Deputy Chair of the Queensland Divisional Advisory Board. It is a great pleasure to have you join us here this morning.

Most Australians have shared a personal connection with the Australian Red Cross, from its humanitarian role during two world wars to preparing, responding to and recovering from natural disasters or helping vulnerable people and communities overcome disadvantage and through its world-class national blood service. For 100 years the Australian Red Cross has enjoyed a unique auxiliary status to government in the humanitarian field, working in partnership with governments of all political persuasions in Australia and internationally.

The organisation aims to alleviate suffering in a voluntary aid capacity whilst adhering to its principles of independence, neutrality and impartiality. The Australian Red Cross is part of the world's largest humanitarian movement, with tens of millions of volunteers working in 189 countries. Those teams are united by the fundamental principle of preventing and alleviating human suffering without discrimination in times of war, conflict, disaster or personal crisis. Today the Australian Red Cross has a network of over one million volunteers, members, staff, donors, aid workers and supporters. Through this network, the Australian Red Cross mobilises the power of humanity to work right across the country in local communities in every state and territory, and further afield, to help transform the lives of vulnerable people in need.

In honour of this very significant milestone, tonight at Parliament House I will be hosting a reception for over 130 guests. It will give me the opportunity to join with members of the Australian Red Cross to celebrate the 100th anniversary of its founding. I take this opportunity to congratulate the generations of Queenslanders and Australians for their extraordinary contributions through the everyday work of Red Cross. I also express my support for the independent, neutral and impartial humanitarian mission of the Red Cross as it continues to work with and assist the most vulnerable people in need, both in Australia and internationally. I move—

That the House take note of this statement.

 Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.40 am): I rise to express the opposition's support for the motion moved by the Premier acknowledging the achievements of the Red Cross in Queensland over the past century. The Red Cross has grown since it was founded on 13 August 1914, in the shadow of World War I. It has become an internationally recognised symbol of hope and humanity to many and brings aid and relief to people in need right across the world.

In Queensland, the mention of the Red Cross brings to mind blood banks, first-aid courses and, of course, a helping hand to those in need. Some may remember the contribution the Red Cross played in the wake of the South-East Asian tsunami, the Victorian bushfires and, of course, the devastation extreme weather caused in Queensland in 2011. In fact, during that horrendous summer the Red Cross assisted over 14,600 people in community recovery centres as flooding peaked. No-one in need was turned away. As Queensland faced one of its biggest challenges, the Red Cross was there. Mothers and fathers had somewhere to take their families, senior citizens had somewhere to feel supported by the community and those in dire need had a roof over their heads during such an overwhelming disaster.

Queenslanders will never forget that the Red Cross was there to help in their time of need and Queenslanders remain grateful for the hard work of Red Cross volunteers. We know Red Cross staff and volunteers are among the first to arrive and the last to leave. They are the ones on the front line, providing food, shelter and medical assistance to those in need, often in difficult or potentially dangerous circumstances. No matter the location or the seemingly impossible odds stacked against them, the ongoing legacy of Red Cross staff is the compassion they show to those in need.

The Australian Red Cross has become an important and much-relied-upon establishment in our community. Its achievements over the past 100 years are significant, helping countless people in times of hardship and devastation. I wish to congratulate and thank the individuals who have worked to grow this organisation during the past century, including the current executive director, Kevin Keeffe. To all Red Cross staff who are here today, I say thank you very much for your assistance and help. Your contribution to Queensland and Queenslanders will never be forgotten.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Education, Achievements

 Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.43 am): Everything that we do in education is aimed at making sure the kids of today can get great jobs tomorrow. We are improving teacher quality, targeting the early years, increasing school autonomy and enhancing student discipline. We have increased the Education budget by around 10 per cent to \$11.8 billion without new taxes or reducing other services. We have a strong plan to secure Queensland's finances by making the strongest and smartest choice to reduce debt so that we can build the schools we need. These policies are having an impact in the classroom.

Last week during my visit to Bundaberg, the local members told me that the highly respected principal of Bundaberg East State School, Doug Ambrose, had said recently—

Schools have never been better resourced in all my years of teaching.

Doug has been teaching forty years. Principals in my own electorate have also enjoyed increased autonomy and funding through the Great Results Guarantee, with \$131 million shared among all state schools, focused on the vital early years. This year an eight-year-old grade 3 boy started at Ashgrove State School and was barely able to read. His previous school had almost given up on him. Through the Great Results Guarantee funds, the school has raised him from reading level 1 to reading level 12 in just four months. That is an amazing result. NAPLAN testing results are better in year 3 and year 5, with four of five test result areas improved from 2013 and nine out of 10 kids reaching the national minimum standard.

Under Labor, state schooling was heading into decline. It was the third choice option, but not anymore. This year we have seen public schools grow for the first time in ten years. The point is that mums and dads are seeing the great things that are happening in our state school system and are voting by placing their children in the care of those schools.

Queensland schools are also benefiting from more than \$66 million from Great Teachers = Great Results, so that our kids are taught by the best and brightest teachers; \$6 million more for independent public schools so Queensland principals, mums and dads can make the decisions for their schools; 761 new teachers and teacher aides to provide more help in the classroom; an extra 2,250 prep teacher aide hours, so that preppies can get more one-on-one attention, again highlighting our focus on the early years; and in the 2014-15 financial year \$59 million to work on 10 new schools, so that the kids born today have a future in a great state school tomorrow. There is also \$1.1 billion for training and tertiary education that is targeted towards addressing skills shortages and ensuring that training equals jobs. That has to be the driving principle behind the vocational and educational

training system. In summary, only the LNP has a strong plan for education and we will stick to it, because it is getting results, it is the right plan for Queenslanders and it will provide a brighter future for our kids.

Galilee Basin State Development Area

 Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.47 am): The Galilee Basin will be the economic engine room that will generate the funds to pay for the schools and hospitals that Queenslanders will need now and into the future. The potential economic contribution of just one of those mines and associated rail infrastructure is enormous. For example, the Carmichael mine is estimated to return \$22 billion in taxes and royalties to the Queensland government and an almost \$5 billion contribution to the gross state product. The development of the proposed mines such as Alpha, Kevin's Corner and the Carmichael mine have the potential to deliver up to 28,000 new jobs for Queenslanders, 15,000 construction jobs and over 13,000 operational jobs. Since coming to government, we have moved decisively to progress major Galilee Basin resource projects and to put into place the mechanisms to ensure that serious proponents can proceed with certainty and, equally and just as importantly, landholders are given the certainty that they need to plan for their futures.

After two years of consultation by Queensland's independent Coordinator-General, we declared the Galilee Basin State Development Area consisting of one east-west corridor and one north-south corridor to support the construction of rail lines from the major mines to the port of Abbot Point. In coming weeks, we are taking the next steps to ensure that the jobs and the economic benefits flow from the Galilee to all Queenslanders, with particular regard to the Galilee mine and the railway proposed by the Adani company. The Coordinator-General has informed me that he will be communicating directly with the 16 private landholders whose properties will be affected by the potential construction of this rail infrastructure in regard to the critical issue of securing the land identified as being required for the project to succeed.

Over the past 2½ years we have pursued strategies to minimise the number of landholders affected. Importantly, landholders and the community can be assured that the minimum amount of land needed will be involved with a corridor generally only 60 to 100 metres wide. These 16 private landholders will be updated by the Coordinator-General on the process ahead which involves negotiations between Adani and the landowners to reach a marketplace based commercial agreement between the parties before the land will be formally acquired by the Coordinator-General based on the terms of those agreements and then leased back to Adani to operate the railway. It is important that the process of land acquisition is made clear to give both the proponent and the landowners more certainty of the process ahead and to allow more time for them to finalise their agreements through commercial negotiations before the Coordinator-General begins the formal process.

Over the past 2½ years we have proceeded methodically to bring about certainty to landholders and proponents in the Galilee Basin and to minimise the impacts on landholders and on the community in that part of Queensland. The development of this great resource will bring certainty to future generations of Queenslanders—certainty that they will have access to jobs and business opportunities and certainty that we will be able to fund the schools and hospitals and deliver the services that they will need in the future.

Education, Funding

 Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (9.50 am): This government has always been about delivering for the next generation of Queenslanders. Our commitment to fiscal discipline is made with two key thoughts in mind: firstly, not leaving a legacy of debt and deficits for our children and grandchildren to deal with; and, secondly, ensuring that we can sustainably deliver the services that our community needs. Because of the actions taken by this government, debt this year is going to be more than \$5 billion less than was predicted by the last Labor government. We have also outlined a plan to deal with Labor's debt and to build the infrastructure and deliver the services—the schools and the hospitals—that a growing state like Queensland needs.

Our commitment to the next generation of Queenslanders can particularly be seen in the investments we are making in education across the state. I was very proud to announce in June that the education budget has increased by seven per cent to \$11.8 billion in 2014-15. This was in addition to a 6.6 per cent increase in the 2013-14 budget.

Of course, this government's focus lies on outcomes. That is why we are directing funding to programs that will deliver results for young Queenslanders. We are investing \$537 million over five years to ensure professional excellence in teaching through Great Teachers = Great Results. Our Great Results Guarantee, as the Premier has said, is a \$131 million commitment aimed at lifting student outcomes and ensuring that Queensland is among the top performing states in literacy and numeracy in Australia by 2020.

We are also making sure that classrooms in the areas of greatest need have access to teacher aides through our four-year \$53.6 million Boosting Prep for our Children's Future commitment. By 2015-16 this program will support up to 9,000 extra teacher aide hours a week.

Not only does this government want students to have access to the best teaching resources, we also want them to have pride in their schools as places of learning. The previous Labor government let our schools fall into a state of disrepair. This government is getting on with the job of fixing this problem, with a \$300 million commitment to address the school maintenance backlog.

We are also planning for future growth in our education system. This year's budget included a further \$23 million to construct a new high school at Highfields in Toowoomba North, which will be open for students in 2015. The government has also committed \$1.4 billion to build 10 new schools in high growth areas in Queensland, under the Queensland Schools Project public-private partnership. The first schools in Burpengary and Pimpama are set to commence in 2015.

This government is committed to education and providing opportunities for young Queenslanders. We are doing it by investing in major education programs now, and we are doing it by planning carefully and methodically for future growth. Over the next 20 years it is estimated that the school aged population in Queensland will grow by 400,000. Only the LNP government has a plan to provide for this future growth and to provide more education opportunities for all Queenslanders.

Education, Teacher Performance

 Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (9.53 am): Since day one of this government we have focused—relentlessly focused—on improving student outcomes. This is because we know the value of a great education and the transformative role that it can play in young people's lives. In our efforts to build the best education system in Australia, we have tackled this challenge from every angle. We are delivering money straight to schools through our Great Results Guarantee. We are giving principals and teachers greater powers to deal with disruptive students so that those children doing the right thing have a safe place to come to school. We are building the schools of the future so that Queensland children have access to great facilities to play and learn. We also introduced Greater Teachers = Great Results—our \$537 million action plan to improve teacher performance and reward teacher excellence.

We did this because there is an overwhelming body of evidence that says when it comes to ensuring our students are achieving all that they can our attention needs to be on the most important person in their classroom—the teacher. While the research and evidence is there, we need only to reflect on our school years to know that having a great teacher is what makes all the difference. We want all Queensland children to have this experience. That is why in Greater Teachers = Great Results we committed to introducing a structured, annual performance review process.

Today, I can announce that that is exactly what we will deliver from the beginning of next year in all Queensland state schools. We have done it with the support of the Queensland Teachers Union. The old performance review process was voluntary. It was ad hoc. It was unstructured. It pretended that all teachers and all schools were the same. Most importantly, it did very little to identify or link how a teacher's performance could be improved to better support their students' learning.

In almost every other profession there are clear and vigorous mechanisms for review of performance. Why should it be any different for the people to whom we entrust our child's education and, in doing so, their future. The new mandatory annual performance review process that we have introduced with the support of the Queensland Teachers Union is a sophisticated one. Every year teachers must come together with school leaders to develop a written plan that sets out their goals and professional practice and learning opportunities with ongoing opportunities for feedback and review.

Queensland state school teachers have a big job and it is an important one. This government has always acknowledged that. That is why we are providing them and their school leaders with the tools and the support to work together, in the context of their school, to focus on improving their performance and that of the children in their charge.

The approach of those opposite was always to say, 'That's good enough.' They would never have embraced a measure such as this because it would have been too hard to roll out with their top-down, command-and-control approach to running schools from Mary Street. On this side of the House, we have listened and we are acting. Our new performance review process has the backing of mums and dads who want to see their child's teacher be the best they can be. It has been given the tick by principals who want to work with their staff to build a more collegiate environment and be able to link the teacher review process to the specific needs of their schools and the students within them. With the imprimatur of the QTU it has the full support of teachers because they too want their professionalism to be acknowledged and recognised. It is all part of our strong plan for a brighter future for education in Queensland.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Federal Government, Budget



Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (9.58 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

- notes that figures released by the federal treasury department this month (August) show that the first budget of the Abbott government will have a massive impact on low-income families;
- notes that the Abbott-Hockey budget includes the imposition of a \$7 GP co-payment and massive cuts to health, education and welfare support;
- condemns the Abbott government for its budget of broken promises; and
- calls on the Newman government to join with the Labor opposition and urge the Abbott government to scrap its unfair budget.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before commencing question time, I would like to acknowledge the schools visiting today: St Paul's Lutheran Primary School from the electorate of Pumicestone; St Mary's Catholic Primary School from the electorate of Bundaberg; and St John's Catholic School from the electorate of Mirani.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Madam SPEAKER: Question time will still finish at 10 o'clock—11 o'clock. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Strong Choices



Ms PALASZCZUK (10.00 am): It is over before it has even begun. It is over before it has even started. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that Crosby Textor had an integral role in formulating the government's Strong Choices campaign? Will he ensure that a detailed list of all consultants engaged by the LNP government and funded by taxpayers is publicly released today?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. I can confirm that, yes, they are involved. In relation to costs and their activities, a report will be provided at the conclusion of this work. I also point out that in the time allocated for estimates there were huge opportunities for the opposition to ask questions on these matters. There were huge opportunities during the six hours—twice the period of time allocated in the last two years. There was plenty of time available for the opposition to ask all sorts of detailed questions about those matters.

The work that is being undertaken is critically important in terms of the future of this great state. A couple of weeks ago at Hervey Bay I was delighted to hand down on behalf of Queenslanders the Queensland Plan. During this parliamentary week I will be introducing legislation so that we legislate the Queensland Plan and create a pathway forward to achieve the vision that Queenslanders want for this state over the next 30 years. If we are to achieve elements of that vision, we need to make strong choices and we need to have the financial mechanism to pay for the infrastructure that this state needs and, indeed, the people of this state deserve. We know that Queenslanders expect world-class roads, bridges, public transport infrastructure, schools and hospitals, and community facilities. Indeed, a few communities seem to want sport stadiums as well, I note.

If these things are to be funded, this side of the parliament has a strong plan to achieve that. We know how we can achieve the things that we will be talking about between now and election day. If we are re-elected we know how we will, in a financially responsible and sustainable way, pay for the infrastructure of the future. Those opposite have no plan. They are recycling the same failed people who got us into the financial mess that the state was in. Nothing has changed. We saw other elements, shall I say, on the weekend in their little get-together here in Brisbane which showed they have learnt nothing.

The point is there is a very clear decision to be made at the next year's election. You can have a strong team with a strong plan that will deliver the infrastructure and the vision for the state that Queenslanders want or you can go back to chaos and financially irresponsible management. You can have the same focus on politics rather than outcomes. The choice is clear, and I urge Queenslanders to think carefully about the decisions they make at the ballot box next year.

Electricity Prices

Ms PALASZCZUK: My next question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's plan to privatisate huge chunks of the state's electricity industry, has the Premier commissioned modelling into the impact of this decision on household electricity prices?

Mr NEWMAN: I find it fascinating that a political party that privatised elements of the electricity industry and stated that it meant lower power prices—remember what a former Premier said—would have the ticker, or the gall, to come in here and ask such a question because it is extraordinary.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order!

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! I warn members on my left.

Mr NEWMAN: All I can say to them is: watch this space; wait and see. All things come to those who are patient and wait. While we are talking about electricity prices, I was fascinated to see what has been going into people's letterboxes in recent days. Here, for example, is a notice from Origin Energy to their customers saying that, as a result of the carbon repeal, they estimate that Queensland electricity customers in this billing class will this year on average save eight per cent on electricity based on the average total energy bill.

Here is a notice that came in my letterbox—my own gas bill—and it does not quote a specific figure but it says, 'Households will also see reductions to their Origin natural gas bill,' and they are talking about the carbon price repeal. This is my own EnergyAustralia bill—actually it goes to Lisa. It says, 'The carbon price will be removed from your electricity rates in September'. As a result, the average EnergyAustralia customer in Queensland will see estimated savings for the financial year beginning 1 July 2014 of around 8.3 per cent lower prices for electricity. This equates to estimated savings for an average Queensland customer of \$174 over this 12-month period.

If my memory serves me correctly, we moved a motion calling for the abolition of the carbon tax because we wanted to take the pressure off the cost of living for families. If memory serves me correctly, those opposite were against that motion. In other words, they support the carbon tax. They support higher prices for electricity—ergo they support higher gas prices. In recent days we have heard Lord Mayor Graham Quirk saying there are savings from the carbon tax. We believe there are savings from the carbon tax repeal, and we will be handing back savings to Queenslanders or giving them other options. Those opposite have no credibility when it comes to the cost of living. If they had any credibility, they would have supported the abolition of the carbon tax but they failed to do so. Only the LNP has a strong plan to keep downward pressure on the cost of living for Queenslanders.

Education, Pumicestone Electorate

Mrs FRANCE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure our children have access to the best education today and into the future in my electorate of Pumicestone?

Mr NEWMAN: The member for Pumicestone, Lisa France, has been very active improving education outcomes and supporting her local school community, and I thank her for that. From sponsoring school awards and graduation ceremonies to attending sports days and presenting awards, she is always a friendly face around the school grounds.

Other key achievements of the government in the area represented by the honourable member are, firstly, lobbying to have the Banksia Beach State School concert band, which happens to be the best primary school band in Queensland, open the recent Fanfare finals at the Brisbane Convention Centre. She ran a petition for improving safety at the Old Toorbul Point Road intersection that was causing great distress to parents, resulting in the speed limit being dropped from 100 kilometres an hour to 80 kilometres an hour. She has provided support to schools making an application for independent public schools and has assisted P&Cs in applications for grants and funding. Well done to the honourable member.

In terms of what is going on in her area from the funding perspective, new schools for Pumicestone is part of the \$1.38 billion 10 new PPP schools program which sees a new primary school at Caboolture north-east, stage 1 completion in January 2017 and stage 2 completion in January 2019; and a new primary school in Caboolture west, stage 1 completion in January 2016 and stage 2 completion in January 2018. Then there is the \$5.46 million early childhood development program facility for Caboolture East State School.

In terms of school maintenance in her electorate, the total 2012-13 allocation was \$1.373 million. The total 2013-14 allocation was \$1.278 million. The total 2014-15 allocation announced on Thursday will see the fixing of rusty downpipes, ripped carpet and peeling paint so that schools are once again a great source of pride for students and teachers where people can learn and communities can come together. Remember those opposite used to put solar panels on roofs, while around the state we had leaky school roofs.

The Great Results Guarantee in the honourable member's electorate is delivering \$1.745 million so that our younger children get the boost in literacy and numeracy that they need to support lifelong learning. In terms of independent public schools in her electorate, there is funding for the Banksia Beach State School to become an IPS, empowering the local school community, the principal, the teachers and the mums and dads to make the right decisions for the school. We have seen a massive increase in prep teacher aide hours in Pumicestone and significant capital works costing \$4.9 million in the 2014-15 financial year.

Unemployment

Mr PITTS: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. In response to last month's disturbing 11-year-high unemployment rate, the Treasurer claimed that his Strong Choices asset sales will create 25,000 jobs over six years even though half this number of jobs was lost in July alone—the largest fall in jobs in the country. Will the Treasurer confirm that his asset sales plan is the only plan the Newman government has for jobs?

Mr NICHOLLS: It is indeed a pleasure to receive a question about our plan for the future from a party that has no plan for the future, and we saw that on the weekend where one observed the machinations of the ALP conference. We had the member for Bundamba taking on the former member for Greenslopes and future member for Woodridge, saying quite clearly, 'There's a fair bit of self-interest in it, Cameron,' if I recall. I am not sure if that is the member for Bundamba's self-interest, the putative member for Woodridge's self-interest or someone else's self-interest.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members. I call the Treasurer.

Mr NICHOLLS: What we clearly have here is a question from an opposition that has no plan. During the past 2½ years there has been ample opportunity to put forward their alternative ideas. There have now been three budgets and other opportunities, yet all we have heard from the shadow Treasurer when questioned by the media and by informed commentators is, 'I don't believe that we need to put forward an alternative plan.' We have an opposition that has 22 or 23 staff and they are entitled to a budget of some millions of dollars. There has been no reduction in the size of their budget, but there has certainly been a substantial reduction in output because there is no plan that has been put forward.

In Queensland we have generated over 50,000 jobs in the past 12 months, the highest number of jobs created in any state in Australia.

Mr Pitt interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: They can squawk, but they do not like the facts, and the facts are these.

Mr Pitt interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Just pause the clock. Leader of Opposition Business, your interjections are not being taken. I will start to warn you under the standing orders if you do not cease.

Mr NICHOLLS: We are delivering in terms of job creation. More jobs are being created in Queensland than in any other state in Australia. Under Labor—a government that failed to honour its own commitment to create 100,000 jobs for 100,000 breadwinners, a commitment they subsequently tried to water down—in seven of the last 12 months of the Labor government, Queensland had the highest unemployment rate in the mainland. By contrast, where are we now? We are ahead of South Australia, ahead of Victoria and only slightly behind New South Wales. We have gone from tail gunner to being almost at the front of the plane. That is our program. We are cutting red tape, delivering jobs and investing in the future.

(Time expired)

Morayfield Electorate, Education

Mr GRIMWADE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure our children have access to the best education today and into the future in my electorate of Morayfield?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for the question. I know that he has a longstanding interest in revitalising front-line services to improve education outcomes for Queensland school students, especially those in Morayfield. Importantly, he is also doing it as part of a great team, working together with members in his region such as the member for Kallangur, who I know is going to be asking me a question pretty soon about similar issues. The point is that they work together on issues regarding schools that neighbour their own electorates as parents from their own schools can also have children attending schools in the other electorate. They are working together. That is why when we have principal round tables in either or both of their electorates, we meet these members together. I am pleased to work with them as part of the Newman team.

Last year we held a principal round table at Morayfield East State School and principal Judy Menary hosted the discussion about what exactly schools need to do to get on with the job of educating our children. When we hold those round tables we talk about things like red tape, IT, the diversity in our classrooms and how we provide services for our teachers and principals, curriculum, maintenance and any other issues that they may raise. It is from those discussions and working with Darren Grimwade, the member for Morayfield, that we are able to provide the resources they need. For example, we have already had flashing lights put outside three schools in Morayfield thanks to my colleague the honourable Minister for Transport, and Darren Grimwade is advocating strongly for a fourth set at Burpengary Meadows State School. We have also invested \$2,386,000 in maintenance for the nine schools in the good member's electorate. That is part of the \$300 million action plan on which we have delivered to stop the Labor rot in Queensland state schools. There was a \$300 million maintenance backlog left by those opposite. They were happy to see Queensland schools slide into disrepair.

Through our Great Results Guarantee that the Premier has spoken about this morning, \$1.7 million is providing literacy and numeracy support to the prep to year 2 students in Morayfield who need the greater support, as well as every other student in their primary and secondary schools. We want every student to have a great start so they can succeed at school and join the supercharged Queensland economy when they graduate from school, training or higher education.

We spent almost \$8 million providing additional classrooms at Morayfield and Narangba Valley State High School. The local Catholic school, Carmichael College, has received \$1.7 million worth of additional classrooms and facilities. The local community has advocated for a new high school to be built next year. It will commence with its first cohort of students in Burpengary in 2016. By 2022 there will be more than a thousand students in a state-of-the-art facility that will service both electorates and the booming student population there.

That is how the Newman government is planning for a bright future for all Queensland students from crayon to career.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr MULHERIN: My question is to the Premier. In May this year the Premier said that job losses 'happen in privatisation'. Why is the Premier saying that privatisation costs jobs while the Treasurer says that asset sales are his government's plan for jobs?

Tabled paper: Article from the Sydney Morning Herald, dated 26 August 2014, titled 'Aurizon cuts up to 480 jobs in Qld' [5734].

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the question. I must say that it sounds to a certain extent as if the member opposite is verballing the Treasurer. The Treasurer has on many occasions spoken about the government's plan for job creation. Let me talk about that right now. What is our plan for job creation? It is a relentless plan every single day of the week to make this the best place in Australia to do business. It is as simple as that. We got rid of a waste tax. We reformed workers compensation to make it the best scheme for employees in Australia while making sure the premiums could come down on small, medium and large businesses by an average of 17 per cent. That means more people being employed. We dropped payroll tax and we will continue to drop payroll tax. We have reformed director liability obligations in the law. We have undertaken reforms of legislation in the four pillars of the economy: tourism, construction, resources and agriculture. The results speak for themselves. We are seeing that, with only one-fifth of the nation's population, Queensland is generating more than half the jobs in any reporting period.

There is a whole lot more to be done. I am very excited that we are seeing the massive Galilee Basin coal projects now going forward. It is something that the industry needs right now. We need the thousands of jobs, the huge amount of infrastructure that will be created and the benefits from decades of royalties coming back into this state to build new schools, hospitals, roads and the like. Tourism has also had a huge renaissance over the last two years and four or five months since this government actually lined everyone up together, got a proper plan for the industry, promoted Queensland properly, got rid of red tape and bureaucracy and let the private sector get on with it.

That is where we will see jobs created. At the end of the day, the jobs that we need to see created are in small and medium sized businesses in the private sector, and they are the jobs that will see Queenslanders going back to work. It is the case that with their background the Labor Party does not understand small business. They have come from large organisations, usually unions, where you do not have to worry about where the next dollar is coming from because, day in and day out, it just keeps coming down the pipeline. It is a bit different in smaller and medium sized businesses, which have to fight for every dollar. That is the Treasurer's plan; that is the government's plan; that is what we are doing to make sure that we create jobs for all Queenslanders. Today we are particularly talking about the way that we are skilling younger and older Queenslanders so they can get great jobs.

Toowoomba North Electorate, Education

Mr WATTS: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure that our children have access to the best education today and into the future, particularly in my electorate of Toowoomba North?

Mr NEWMAN: I would like to thank the honourable member for his interest this morning in asking such a question. I would note upfront that the government is delivering a new high school at Highfields, which is a commitment that the honourable member made in the 2012 election campaign. I know that he is delighted, and we in this government are thrilled to be delivering on that commitment. The honourable member sent his children to the Highfields primary school, but when his children reached high school age he was forced to move away from Highfields because there were no high schools in Highfields and the daily school run became too difficult. So the member has lived the problem and he knows what mums and dads have faced in his part of that great city of Toowoomba. He knows and cares about what this new high school will mean for his local community. But it is not just the new high school; this government has also provided funding towards the new Mary MacKillop secondary school at Highfields, extending the school from P7 to P12. The government has also provided funding towards the extension of the Toowoomba preparatory school from P7 to P12. The member is passionate about education, and today I acknowledge that he has been keenly involved in the process of getting those new schools off the ground.

In terms of other things that are going on in his electorate, why don't we talk about funding for maintenance? Maintenance funding is there to deal with the backlog left by the Labor Party. I have spoken before in this place about leaky roofs, rusted-out downpipes, cracked playing surfaces and asbestos. Those issues are being addressed in his electorate, as they are across the state. In terms of the Great Results Guarantee, there has been \$1.27 million for his electorate of Toowoomba North to ensure that every child is given every opportunity to reach the minimum national standard. The guarantee is in place to do that, and the schools have all developed plans to get kids there. Teacher aide hours in the electorate of Toowoomba North: in 2013, 13 hours; in 2014, 42 hours; and in 2015, 60.1 hours. That is increasing in line with the government's commitment. In relation to the capital works program, you will probably not be surprised with these figures: in 2012-13, \$3 million; in 2013-14, \$8.3 million; and in 2014-15 that is increasing to \$24.8 million.

In summary, as is the case across Queensland so it is in Toowoomba North. This government has a very strong plan to revitalise public education and to do the very best for our kids so that they can get great jobs, particularly focusing on those early formative years.

Moreton Bay Regional Council, Draft Planning Scheme

Mrs D'ATH: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Moreton Bay Regional Council's 4,500-page draft planning scheme, which has been significantly amended in the face of public opposition, and ask: will the Premier ensure that the revised draft scheme is released for a new six-week public consultation period so that the residents of Moreton Bay can fully examine the proposed amendments?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for her question. I have noted that there has been some community concern in relation to this plan, and there has been a lot of heavy lifting which has been going on—not by the honourable member who asked the question, but indeed by the member for Pumicestone, who has engaged with this issue in a very wholehearted and comprehensive way. I note that other members of this parliament who are in the Moreton Bay Regional Council area have also been quite active in listening to community concerns. I am not aware that the member for Redcliffe has even corresponded with me on this matter.

Mr Seeney: Me either.

Mr NEWMAN: The Deputy Premier also seems to be unsure whether he has received any correspondence. I would say that fair dinkum hardworking local members do not play political games; they get outcomes. The member for Pumicestone and the other hardworking members of our team have been out there listening to the community and making representations on behalf of the community. It might surprise the member for Redcliffe that the member for Pumicestone was onto this issue when we last gathered in this very House. Where was the member for Redcliffe? Oh, I have it! The story had to appear in the newspaper first before it received any attention from those members opposite. The member for Pumicestone was on top of the issue and was making recommendations.

I will say that the Deputy Premier is dealing with the issue, and I can assure the residents of the Moreton Bay Regional Council area that their views are being taken extremely seriously. One thing they may not realise is that the planning policies of the former Labor Party government would have led to a very similar outcome to what is in that plan. I would particularly make the point today that the Labor Party policies handed down by the former environment minister Kate Jones, the former Premier, Anna Bligh, and the former planning minister Stirling Hinchliffe would have led to this outcome, not just in the Moreton Bay Regional Council area, but other coastal communities all the way from Cape York in the Torres Strait down to Coolangatta. We would have seen the same issues coming up and the same concerns from local residents, and they would have been legitimate concerns.

The Deputy Premier is right onto this issue. It will be sorted out, and he will provide support to the Moreton Bay Regional Council to ensure that they listen to the local community, that the mayor and the councils take on board that feedback and that they develop the very best possible planning scheme to take their area forward. That is being can-do, and that is in line with the wishes of the community and responding to the community's concerns.

Kallangur Electorate, Education

Mr RUTHENBERG: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure that our children have access to the best education today—

Mr Mulherin: Old Nostradamus over there!

Madam SPEAKER: Please pause the clock. I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition under 253A. So that we can hear the question, we do not have interjections when a question is being asked. Would the member start again.

Mr RUTHENBERG: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure that our children have access to the best education today and into the future in my electorate of Kallangur?

Mr LANGBROEK: What a surprise to get a question from the member for Kallangur, but can I thank him for his question and his passionate advocacy for the children and communities of Kallangur. The attitude of the member for Kallangur since he was elected typifies the situation that we

inherited when we came to government. The first school in his electorate that he rang me about was Dakabin State High School, which typifies the issue of the maintenance backlog left by his Labor predecessor. At Dakabin State High School, in some cases the classrooms had not been painted since the school was built in 1974. The honourable member was on the phone to me straightaway because the school community was begging him to get something done there. We have invested \$400,000 in that school, and now students and teachers have a revitalised environment where learning is front and centre. Trevor Ruthenberg, the member for Kallangur, was front and centre at ringing me as a brand new member to make representations on behalf of his community. As part of our Advancing Our Schools Maintenance initiative, we have spent more than \$2 million to address the maintenance backlog in the nine schools in his electorate that students want to attend, that parents are happy to send their children to, and where teachers and the principals are proud to work.

Maintenance was an issue we inherited, but we also deal day to day with current budget issues. The Premier has already outlined this morning some of those programs such as the Great Results Guarantee, where we put \$131 million directly into schools. We did not take anything off the top at all. That means that those schools in Kallangur are guaranteeing that students will either get to the national minimum standard in year 3 for literacy and numeracy or have a plan to get there. Schools in Kallangur have received \$1,579,000 to make sure they get that Great Results Guarantee out there for their parents and their students. We trust principals and school communities to deliver what is best for their students.

Another great example of the teamwork I have spoken about this morning—I have already mentioned the member for Morayfield working together with the member for Kallangur—is at a school called Jinibara, whose innovative and passionate principal, Dr Ray Bloxham, said about his BER money, ‘I would like to have a variation as an early years hub, where we might be able to get the community to come in, as we do with early years learning centres, so that parents can come in with very young children and access other services, prospectively health services.’ We continue to speak to the health minister about being able to provide support to those communities. The members for Morayfield and Kallangur attended the opening of that facility—something that highlights for me the teamwork we see on this side of the parliament. They worked alongside each other to achieve this great facility for the people in their electorates to share.

Warrego Highway

Dr DOUGLAS: My question is to the Minister for Transport. The minister’s department has stated that the Warrego Highway from Toowoomba to Brisbane is not suitable for B-triples and road trains and that 97 per cent of New Hope Coal from the downs is transported by rail. I ask: why has the department laid a tarmac that is three times thicker than required—at 50 millimetres—on the highway from Toowoomba to Brisbane?

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable member, could I ask you to please repeat the question? I could not hear it clearly. And if you could just slow it down, thank you.

Dr DOUGLAS: My question is to the Minister for Transport. The minister’s department has stated that the Warrego Highway from Toowoomba to Brisbane is not suitable for B-triples and road trains and that 97 per cent of New Hope Coal from the downs is transported by rail. I ask: why has the department laid a tarmac that is three times thicker than required—at 50 millimetres thickness—on the highway from Toowoomba to Brisbane?

Mr EMERSON: I thank the member for Gaven—the independent member for Gaven I think it is, this week at least! The situation on the Warrego is one that has concerned me since we came to office, because for too many years it was neglected. It was ignored by the previous government. Local members there were advocating for years. Many of those local members had been in parliament for many years. Sadly, their genuine concerns were ignored by the previous government.

We are getting on with delivering significant, substantial and much needed roadworks on the Warrego. We are delivering that as part of our \$18 billion Queensland Transport Road Infrastructure Program. This year alone \$4.8 billion is being spent and delivered on Queensland roads. That is 37 per cent more than the previous government was planning to do this year. A substantial amount of money is being spent on the Warrego.

I point out that the previous federal Labor government was very keen to ignore these roads in Queensland. I note again that the member for Redcliffe, when she was a member of federal parliament, voted to slash the amount of money the federal government spent on federal roads in Queensland. Traditionally there was an 80-20 split of funding for Queensland roads, but what did the last federal Labor budget do? It slashed funding from 80 per cent to 50 per cent. That was their view.

This is not just an issue with the Warrego. I mention also the Bruce Highway. I was very pleased to join the Premier last weekend to talk about 'Spruce the Bruce', to develop and fix the Bruce Highway. This corridor of commerce that had been ignored for years and years—

Dr DOUGLAS: Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Gaven, what is your point of order?

Dr DOUGLAS: Madam Speaker, I was specific. I asked about the thickness of the tarmac on the Warrego Highway.

Madam SPEAKER: The minister has been talking about the Warrego and has addressed the issues with respect to the Warrego, but I ask the minister to ensure that the question is answered.

Mr EMERSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I said, the 'Spruce the Bruce' campaign is about fixing the Bruce Highway, which had been ignored for years and years by state Labor and federal Labor.

Let us not forget what state Labor's policy is towards the Bruce Highway—that is, state money being spent on the Bruce Highway is a waste of money, is misspending of money. That is how it was quoted in the *Cairns Post*. The shadow Treasurer—the alternative Treasurer, who would decide where money is spent—has said that money being spent on the Bruce Highway is misspending. What a disgraceful policy.

(Time expired)

Waterford Electorate, Education

Mr LATTER: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure our children have access to the best education, today and in the future, in my electorate of Waterford?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. The member for Waterford, Mr Michael Latter, has been dedicated to his school communities. I know that because I have been to his schools and have seen him interacting with those school communities. He has even acted on two occasions as a teacher in the classroom at Beenleigh State School, in an exercise to understand the day-to-day issues confronting our teachers and children in classrooms.

I believe that some of his key achievements should be noted today. He has made representations to the director-general and the department regarding special-needs funding allocations for schools, with the department forming a panel to address the issues that he has raised. He has regularly attended school awards presentations, sports days, positive community initiatives, community-in-the-classroom events, fetes and fundraisers, and he has attended a number of schools in an aspirational educational capacity to talk about his role as a parliamentarian, most recently at Bethania Lutheran. I thank him for all those things.

As I noted earlier, a few weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending Loganlea State High School with the member to see firsthand the school's very innovative community service intervention program. When the students at that school misbehave they are required to perform tasks to improve their school instead of being suspended. I think that is profoundly significant. Students are giving back to the community by working in an aged-care facility or working with Meals on Wheels. That has happened when they have had poor behaviour, but it is making a real difference to those students by actually giving them a chance to put something back. According to Principal Belinda Leavers, whom I acknowledge today as she is doing a great job at that school—

Students learn to own their behaviours—positive and negative—and recognise that the resulting consequences are theirs also.

I will highlight some of the things that are happening in those schools. Maintenance allocations are about dealing with the backlog that we inherited from the former Labor government. The Great Results Guarantee in the electorate is delivering \$2.069 million to improve literacy and numeracy. I understand that there are no independent public schools at this stage, but we are very hopeful that the honourable member will work with those schools to put forward some for consideration. There has been a massive increase in prep teacher aide hours for the electorate of Waterford. In 2014-15 there were 48 hours allocated; in 2015 there will be just a smidgin under 100 hours. And capital works funding has been at a high level of around \$6.8 million. Again, this can-do government is getting on with the job of revitalising our state school system.

Police Service, Parliamentary Committees

Mr WELLINGTON: My question is to the Premier, and I ask: why does the Police Service need to look to the government for direction on how the Police Service responds to an invitation from a parliamentary committee to participate in a committee investigation?

Mr NEWMAN: I have absolutely no idea what the honourable member is referring to—what incident? Whether it be an incident or a figment of his imagination, I have no idea whatsoever. If he would like to provide me with some information, then I could probably answer more directly. He might want to ask the minister the question as well.

I just say this while we are on the subject of policing and community safety issues in Queensland: we are a much safer community today. Our community is safer for our mums and dads and safer for our kids because of the strong laws and the increase in police resources, particularly human resources—800 extra police—because we have a government that backs the Police Service in doing its job. At times the honourable member for Nicklin arguably has not been supportive of the police. At times he has been very critical of this government and its approach to dealing with criminal gangs. At the next election the honourable member will have to explain to his community why he was so against the criminal motorcycle gang crackdown. I know that Matthew Trace, our candidate—a hardworking local farmer—will be taking it up to the member for Nicklin, who has played, frankly, a game that has not been in the interests of Queenslanders on the community safety issue. I know that Matthew Trace as a family man wants to see a safer community, and we are seeing the results. We are seeing crime figures go down right across the state and we are seeing that as a result of the strong laws, the extra police, the new technology, the equipment and the resources that we have given the Queensland Police Service.

It behoves all honourable members to back the men and women in the blue uniform who do the job of protecting us. At times, sadly I must reflect, the member for Nicklin has given ambiguous or indeed on occasions quite negative signals in that regard. I do not think standing shoulder to shoulder with people who are allegedly involved in criminal activities or may allegedly be members of criminal organisations is a good look. If I was a member of the Queensland Police Service, I would be questioning what the honourable member was on about. I would be questioning whether the honourable member backed me in my day-to-day work on the front line protecting Queenslanders. One day in this parliament the honourable member should take the opportunity to stand up and speak about these matters and explain himself, because I know that Matthew Trace is out there today talking to people in Nicklin about the way that he would support the men and women who wear the blue uniform and how he would support strong laws to protect families, particularly the most vulnerable and our kids. That is probably what he is doing right now today and I say this to the people of Nicklin: there is an alternative and it is about time you took that opportunity for a positive alternative.

Coomera Electorate, Education

Mr CRANDON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure our children have access to the best education today and the exciting future in my electorate of Coomera?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for the question. We have moved from the north of the Brisbane River to the south of the Brisbane River and to a member in this place who is absolutely passionate about his schools, from Eagleby to Helensvale and all of the areas in-between. A principal round table was held in his electorate at Pimpama State Secondary College, which is in stage 2 of its infrastructure build worth \$15 million. Whilst we have a challenged infrastructure budget thanks to the debt and deficit left by those opposite, we are making sure that that brand-new school is getting improved facilities. After the election I remember that the honourable member for Coomera, Michael Crandon, was on the phone to me advocating for a playground upgrade at a kindergarten in Helensvale. So whether it is a fence at Eagleby or Eagleby South, which has constant problems with people walking across the school grounds, the honourable member is always talking to me about getting more facilities—whether it is in the outdoor environmental centre where he is interested in getting an upgrade to one of its marine projects and boats or at Pimpama State Secondary College where we sat down with all of the other principals from his electorate, including King's Christian College.

King's Christian College is looking to open a second campus in the electorate of Coomera, and this also typifies many of the problems that schools had when we first came to government. King's College, an independent school in the electorate of Mudgeeraba which is represented by Ros Bates, wants to build a second duplicate campus, and that is why we established the Schools Planning Commission: to bring together all three sectors—Catholic, independent and state sectors—to talk about whether they should be treated as developers and what we can do by working with my colleagues such as the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Energy and Water Supply to ensure that communities that want diversity in schools get the choice of schools. It had taken King's College four or five years to get all of its planning approvals and it has now found that the state has a reassuring process so that in the future, when we know Queenslanders want more schools of different types, including the electorate of Coomera, our teachers, parents and students can have that choice. In Coomera \$1,724,235 has been spent on repairing schools, but most remarkably in Coomera we are going to be opening a brand-new state school in January 2015. We are still consulting on the name with the community—it is known as 'Pimpama State School' at the moment—but here is a remarkable statistic that the member mentioned during the last sitting week of the parliament: this is the sixth of seven schools that will have opened in his electorate since 2009, with another one on the way. I defy any other electorate in Queensland or maybe Australia to have that record. So members can see that we have a strong plan for a brighter future for all Queenslanders—from crayon to career.

Biofuels Report

Mr HOPPER: My question is to the Minister for Energy and Water Supply. Has the minister ever commissioned a report on biofuels and, if so, where is it now and will he table it this sitting?

Mr McARDLE: I thank the member for the question because it gives me an opportunity to talk about the government's plans in relation to energy and where we are headed to in relation to the power sector going forward. Members of this House will be quite well aware that recently I released *PowerQ*, a document that stretches over a period of 30 years to look at all of the sectors in relation to energy to understand what we need to do over generations to come to ensure that we get the best outcomes in relation to power, power generation and servicing our community, both in relation to the consumer at home and businesses right across the sector. *PowerQ* in particular deals with what I call an expert panel, and that expert panel is made up of men and women who will be named later this week. That expert panel is to look beyond the immediate horizons of the issues we face in relation to electricity to deal with the new horizons, the new concerns, the new fronts that we have to deal with because this state has to look beyond a three- or four-year term and under this particular Premier we have a long-term vision not just with regard to electricity but education, health and other issues as well.

This is a government that is proud of what we have done in relation to electricity, and *PowerQ* is a document that allows us through the expert panel to draw together some of the best minds in this state and indeed across the nation to ensure the nuances and more particularly the issues that we will face in the future can be dealt with properly. No longer do we want to be caught by things such as the massive uptake in solar panels without understanding the consequences, as was done by the Labor Party. No longer do we want to be caught up in relation to the massive uptake of air conditioning without understanding the long-term consequences. These are the issues the expert panel has been and will be tasked to consider, and not just those issues but what are the new issues that we face in this state with regard to generating electricity. *PowerQ* is a high-level document but goes a long way to addressing the neglect and, in my opinion, the almost criminal neglect of the Labor Party as it was in power for many a long year. More importantly, this government has taken in hand a revolution with regard to changing the power sector—a complicated sector—over a period of 2½ years in stark contrast to the Labor Party that did absolutely nothing—absolutely nothing. It sat back on its hands and simply waited for power increases to come forward and did not take one step. This government has taken the step of looking to the future, and we do not apologise for doing so.

(*Time expired*)

Whitsunday Electorate, Education

Mr COSTIGAN: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure that our children have access to the best education today and into the future in my electorate of Whitsunday?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I note that just last Friday the MP for Whitsunday had the pleasure of opening the C&K Calen Community Kindergarten, with the government providing \$1 million towards that project. This was a huge result for that community and all the other little farming communities to the north, south, east and west because the nearest kindies were in Mackay, the Pioneer Valley, Seaforth or Proserpine after the Australian Labor Party allowed the former kindy to wither on the vine. That is what they did and it was a huge kick in the guts to these small farming communities. So I know that the honourable member is very pleased with that. The member for Whitsunday also catches up with members of his school communities regularly. Just recently, he caught up with Sam Strang, the principal of Bloomsbury State School, who was raving about the extra hours that we have provided as a government for teacher aides under our \$54 million four-year program that will reach 600 prep class when it is fully rolled out.

One of the biggest achievements for the Whitsunday electorate is obviously the Northern Beaches State High School in Mackay. The school is going from strength to strength since it was opened last year. It was promised by a former Labor MP in 2001 and she said that it would be open by 2003. It never happened under Labor. We are proud to have opened the first new government school in Mackay since the 1990s. How about that! The Northern Beaches State High School opened in 2013, at a total cost of \$45 million for stage 1. The junior secondary precinct is currently catering for over 300 students. Stage 2, the senior secondary precinct, is to be completed by the end of this year. The school will eventually provide comprehensive secondary schooling for a whole school population of more than 1,200 students.

As I have been saying in answer to other questions from other honourable members today, maintenance funding that has been provided is all about dealing with the backlog. We are getting on with the work of fixing up our schools in the Whitsunday electorate. The Great Results Guarantee is seeing \$1.086 million being allocated, again focusing on ensuring that all children get to the minimal national standard for literacy and numeracy. I am advised that there are no independent public schools yet in the electorate, but I know that the honourable member will be working with the school communities to encourage people to put forward submissions and become part of the program.

We are seeing prep teacher aide hours increase. In 2013, it was 35.5 hours. In 2014, it is 74.7 hours. In 2015, it will be 123.4 hours. There have been significant capital works over the last few years: \$38.78 million in 2012-13, \$15 million in 2013-14 and in 2014-15, \$9.353 million.

Gold Coast, Cruise Ship Terminal

Ms TRAD: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier confirm that the government is still proceeding with the construction of a cruise ship terminal on the Gold Coast Broadwater, but that it will be located on Wavebreak Island and not The Spit? Can the Deputy Premier guarantee that there will be less capital and ongoing dredging as a result of the changed plans?

Mr SEENEY: I want to thank the member for South Brisbane for the Dorothy Dixer. It is a question that I have very great pleasure in answering this morning. I would hope that the member for South Brisbane has read the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, because the answer to her question was on the front page and page 3 of today's paper. But I am happy to repeat it for her.

In fact, I think that I should go back to the start of the process and tell the story from the beginning. The process began with an election promise that was made by the then candidate for the Gold Coast Lord Mayoralty, Mr Tom Tate, who made a commitment in his election manifesto to pursue the issue of a cruise ship terminal in the Gold Coast Broadwater. He was obviously successful in that election campaign and approached us as a state government following his election for our cooperation in delivering his election promise.

We agreed to undertake a process to determine whether or not that was possible. There were a number of opinions about whether it was possible and the member for Gaven has expressed that opinion a number of times in this House. What the state government did was to enter into a process to test whether the concept was deliverable on the basis of no cost and no risk to the state.

We have been through a process that involved expressions of interest from a number of proponents. We ended up with a situation where there was only one proponent left in that process. We were prepared to identify that proponent as the only possible proponent left. The issue of the gaming licence was raised by that proponent. We then allowed that proponent to enter into the IRD process that we had already set up to allocate three gaming licences across Queensland. The proponent was then invited to be part of that process.

We are now at the point where the proponent is being requested to put forward their detailed proposal. Part of that request for a detailed proposal is to respond to the community consultation that has already been undertaken—not as comprehensively as I would have liked and I have been critical a number of times and again today. The proponent has not engaged with the people of the Gold Coast to the extent that I would have liked to have seen, and certainly not as extensively as the proponent at Cairns has. But we have said to the proponent this morning that the consultation that has been undertaken has made it very clear to us that there is no support on the Gold Coast for the development of the area of The Spit and that will be reflected in the documents that are provided to the proponent today.

(Time expired)

Albert Electorate, Education

Mr BOOTHMAN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister outline to the House what this government is doing to ensure that our children have the best education today and into the future in the great electorate of Albert?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for the question and I acknowledge his passion for education in all its forms. That is exemplified by the holistic nature of education and that we have to provide all students with real career opportunities, including those who may not be at all stages of their lives academically minded. Mark Boothman, the honourable member for Albert, has been instrumental in setting up certificate II qualifications for students at Windaroo Valley State High School and Albert River Community Farm in horticulture. Already, 25 participants are relishing the chance to get experience and knowledge that could lead to a career in landscaping and plant nurseries. That ties in very well with the mantra of the Newman government about education being from crayon to career, but that different students at different times are going to have different needs, which is why we have this passionate interest from the local member for Albert in making sure that, if people want to get training qualifications—certificate IIs or IIIIs—that we are going to support local communities in their desire to have that.

The original Pimpama State School is the one of the oldest schools in Queensland. Just a few months ago I attended that school for our principal roundtable with Marius Marx, who is very proud of this immaculate little school. For people driving from Brisbane to the Gold Coast, Pimpama was a little stop halfway down. Now, it is a vibrant community. We had to spend \$1.7 million repairing the 12 state schools in Albert. As I have mentioned, there was a black hole for school maintenance across the state. It was \$300 million. They did not care about the state of our state schools. But Pimpama State School looked immaculate.

There is a great diversity of schools in the electorate of Albert. I know that this week Beenleigh Special School is having its sports day presentation. It is the only special school on the south side until you get to Southport Special School, which is why in the Schools Planning Commission we have also made sure that we want to plan for more special schools or schools that are going to cater for students with those extra needs. Beenleigh Special School has been built on a very difficult site. Whenever I see the principal, Roselynne Anderson, with the honourable member for Albert she is always speaking to me about the challenges for that cohort of students to be able to attend that school. That is something on which we are working very hard.

In the member's electorate of Albert, we have invested in more than 200 additional prep teacher aide hours so that our preppies have the one-on-one support that they need to kick-start their learning lives. In the Great Results Guarantee, which I have mentioned—money straight to schools without anything off the top—there is \$2.1 million for Cedar Creek State School all the way through to Mount Warren Park State School. It was to Cedar Creek State School that Mark Boothman, as the new member, took me straight after the floods. That school had suffered significant damage in 2012. That is why we are making sure that we are getting services to all of those schools in the fine electorate of Albert.

Malanda-Upper Barron Road, Upgrade

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Minister, is the Malanda-Upper Barron road being considered for upgrading under the recent funding announcement aimed at getting Queenslanders home safer and sooner?

Madam SPEAKER: I call the minister. There is one minute on the clock.

Mr EMERSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do thank the member for Dalrymple for the question. As we have indicated, we have a very comprehensive plan across the whole of our network, but particularly in relation to roads, including the Bruce Highway and major arterial roads, to deliver better roads for the entire state of Queensland. As I indicated in an earlier question, our spending this year is \$4.8 billion. That is 37 per cent more than the previous government was planning to spend this year. We are delivering on crucial infrastructure across Queensland, but particularly on roads. When we talk about infrastructure in regional and rural Queensland that means roads. That is what those communities understand infrastructure to be. We are delivering record spending this year on the Bruce Highway. The amount of \$18 billion is part of our QTRIP plan to deliver much needed roads for communities across Queensland.

(Time expired)

Madam SPEAKER: Order! The time for questions has expired.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Strong Choices

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.00 am): Today I asked a very clear question to the Premier. That question was will the Premier confirm that Crosby Textor had an integral role in formulating the government's Strong Choices campaign. The Premier answered yes to that question, but there was a second part to that question which was how much were they paid and what were the sources of the other consultants and how much are they being paid.

I raise this issue because I think Queenslanders have a fundamental right to be concerned when Liberal Party strategists are being employed to do the Treasurer's bidding. The government is being very tight lipped about who is receiving taxpayers' money for doing work in relation to their Strong Choices campaign. I think many Queenslanders share my view that this is a fundamental waste of taxpayers' money. My challenge to the government today is to release the details of who is being paid and how much are they being paid. This is a government that has said it would be open and transparent. In fact, I think the words were it was going to be the most open and transparent government in Australia. If it is being open and transparent, how much is Crosby Textor being paid, how much are the other consultants being paid and why will the Treasurer not release these facts and figures to the Queensland community?

Once again, in the wake of the Stafford by-election, the LNP has deployed 'Operation Boring'. Obviously that message has gone out far and wide to every single LNP member who sits in this House. What is it about conservatives and the use of military terms? Time and time again we see Tony Abbott referring to military titles. Now we have the Premier using the term 'Operation Boring'. Those opposite do not like the terms 'Operation Listen' or 'Operation Sack Jarrod'. We know that the Premier has 'Operation Moggill' firmly in his sights and I have been advised that the Premier is giving his support to 'Operation Redlands'. We will wait to see details in relation to 'Operation Redlands' and 'Operation Moggill' in the not too distant future. I have heard that these 'operations' might be delayed until later in the year after parliament has risen and in the Christmas season when things are a little quiet.

Madam SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry to interrupt. Please pause the clock. Members, there are too many conversations in the chamber. Please take them outside. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Today I want to reflect on the LNP record over the last 2½ years. It is a dismal record. It is a record that I was pleased to recount to the party conference on the weekend. This record needs to be remembered. We will be reminding Queenslanders each and every day up until the election about this government's record. When the Premier talks about jobs, Queenslanders need to be reminded that it was this government that, after telling public servants before the last election they had nothing to fear, axed up to 20,000 jobs. We have also seen a slowing economy and skyrocketing unemployment. The Premier said that he would be moving towards unemployment levels of four per cent. It is going in the wrong direction. It is heading towards 6.8 per cent. We are not seeing job creation programs across the state. What we are seeing is this government continuing to open infrastructure projects built by the former Labor government. I find it quite hypocritical that the Minister for Transport condemns the work of the former Labor government, yet we see his smiling face on the TV hopping on the Gold Coast Rapid Transit project. The Gold Coast Rapid Transit project was built by Labor. We will remind Gold Coast

residents of that fact. Those opposite can have the smiling faces, they can cut the ribbons, but Queenslanders will be reminded of the fact that it was Labor that introduced these job-generating projects. It was the infrastructure programs that kept Queenslanders in jobs, especially during the global financial crisis, which people seem to want to sweep under the rug.

We will also continue to remind Queenslanders about the trashing of democracy in this state. We will continue to remind Queenslanders that the current acting chair of the CCC, Dr Ken Levy, remains in that position despite the fact that after the Stafford by-election the Premier said that the chair would now have bipartisan support. Dr Ken Levy does not have bipartisan support and should be removed. I want to know if there is a reason why the government still wants Dr Ken Levy there. Are there any matters before the CCC at the moment involving any LNP members or any current members of this House? Is that why Dr Ken Levy is still there?

We know that secret cash donations are happening across this state. They are happening because this government changed the electoral donation laws. This government raised the threshold from \$1,000 to \$12,400. This is the record of this government. With the revelations of ICAC I would not be surprised if the government of New South Wales moved its electoral donation laws towards the law Queensland had previously. This is a government that will have tens of thousands of dollars in its election war chest for the next state election that no-one knows who has donated. This is the trashing of democracy in this state. This is a government that will do whatever and say whatever to stay in power. This is a government that will not be open and transparent. This is a government that will not say who is donating to it. This is a government that is returning to the days of brown paper bags where no-one knows anything and Queenslanders are kept in the dark.

Mr Pitt: This is a desperate government.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. This is a desperate government. We will also be reminding Queenslanders about the fights that this government has picked with its community: the fights with the doctors, the ambulance officers, the construction workers, the public housing tenants and the pensioners. Who can forget the recent state budget, when the largest group of people that this government decided to pick a fight with was the pensioners of this state? I can guarantee one thing: the pensioners of Queensland will not forget it. Who is going to forget the fights with the judiciary and the all-time low, the fights with the legal profession?

However, one thing that stands out that Queenslanders will not forget is the soaring cost of living, because this government went to an election saying that it was going to lower the cost of living, yet we have seen skyrocketing electricity bills. The Premier can stand in the parliament and smile, but it was he who said that he would lower the costs. Time and time again, we have seen electricity bills going through the roof and families struggling to make ends meet. The families in my electorate are doing it tough and they are doing it tough in the electorates of Mackay, Mulgrave, Woodridge, South Brisbane, Logan and every part of this state. Queenslanders are finding it very hard to make ends meet.

We very clearly asked the Premier how the assets sell-off will impact household electricity prices. We asked if there has been any modelling done in relation to this issue. Once again, there was no answer. Queenslanders deserve to know. If it is selling large chunks of our electricity industry to the private sector, how can the government guarantee that electricity prices will not go up? If it has not done the modelling, we simply do not know. Once again, it is on a need-to-know basis. This government is hiding the facts and hiding the truth from Queenslanders. We will continue to raise these issues on behalf of Queenslanders. In the lead-up to the next election we will be talking about jobs, we will be talking about education and we will be talking about health. There will be a very stark contrast between what Labor stands for and what this government simply does not.

Electricity Prices

 **Hon. MF McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (11.11 am): Today it is a pleasure to follow the Leader of the Opposition in this House. She raised issues that the people of Queensland will remember in the upcoming election campaign. I will run through a few things that they will remember. Let us remember the fake Tahitian prince and the \$16.6 million that he got away with under the Labor government. Let us remember the \$1.253 billion Health payroll debacle that was laid at the feet of the Labor government and the shambolic attempts it made to try to rectify that situation, which derived from a \$6 million initial cost to a \$1.25 billion blow-out that we now have to deal with. Let us remind Queenslanders of the \$80 billion debt and deficit left by the Labor government. Let us remind Queenslanders of the interest bill of \$450,000 per hour that we have to

take up the cudgels for. Let us remind the people of this state that debt and deficit is in the DNA of the Labor Party. Let us remind them that they had a power price increase of 83 per cent under the Beattie/Bligh governments. Let us remind them that Peter Beattie promised that we would save \$150 when he deregulated the retail sector in the south-east corner, but that saving never came through. Let us remind them of the \$7,000 tax slug on the purchase of a home, which was imposed upon Queenslanders by the Labor Party. Let us remind them that between 2008 and 2012 the registration of a six-cylinder vehicle rose from \$107 to \$443 and that public transport fares were increasing by 15 per cent per annum.

It is the height of hypocrisy for members of the Labor Party to stand in this House and fail to acknowledge that clearly the cost-of-living issues were a result of their failings over 20 long years in government, yet they tell us that they know the way forward. I recall two radio interviews, one with the member for Mulgrave on 4BC and the other with the Leader of the Opposition on the ABC. Patrick Condren asked the member for Mulgrave to explain his policy for energy and electricity prices. He said something along the lines of, 'Well, I don't have to do that now'. Patrick Condren said, 'I'll give you two minutes, sport, to roll out the policy'. He mumbled and he fumbled and he bumbled, but he got nowhere at all. I think he mentioned solar power in there somewhere. It was a good giggle and a good laugh. Steve Austin asked the Leader of the Opposition if it was, in fact, the case that she was going to lower electricity prices. My recollection is that she said, 'I'm not going to promise that,' or words to that effect. If I recall correctly, then she was asked whether she was going to reintroduce the solar panel rebate or fit. Again I think her words were, 'I'm not going to promise that'.

It appears to me that they have absolutely no plan whatsoever. In fact, during his reply speech to the 2013-14 budget, the member for Mulgrave said that the Labor Party would put in place a productivity commission to deal with electricity. Following that, he said that in the next few months they would outline more plans, or words to that effect. That was in June 2013. To my knowledge, there is nothing on the website in regards to policy. I do not think they even made a submission to the IRP or any other body looking at what we can do regarding electricity prices. I do recall the ETU made a submission. We all know the ETU is the real powerbroker in relation to the Labor Party. It will appoint the leader. If we win government in March 2015, we know it will not be the Labor Party members of parliament who will appoint their leader. It will be the old union mates, the boys from down the street, the old lads gathering together to work out who is to be the leader. The Labor Party members of parliament are being sidelined. John Mickel made it quite clear that their proposal in relation to the selection of a leader post the election campaign, if they do not win, was in essence a shambolic mess. We have come to expect that from the Labor Party in this state. For 20 out of 22 years, they had the cudgel and they blew the budget.

(Time expired)

Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative

 Hon. AP CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (11.16 am): The Newman government has a strong plan for Queensland, particularly for communities in regional and rural Queensland. We are committed to supporting and growing the resources and agriculture pillars of the Queensland economy. The Great Artesian Basin plays an important role in sustaining and developing economies and communities in inland Australia, particularly across a huge area of regional and rural Queensland. Water from the GAB supports town water supplies, pastoral and resource activities, and natural springs of significant cultural and environmental value. The Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative, or GABSI program, is a \$450 million national program that has been running since 1999, aimed at reducing the uncontrolled discharge of the basin's precious water resources and arresting declining aquifer pressure. Under GABSI, the Queensland and Commonwealth governments have jointly provided funding for landholders to rehabilitate uncontrolled bores and replace bore drains with piping. This program has been a great success.

Unfortunately, today I am disappointed to advise that in the absence of a clear, ongoing commitment from the Commonwealth the Queensland government cannot sustain its continued operation of the GABSI program. Notice of the conclusion of the program is now being provided to Department of Natural Resources and Mines employees in GABSI units and a wind-down plan is being implemented. The last bores to be rehabilitated under the program will be completed by the end of this year. To date, approximately 648, or 70 per cent, of the bores in Queensland have been rehabilitated and 12,600 kilometres, or 70 per cent, of bore drains have been capped and piped. However, there are still approximately 250 uncontrolled bores and 5,500 kilometres of bore drains that discharge an estimated 75,000 megalitres per annum of groundwater from the GAB.

A review of the GABSI program undertaken by consultants to the former Commonwealth government recommended that the GABSI program cease in June of this year without completing planned works or fulfilling planned expenditure. This report came as a great shock to many stakeholders closely associated with the GABSI program. I am extremely disappointed with the narrow-minded views and lack of practical understanding of the value of the GABSI program documented by this report and I reject the recommendations strongly. I have consistently argued that the GABSI program should continue its work to cap and pipe uncontrolled bores. Queensland stakeholders unanimously support such an extension. The loss of the current momentum that this short-sighted decision will cause will be very difficult to re-establish within the GABSI unit due to the loss of skilled employees. Continued collaborative investment from the Commonwealth government is essential to continue to improve the management of this scarce and valuable resource, as well as to ensure the long-term viability of industry, town water supplies for local communities and environmental and cultural values.

In May 2013 the former federal Labor government played politics, ignored local industry and communities and discontinued funding of more than \$22 million for the program. I wrote to the former Labor environment minister, Tony Burke, in April 2013 and former Labor environment minister, Mark Butler, in August 2013 asking them to reconsider the former government's decision. Unfortunately, they would not.

I have also written twice this year to the Commonwealth minister seeking assurances that the GABSI program would be extended. I am, unfortunately, yet to receive a definitive response. I continue to urge the Commonwealth government to reconsider its position and reinstate funding for this important program.

In the absence of this commitment to date, the Queensland government has had no option but to commence with the cessation of the program and the dissolution of the expert unit that has undertaken on-the-ground works within my Department of Natural Resources and Mines. The program cannot rely solely on state funding so it is imperative that we see Commonwealth funding continue for this critical program.

This has been one of the most successful natural resource management programs, conducted in partnership between the Commonwealth and state governments and landholders. It has played a vital role in preserving the sustainability of regional livelihoods resulting from bore rehabilitation and improved access to water. Industry has benefited from a secure water supply and increased pressure. The GABSI program has promoted improved land and water management outcomes, enabled improved grazing management for both cattle and sheep, improved the health of springs and allowed for more effective control of prickly acacia.

The Queensland government remains committed to the program. We will continue our contribution to the end of 2014.

(Time expired)

Gladstone Electorate, Crime Statistics

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (11.21 am): In my local paper, the *Observer*, on Thursday, 14 August the front-page headline read 'Crime time—six houses a day targeted by brazen thieves'. The article went on to say that the crime statistics for break and enters in effectively my electorate—the Gladstone police area is much larger—were as high as 2,000 a year. That morning, I had a phone call from the inspector who was very disturbed by that headline given that the actual figure is 300 a year. One of his officers had contacted the journalist to speak to him and ensure a correction was made.

On Saturday, 16 August on page 4 of the paper there was a much smaller article headed 'Police clarify break-in figures'. The article stated—

The material—

that was the material that formed the headline—

was gathered from Queensland Police's publicly accessible Reported Offences Rates section on its website.

The *Observer* published data from the website in good faith.

The data was calculated as crimes per suburb, leading to the conclusion that 2000 homes were broken into over a 12-month period.

However, it should have been calculated as crimes per 100,000 head of population.

Under this calculation, the data shows that during the 2013/2014 financial year, the number of homes and business break-ins reported to police was: Agnes Water, 13; Biloela, 36; Calliope, 16; Gladstone, 203; Miriam Vale, 9; Mount Larcom, 7; Tannum Sands, 34.

The total is 318.

Can I say that that is a significant difference in terms of the figures that were reported. It is of regret that the first report—admittedly published on a Thursday, but that is a high circulation day for the paper—was on the front page and the correction was published in a smaller article on page 4 of Saturday's paper, which is probably their highest circulation day. I certainly hope that the people who read the first article read the second one. The correction article went on to explain—

Crime Services Detective Inspector Darrin Shadlow reminded all people to ensure that doors, windows and garages are securely locked when you are home or away.

That is common sense for all of us who own houses. My concern is that the police in Gladstone could feel very much undermined and betrayed by that initial article. Almost without exception, police officers in Gladstone—and I am sure in other electorates—do an excellent job. They have been under a lot of pressure lately with quite a significant FIFO population as well as a lot of workers on Curtis Island who come over to Gladstone on the weekend to 'let off steam'.

We need additional police to cope with that change. I am very grateful to this government that they have introduced a safe-night precinct for the Gladstone area. That will be welcomed. Certainly much of that type of crime is carried out in the main street which is the area over which this declaration will be made.

What I would like to say is this. Police in the Gladstone region do a wonderful job. Are there residents who have had a negative confrontation with a police officer? I am sure there are because we are all human beings. The figure for property crime in my electorate is 318, not 2,000 as reported. I would remind, as did the police, all people who own property to be very careful and mindful when they leave to ensure that their property is secure. In particular, I want older people to know that they are safe, that police are vigilant and that if they keep their premises as secure as is reasonable they can enjoy quietly their home and their community knowing that the police in the Gladstone region are on the ball, are looking after them and are responding to property crime in a timely and appropriate manner.

Democracy

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (11.26 am): History it is often said can turn on a critical moment or invention. Around 2,600 years ago, when ancient Greeks lived on the southern eastern fringes of Europe, they laid claim to an invention that, according to John Keane, now ranks in historical importance with the wheel, the printing press, the steam engine and the cloning of stem cells. Born of resistance to tyranny, their claimed invention at first caused no great stir. Few spotted its novelty. Some condemned it for bringing chaos into the world. Nobody predicted its universal appeal. The invention was a potent form of wishful thinking that is still with us today. The Greeks called it demokratia. Winston Churchill said in 1947 that democracy is the worst form of government, except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.

It is very rare to rise in this chamber and support the effort of all 89 members. Regardless of our political and ideological beliefs, we all share one binding belief. That is the importance of a robust democracy. I listened intently to as many maiden speeches as I could and a recurring theme of all members was to try to make a difference to not only our local constituencies but to society overall. We all share a strong belief in the necessity for robust debate in order to have the democratically elected government of the day perform.

The democratic process is hardly perfect, but it has proven to be resilient and produces the most desirable form of government. It is the purpose of this speech to defend it with gusto. Poll data reveals Australia's waning interest in politics and, of far more concern, a decline in support for the actual concept of democracy itself. It reveals a significant decline in support for democracy over the past seven years.

An Australian National University, ANU, study conducted in partnership with the Social Research Centre found satisfaction with democracy slumped from 86 per cent in 2007 to 72 per cent when attitudes were surveyed again in June of this year. Early this year the annual Lowy Institute poll of Australian attitudes found 40 per cent no longer believed democracy is the best form of

government. The Lowy Institute poll asked respondents to share how engaged they were in Australian politics and what they thought of the survey results. According to the Lowy Institute's Alex Oliver—

We have had long decades of prosperity and no major wars. I think people have lost touch with what democracy means. I think people have to modify or lower their expectations of what democracy is—it is adversarial and full of compromise. I think people have unrealistic expectations.

The reality is that modern Australia over the last two decades has been well served by the democratic process because we have had nearly 23 years of continuous economic growth. The early reforms of the Hawke-Keating years followed by the outstanding efforts during the Howard-Costello years have led to a period of unmatched prosperity for all Australians. Tragically, we only have to tune into the nightly news on television to see what other forms of government are achieving. Democracy is a fragile, precious gift. Over the past century more than 100,000 men and women have died defending the ideals, traditions and values of the Australian way of life. What holds this way of life together? It is the democratic system of government we choose to adopt. As I wrote in my maiden speech, what makes me so proud to be a Queenslander and an Australian is that we have a robust democracy decided by the power of the ballot box and not by the sound of Kalishnikovs. We should never take this fact for granted. Indeed, we are one of the very few democracies that have been forged through ink on paper rather than blood spilt on the battlefield. Democracy is a precious gift that has been taken for granted by too many Australians.

I concur with the comment that Terry Sweetman wrote in the *Courier-Mail* on 17 August that 'It is truly bizarre that we send our best and finest to far-flung places to plant democracy in barren fields when so many are willing to let it wither at home.' Why, then, did nearly 20 per cent of eligible voters—about three million Australians—effectively opt out of the democratic process at the last federal election by either failing to enrol to vote, not showing up to vote or voting informally? There is a very big difference between apathy and disenchantment and disengagement. I am always reminded of the famous line that democracy is sometimes hard to observe, but I sure know anarchy when I see it.

Unemployment

 **Mr PITTS** (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.31 am): Queensland's unemployment rate in July increased to 6.8 per cent seasonally adjusted or 6.5 per cent trend. On either measure, Queensland now has the highest unemployment rate since 2003—the highest in 11 years. On either measure Queensland's jobless rate is well above the national average of 6.4 per cent seasonally adjusted or 6.1 per cent trend. In opposition the LNP described an unemployment rate of 5.4 per cent under Labor as a 'fail'. If they said that when the jobless rate was 5.4 per cent, what do they say now when it is 6.8 per cent?

There are now more than 37,000 Queenslanders who have joined the unemployment queue since the election. The number of unemployed in Queensland in July is the highest in the ABS series, dating back to 1978. It is our young people who are being hit hardest. Youth unemployment has risen to 13.7 per cent in Queensland, with around one in five young people in Cairns and Ipswich unable to find any work. There is no spinning these figures, as the Treasurer and Premier consistently try to do. The Treasurer and Premier have been talking about the trend number of jobs created over the last year following the worst year for jobs growth in this state in more than two decades. However, we hear no mention of the fact that only six per cent of these jobs are full time. As shadow Treasurer, the member for Clayfield used to describe these as 'one hour a week jobs' and said people should focus on full-time jobs. On a seasonally adjusted basis, there are 14,200 fewer full-time jobs than in March 2012. The Treasurer knows there are fewer full-time jobs than at the election, although he was unable to admit it when asked repeatedly on 4BC last week. The Treasurer's response was to say that asset sales are the answer. This is in direct contradiction to the Premier, who said in May that job losses 'happen in privatisation'.

The LNP say that a record \$33.6 billion asset sell-off would create 25,000 new jobs over six years. We say this is laughable, as they continue to have no plan to respond to the loss of 12,600 jobs in July alone—the biggest fall in employment in the nation. So we have the Treasurer saying we have to sell assets to create jobs and the Premier saying that selling assets will lead to job losses. But I should cut the Treasurer some slack. Maybe he was talking about the jobs he has created for financial elites—jobs in Sydney and Melbourne, jobs for multinational investment banks and legal and accounting firms, all working on his asset sales scoping studies. We know that the Treasurer has created many jobs for spin doctors and LNP hacks down south, including Crosby Textor, as part of his \$15.4 million Strong Choices taxpayer funded propaganda campaign. The Treasurer now has his own FIFO workforce in pinstripe suits to do his work for him.

The Treasurer keeps asking what Labor's plan for jobs is because he needs some help. How is this for a plan? How about his government stop spending tens of millions of taxpayers' money in secret on asset sales without an election mandate? Instead, how about he use this money to reinstate the job-creating and supporting programs that they have scrapped such as Skilling Queenslanders for Work and put in place some real programs to help our young people such as Labor's Ready for Work policy?

Nobody believes the Treasurer's claim that the LNP's scoping studies are needed before an election, apparently to inform Queenslanders. Tens of millions of dollars are being spent in secret because this Newman LNP government does not want Queenslanders to know that it made up its mind on asset sales long ago. We need look only at the secrecy around the electricity network privatisation model. Despite saying at the last election that they had a plan to pay down debt that did not rely on asset sales, after the election their plan was exposed—the largest asset sell-off in our state's history. There was one—call it a policy if you like—that we heard about from the LNP before the election. In response to a recent report from Deloitte, the Treasurer said that the report reinforced his government's four pillars policy. Did the Treasurer even read the report? It was talking about the diversification of Queensland's economy and the next wave of investment in international education and wealth management, not just gas, agribusiness and tourism. The Treasurer probably has not read his latest Treasury Corporation investor booklet either which points out that these so-called four pillars make up only 27 per cent of the economy and 22 per cent of employment. We never heard the Treasurer quote Deloitte when they said that his government 'overdid it, leaving their austerity weighing on economic growth'. Essentially, Deloitte said that the LNP's cuts slowed the economy and are a factor behind current economic weakness.

The only party with a plan for our modern diversified, service based economy is Labor, with policies like Advance Queensland, Jobs Queensland, Building Queensland and Skilling Queenslanders for Work. Labor is the only party that has listened to the message from Queenslanders—the message that was sent to all politicians, not just Labor, at the last election, that is, they do not want their income-producing assets sold. They want them to stay in public hands. They want the benefit of today's money—\$2 billion a year—coming back to the taxpayer and back to this state. At the next election, the choice will be clear: an LNP government focused on asset sales or a Labor government focused on jobs.

North Stradbroke Island, Economic Transition Group

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (11.36 am): It is my pleasure today to advise the parliament that the LNP government has announced the formation of an economic transition group to steer North Stradbroke Island through its economic transition to a broadbased post mining economy. Having the support of the government to form the NSI Economic Transition Group means that we can better plan for the island's economic future. Much work will need to be done if we are to ensure a smooth transition over coming years from mining to an alternative economy, but unlike the previous government's political plan, our plan is the only plan that allows island residents the time and opportunity to successfully make the transition without falling into a destructive local recession.

This plan to allow sandmining further time and to not shut Straddie down supports the wishes of the 90 per cent majority of island residents including most Indigenous families. It allows sufficient time to grow alternative businesses and economies. To achieve this aim, we will need all parties to work collaboratively towards a common goal: a sustainable future for the island and its people. Island residents, community groups and small, medium and large businesses must work together if the island's full potential and a sustainable economy is to be realised. The formation of an economic future group will run in parallel to the well-established Quandamooka round table, formed to address the implementation of the important ILUA on North Stradbroke Island with the Quandamooka people. I envisage that both groups will work together on a vision and strategy for the island's future.

Membership for the NSIETG will be drawn mainly from business leaders and groups who have both an existing economic or business interest in the island and a vision for its future. The government is in the process of approaching key people to be potential members. Prominent businesses and other entities such as Straddie Camping, QYAC, Straddie chamber, tourism and transport operators, the University of Queensland, Sibelco, Redland City Council and federal entities may be invited to work together to investigate and help plan a viable future for the island.

I want to thank the Deputy Premier, Jeff Seeney, for committing a senior officer from his Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning to be part of the group. The department will also provide support such as economic analysis, economic strategies, development

facilitation and land use planning and development. These changes are compatible with the government's stated aim of a more broadbased economic development. The department leading the way, informed by key locals, will mean the government can plan and deliver the services, infrastructure and opportunities that local residents want.

The structure of the ETG is different to the spaghetti mess that Labor tried to set up under DERM. DERM's powerless and insipid approach achieved very little but typically spent a lot of taxpayer funds and resources that achieved little. The Redland City Council has also been invited to be represented on the ETG via the Mayor, Karen Williams. Councillor Williams has advised that she looks forward to playing a role in the transition process. Her role as co-chair of the ETG, together with me, will ensure a wide-ranging, whole-of-government approach. I agree with Councillor Williams when she stated, 'The formation of an economic transition group with appropriate representation of government, business and the community to advise government is critical to the future planning needs and economic development of the island.' Once the ETG is finalised, one of its first duties will be to consider key elements of the former ETT and to adapt or adopt anything that is still useful.

The announcement of the economic transition group comes on the back of the government's amendments to the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Amendment and Another Act 2013 that allows sandmining to continue, plus plans to upgrade Toondah Harbour and to start a Rural Fire Brigade on Straddie among other exciting developments.

Only the LNP has a strong plan for Straddie residents. Only the LNP has a plan to save their jobs, a plan that supports and grows the local economy in a carefully managed economic transition, one that manages the national parks together with the Quandamooka people and that grows tourism, education and Indigenous opportunity. Labor plans to cut jobs, starting with 250 mining workers, followed by the hundreds of small business jobs that will go as a part of another Labor recession that we had to have. Labor's plans are to sack 150 Indigenous workers and send them from good, paying jobs that provide a good standard of living and sense of pride back to the dole queues. Labor and the Greens are planning for the demise of the island's economy and jobs. This government's decision to establish an ETG provides the local advice and inputs to government and is part of our strong plan that will deliver a bright future for the people of North Stradbroke Island.

Royalties for the Regions

 Hon. TS MULHERIN (Mackay—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.41 am): Last Wednesday the Deputy Premier announced the opening of round 4 of his so-called Royalties for the Regions fund. For quite some time the opposition has been pointing out the fact that, despite the name, this is not a real Royalties for the Regions fund as exists in Western Australia. There is no reallocation or hypothecation of royalties to this fund and the Newman government has been double counting this money at every opportunity, saying it is new money for responding to disasters, then announcing the same money again as Royalties for the Regions.

What was remarkable about this media release on Wednesday was the following text. It states—

Under Round 4, all councils and state government agencies can apply for funding for projects that support economic growth in their region ...

We know that the Deputy Premier has already backtracked partially on this after realising that he could not get away with giving the so-called Royalties for the Regions funding to councils in South-East Queensland. However, I am yet to hear the Deputy Premier backtrack on his proposal to allow state government agencies to apply for this fund as well. To have state governments engaging effectively in a budget bidding process in competition with regional mining communities is farcical. It is further evidence that the so-called Royalties for the Regions is nothing more than an LNP pork-barrelling fund. I have never seen anything like this. I wonder what the departmental officials are calling this. Is it the 'Seeney budget review committee'?

I call on the Deputy Premier here today to end this nonsense and change these guidelines back so that the state government departments are not competing with regional councils, some of which are being bled dry by this government. I speak of councils like Isaac Regional Council which the Deputy Premier continues to try to bully by withholding Royalties for the Regions funding in exchange for getting what he wants on the development of the Belyando estate. The Isaac Regional Council area has around half of Queensland's coal production yet it has only received \$1 million, or less than half a per cent of funding allocated so far. Half of Queensland's coal production and less than half a per cent of the funding from the so-called Royalties for the Regions fund—this just shows what a pork-barrelling joke this fund is.

Apparently, in the Deputy Premier's mind, Gympie is the centre of our resource industry in Queensland; it is Gympie and the Mary Valley Rattler that are crucial to unlocking economic growth and increasing the output of our resources industry. What a load of complete and utter rubbish! For the Deputy Premier's benefit, the old Gympie gold mine is now a museum. If the government wanted to fund the Mary Rattler it should have a local government fund, not a Royalties for the Regions fund. The Royalties for the Regions is to help those communities that are impacted directly by mining and also the downstream communities.

If we look at North-West Queensland we see that it has received just over three per cent of Royalties for the Regions funding. That is just over three per cent for the entire North West Minerals Province of the state. How much of this fund has the south-east of the state received? It has received more than half of the funding.

I say to the Deputy Premier that it is time to end this facade. He should either rename this fund the 'LNP pork-barrel fund' or change the guidelines to immediately stop the state government agencies applying for this funding. He should change the guidelines so that the resource regions that need this funding most are provided with proper consideration.

Workplace Health and Safety; Cultural Diversity

 **Mrs OSTAPOVITCH** (Stretton—LNP) (11.45 am): Last month I had the privilege of representing the Attorney-General at the Zero Harm at Work workshop at Brisbane Technology Park within my electorate of Stretton. About 80 people were in attendance to collaborate on how companies can make their workplace safer for their employees. They included Deputy Director-General, Dr Simon Blackwood; Mr Gus Taddeo from QMI Solutions, which is another great company in my electorate; Mr Mick Crowe, Work Health and Safety Board member, Chief Executive Officer of G&S Engineering Services Mackay and former chair of the Mackay health and safety committee, who organised a live feed back to Mackay.

A year earlier I also attended a Zero Harm at Work forum with the Attorney-General. It was to be of great value to me when the Finance and Administration Committee was given the task of reforming the workplace health and safety legislation. Those reforms have seen an average 17 per cent reduction in insurance for businesses. I vividly recall that during one of our public hearings a couple of union representatives made a bizarre proclamation that employers did not care if their employees or the general public had a slab of concrete fall on top of them. At the time I questioned the other nine union representatives in attendance as to whether they really believed that employers did not care about the safety of their employees. All but one remained silent.

As I listened to the presentations by companies like Capral, the largest aluminium extrusion plant in Australia, and JBS, I could not help but think how wrong the unions and the opposition have it about employers in Queensland. Throughout the morning I heard from management level representatives terminology such as 'if we injured someone' with the connotation that it was the company's responsibility. Later I questioned the senior managers as to whether they believed the company or the individual was responsible for the injury. They told me it had to be a team effort with employees taking due care for their safety but that behavioural change starts at management level. They support the Kaizen approach, which includes a 'caring' tool kit. Capral spoke about giving employees the questions to answer themselves regarding safety and prevention. We watched a presentation of interviews and one Capral employee stated, 'Rather than getting told what to do, we come up with our own solutions.'

The motto of many companies is work safe, home safe. Many follow the Lean process and describe this as a journey. Apparently this process works in reducing injuries. In a workplace of 300, Capral has reduced injuries from 10 a year ago to four. They recognise that this is four too many and they and others in the room work towards the goal of zero. What a wonderful goal to have: zero harm at work. I wonder if the unions would then acknowledge that employers really do care about their employees' health and safety.

To change the subject completely as I still have a couple of minutes—but it is still a matter of public interest—may I announce that next week is Cultural Diversity Week right across Queensland. I am proud to be the host of another Taiwan Festival in the Stretton electorate. Performers come from Taiwan to perform at the Sunnybank Hills Shopping Centre on Thursday night and then again on Saturday, 6 September at Calamvale Central Shopping Centre. Everyone is welcome.

Charlton Wellcamp Industrial Estate

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (11.50 am): The enthusiasm shown by the minister for agriculture, Mr John McVeigh, for the Charlton Industrial Estate near Toowoomba would appear extremely curious. Despite the Charlton Industrial Estate not being in Minister McVeigh's own electorate of Toowoomba South—it is in the Condamine electorate—and despite an industrial development such as this having little to do with producing better agriculture such as beef, wool or grain, Charlton would appear to be the minister's favourite project. Once you understand that Mr McVeigh's brother Tom is a major shareholder in the Charlton Industrial Pty Ltd company, one of the primary developers of the Charlton project, then things start to explain themselves. You see, Toowoomba is a place where they like to put family first.

In September 2010 the media reported that Mr McVeigh, then a councillor with the Toowoomba Regional Council, informed the council he was concerned that the then state government was hindering the development of the Charlton Wellcamp Industrial area and that those associated with the development of the Charlton Wellcamp area as an industrial and freight centre were frustrated with its progress. He said that they want to facilitate the signing of projects. He said—
We have investors and developers ready, and there are businesses ready to sign projects.

By 25 June 2012 the new minister for agriculture, Mr McVeigh—now a member of this government—showed that he was just warming up. Two months after being elected he told the Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce that the project was a vital piece of Queensland's infrastructure. He noted that he had already met with Minister Emerson to raise issues around the intersection of O'Mara Road and the Warrego Highway, and he added that he was pleased to say that Minister Emerson had been very well briefed on the issue and recognised it as a priority. I will just bet he was! It was the minister's brother's first project and, you see, up in Toowoomba they know that you always put family first. By May 2013 McVeigh was urging local schools threatened with closure to put every effort into proving their value. Suddenly the local Charlton school was on the list of schools being considered for closure. The *Toowoomba Chronicle* stated—

Mr McVeigh said on-the-ground information—such as Charlton's position in an area of burgeoning industrial growth—could help sway the final culling list.

By October 2013 Charlton struck the pot of gold at the end of the state government rainbow when it was announced that the Charlton Wellcamp Industrial Area was to be funded—you guessed it—by the Royalties for the Regions program. According to a government media statement—

Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning Jeff Seeney said that Toowoomba Regional Council would get \$10 million from the second round of the R4R program.

That is almost half the cost of the entire \$21 million O'Mara Road upgrade. Minister McVeigh was right there beside him, telling the media that the Royalties for the Regions program was providing real benefits for local councils in Queensland. He said that it was great to hear that Toowoomba Regional Council's application had won funding. According to Mr McVeigh, O'Mara Road was an example of infrastructure pressure and remarkably likened it to the pressures on James Street and the Toowoomba range. By 13 December of that year Miss Lavelle, the head teacher at Charlton Primary School, was saying goodbye to her pupils. She said—

We sort of hoped they would change their minds, because there were a million other schools that they could have picked, but they didn't.

You see, up in Toowoomba they put family first, but it helps if it is your own family and not those families from little country schools outside your town. Charlton school was shut down despite the finding from the Queensland Schools Planning Commission that three new primary schools and an additional high school would be required in Toowoomba over the next 20 years.

On 19 February, two months later, the media reported that an application was lodged with the Toowoomba Regional Council to build a 4,700 square metre shopping centre at Charlton. Yes, that is right next door to the newly closed school. The development application noted that the supermarket would meet the local convenience needs of employees in the surrounding industrial areas. By 9 May the minister for agriculture was back at it again, turning the first sod at the Charlton project site and spruiking the virtues of a large industrial estate. He said that the enterprise 'has the potential to create 12,000 to 15,000 jobs as a major industrial expansion area servicing the Surat Basin and Darling Downs'. It goes on and on. On 6 August it was announced that the former site of the Charlton Primary School would become a new fire station which all of a sudden had a secure water supply, so the property all of a sudden had a major water supply. They put family first in Toowoomba: that is what the Minister McVeigh does for his family. There is a smell blowing from the Charlton Industrial Estate and—

(Time expired)

Whitsunday Electorate, International Airport

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (11.55 am): This morning I rise to talk about the growing need for an international airport midway along the Queensland coast between Cairns and the south-east corner of our great state. This has been the vision of people from my community over many decades. In fact, it was the likes of the late Ian Wood, a former long-time Liberal senator based in Mackay where he also served as mayor, who strongly advocated for an international airport. Senator Wood, also known as the cycling senator for his use of a bicycle in getting around town as he did not drive a car, also owned and operated a highly successful travel agency. Furthermore, it was Senator Wood who was instrumental in developing the town common as a site for the Mackay Airport, and he also paved the way for a tourist resort on Lindeman Island where the Whitehorse company is currently in the process of building a new resort. In the days of Senator Wood, Mackay, along with Cairns, was the departure point for ‘fun in the sun’ in Queensland’s tropics—and I see my northern colleagues nodding behind me—specifically the Great Barrier Reef. In our case we have the extra drawcard of the magic of the Whitsunday islands, which I proudly represent in this place.

Since then we have seen the development of jet airports at Proserpine in the 1960s and on Hamilton Island in the 1980s. Both airports continue to provide great access for tourists from Queensland, Australia and right around the world. I was thrilled to see the flying kangaroo back in the Whitsundays this year as Qantas brought back its direct service from Sydney to Hamilton Island. On top of that we have seen direct services from Sydney to Proserpine thanks to Tigerair. There is great scope to further expand the airport at Proserpine so that we can take international flights to cater for tourists from new markets in Asia and the Middle East and export fresh North Queensland produce from the northern Whitsundays. If we build the mighty Urannah Dam, that would further open up the opportunity to export quality produce directly from the Whitsundays to overseas markets.

As for the Mackay Airport, perhaps that is where the greatest opportunity can be viewed because here we have a terrific piece of infrastructure—albeit sold off by the former Labor government to pay for our new regional hospital—which is smack bang in the heart of a dynamic region. After all, Mackay is the capital of a region that is home to the biggest economy of the north. I have said it before and I will say it again: it is a \$22 billion regional economy that encompasses our three local government areas. Right now work is progressing on a \$900 million redevelopment of the Mackay Airport that includes a hotel and facilities to establish a new-age transport and freight hub. This is a huge project which will contribute to our GRP. We are talking about a \$721 million boost, the work generating 2,100 full-time jobs. That should surely warm the hearts of locals. They are impressive numbers, and they have all come about through private investment in a region that was proudly built on private enterprise whether it was tourism, agriculture or resources.

For the record, with 1.2 million passengers a year Mackay Airport is the fifth busiest in the state, with the four airports in front of us all having international status. I am told that in time Mackay will eclipse Townsville in terms of passenger movements. Mackay Airport, owned by North Queensland Airports—which also owns Cairns Airport—has already flagged trans-Tasman flights by 2019. That is probably no surprise given that Auckland International Airport has a significant financial stake in NQ Airports. It was interesting to see the peak national industry body Tourism and Transport Forum release their paper ‘Bringing Our Neighbour Closer’ including four reforms to maximise tourism from New Zealand, which is Australia’s largest market for international visitors.

One of the key messages in that report is to open up more regional airports to trans-Tasman flights and to provide access to more—and indeed Queensland—regional destinations. One of the recommendations specifically was developing a new joint border agency model for small, rapidly deployable teams of cross-trained officers for regional airports like Mackay or perhaps Proserpine’s Whitsunday Coast Airport, which is owned by the council. Either location would serve a huge slice of Queensland and bring international visitors to our region.

Today I call on the federal government to provide all necessary assistance in delivering a regional model when it comes to customs, immigration and quarantine processing for an international airport in our region that would connect our region—the place I call paradise—to the world and open up opportunities for people from all corners of the planet.

(Time expired)

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

QUEENSLAND PLAN BILL

Introduction

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (12.00 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for the development and implementation of the Queensland Plan and related purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Finance and Administration Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Queensland Plan Bill 2014 [[5735](#)].

Tabled paper: Queensland Plan Bill 2014, explanatory notes [[5736](#)].

I am pleased to introduce the Queensland Plan Bill 2014. The bill enshrines in legislation *The Queensland Plan: Queenslanders' 30-year vision*, the plan, which I was honoured to launch in Hervey Bay on 31 July 2014. I now table the Queensland Plan.

Tabled paper: Queensland government document titled *The Queensland Plan: Queenslanders' 30-year vision* [[5737](#)].

The Queensland government announced the development of the Queensland Plan to address the community's desire for a long-term approach to state planning that goes beyond electoral cycles. This bill further supports the achievement of this aim. The Queensland Plan is the culmination of the largest community engagement activity of its kind in Australian history and one of the largest in the world—a massive and exemplary exercise in listening and consulting that involved discussion forums from summits and community think tanks to boardroom workshops and robust family debates. The vision that the 80,000 participating Queenslanders have set for our state is one worth aspiring to. It is bold, ambitious and, if achieved, would see Queensland become an even more remarkable place to live, work and raise a family.

The 30-year vision set by Queenslanders for our state is as follows: in 30 years Queensland will be home to vibrant and prosperous communities; our state will be well planned, with the right infrastructure in the right places to support a population that has grown across every region; we will value education as a lifelong pursuit where we gain practical skills, enrich our lives, find secure jobs and improve the competitiveness of our economy; our brightest minds will take on the world and we will work collaboratively to achieve the best results for Queensland; we will be the greatest state in which to live, work and play and guardian of a sustainable natural environment that inspires an active lifestyle and supports healthy communities; and we will have a community spirit that embraces our diversity and unique culture and gives everyone the opportunity to shine. We will not leave anybody behind. Government cannot do this alone, but as a community working together we can achieve everything we want for our state's future.

The Queensland Plan is not the government's plan; it is the people's plan. It is only by working together that the shared vision, supported by 35 goals and 20 measureable targets, will be achieved. The bill provides for the development, reporting and updating of a plan, known as the Queensland Plan, and gives guidance about the plan's purpose and principles. The principles that underpin the plan include that it is long-term, visionary, strategic, community driven, bipartisan, measureable and based on joint implementation. As outlined in the bill, my intention is to seek ratification of the Queensland Plan by the Legislative Assembly. The plan reflects the views of Queenslanders from every electorate in our great state, and I will encourage honourable members to support their community's vision.

The bill provides an implementation framework for the plan, including development of a Queensland government response—the government response—local government alignment to the plan's strategic direction and establishment of the Queensland Plan Ambassadors Council—a group of eminent Queenslanders who will promote awareness and advocate implementation of the plan within the community, business and industry.

The government response will outline the state government's approach and contribution to implementing the plan. Public authorities—defined as Queensland government departments and statutory bodies—will be required to ensure their policies, programs and the services that are delivered are consistent with the strategic direction of the government response. Local governments, in preparing their corporate plans, will need to have regard to the plan's strategic direction, and their annual reports will need to include a statement about actions relating to the plan. A whole-of-state annual progress report on implementation of the plan, prepared in consultation with the ambassadors council, is to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly by 30 November each year.

The bill has been developed in consultation with principal stakeholders including the Queensland Council of Social Service and several business and industry representatives including the Property Council of Australia, the Queensland Tourism Industry Council, the Queensland Resources Council and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland. Targeted consultation was also undertaken with local government bodies including the Local Government Association of Queensland, selected regional organisations of councils and individual local governments including the Brisbane City Council and a number of regional councils. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (12.05 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 Finance and Administration Committee

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

MAJOR EVENTS BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (12.06 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for the holding of major events, the safety of visitors and spectators at major events, to allow visiting health practitioners to provide health care services for major events without becoming registered under state law, to protect the rights of event organisers and sponsors at major events and for related purposes, to amend this act, the Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act 2011, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998, and the acts mentioned in schedule 1, for particular purposes, and to repeal the Motor Racing Events Act 1990 and the Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Major Events Bill 2014 [5738].

Tabled paper: Major Events Bill 2014, explanatory notes [5739].

It gives me great pleasure to introduce this bill, which will facilitate the holding of major events in Queensland. As a government, we understand that major events are important for Queensland. They bring life and vibrancy, encourage widespread community engagement and participation, and provide invaluable opportunities for Queensland to showcase her considerable assets to the rest of Australia and the world. Importantly, major events also contribute significantly to Queensland's economy by bringing business investment and visitors to the state. Tapping into the limitless stream of opportunities these events generate has seen local benefits through a boost to tourism visitation, creation of jobs and millions of dollars contributed to the Queensland economy.

Queensland already hosts an enviable calendar of major events; however, in coming years Queensland will host the 2015 AFC Asian Cup, the 2015 ICC Cricket World Cup and the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. These are in addition to the V8 Supercars motor-racing events currently held in Queensland.

As we have recently seen, the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games flag handover and closing ceremony, which was broadcast to over 1.4 billion people, was a once-in-a-lifetime chance to showcase a sample—a taste—of what our great state has to offer when the Gold Coast hosts the Commonwealth Games in 2018. The Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games will be the largest sporting event in Australia for more than a decade, drawing 6,500 athletes and team officials as well as spectators and visitors from across the world.

The games will provide the catalyst to drive lasting economic benefits for Queensland, with \$2 billion being injected into the state economy and up to 30,000 new jobs being created. This major event will also deliver an opportunity to strengthen Queensland's reputation as Australia's premier tourism destination and reinforce our status as an attractive place to invest and do business.

Increasingly it is becoming the norm for the governing bodies of major sporting codes or event organisers to seek certain legislation as part of a bid process to host a major event. For example, the bid book and the host city contract for the 2018 Commonwealth Games include a range of commitments that require legislation. In the past, legislation for major events has been developed on an ad hoc basis as it has been required. This has resulted in a range of disparate legislation that may be invoked for a major event by a separate regulation or declaration. The government is introducing the Major Events Bill to provide a generic legislative framework that may be used for the conduct of future major events held in Queensland. A range of provisions in current legislation that relate to major events will be consolidated into a single act.

The bill contains provisions relating to transport management, including the ability to prescribe major event lanes, temporarily close roads and remove vehicles and vessels from major event areas. The bill also contains commercial protections to assist event organisers in staging an event. This includes prohibiting street trading in the vicinity of venues, ticket scalping, ambush marketing by intrusion, unauthorised broadcasting and prohibition of certain advertising such as aerial advertising and advertising on buildings and vessels. To ensure the safety of patrons and effective crowd management, the bill provides for the control of entry and prohibition of certain items from major event areas and police and authorised person powers to control antisocial behaviour. The bill also provides registration exemptions for visiting health practitioners to enable visiting health practitioners from overseas who are accompanying athletes or visitors to provide healthcare services to them.

The bill allows for an event to be prescribed by regulation as a major event only after consideration of the size, scale and nature of the event and whether it is in the public interest to do so. The regulation will also prescribe which components of the bill apply to the event and the period that the provisions apply. Not all components of the bill will be required for each major event. This will enable government to scale the requirements based on the nature and size of each event. For example, while the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games may require a full suite of the legislation, other major events such as the V8 Supercars would require fewer provisions to be prescribed. The bill repeals the Motor Racing Events Act 1990 and the Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998 and also omits chapter 19, part 2 from the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, replacing them with a more efficient and streamlined single piece of legislation. This cuts red tape and provides ongoing red-tape reduction by alleviating the need for further event-specific legislation to be drafted for future major events in Queensland. In addition, the bill provides a more efficient model and streamlined process for event organisers.

This bill also contains an amendment to the Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act 2011 and minor amendments to other legislation. The amendment to the Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act will help prevent the use of protected games references in registered business and company names. Major events legislation will put Queensland on equal footing with other Australian jurisdictions that have similar legislation in place. It will send a clear message that Queensland recognises the value of major events and that we are the pre-eminent destination for major events. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JA STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (12.13 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 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee

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

SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 6 June (see p. 2236).

Second Reading

 Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.14 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I note that the committee tabled its report on 18 August 2014 and I now table the government's response to the committee report on behalf of the Premier.

Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 70—Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response [5740].

I take this opportunity to thank the industry and community stakeholders who took the time to make written submissions or appeared at public hearings to assist the committee in its consideration of the bill. Queenslanders and visitors to our great state have the right to enjoy our vibrant and diverse night-life, and feel safe while doing so. The passage of this bill will deliver positive changes for the people of Queensland by reducing alcohol and drug related violence and providing a safer night-life that all Queenslanders can enjoy, because we on this side of the House know that a great night out is a safe night out. It is a comprehensive and holistic approach aimed at delivering long-term changes to the culture that leads to antisocial and violent behaviour. It also reflects the clear community sentiment that this culture and the violence associated with it is not welcome in Queensland and must stop now.

I now turn to the committee's recommendations. The committee has made three recommendations about the bill and sought clarification on four issues. The government wholly supports the first two recommendations and supports the third in part. The government welcomes the committee's recommendation that the bill be passed. The committee's second recommendation requests confirmation that the evaluation framework for the sober-safe centre trial will be developed prior to the commencement of the trial and that the result of the evaluation will be provided to the Legislative Assembly for further consideration. I can confirm that the government supports this recommendation. The framework for the evaluation of the strategy is currently being developed and will be finalised in the last quarter of 2014. This date reflects the government's effort to accommodate the differing implementation dates for the initiatives in the strategy and to ensure that it reflects the final practical design of each relevant element of the strategy. The results of the evaluation will also be provided to the Legislative Assembly for further consideration at an appropriate time.

The committee's third recommendation is that the bill or an appropriate regulation be amended to ensure that ID scanning must commence for regulated premises no later than 10 pm, enable flexibility for individual regulated premises to commence ID scanning earlier than 10 pm if they wish and, finally, empower local board associations to set a compulsory earlier commencement time for ID scanning for all regulated premises within their precinct from time to time to assist with maintenance of safety and security at specific events. The government supports this recommendation in part and I will be moving amendments during consideration in detail of the bill to achieve that objective.

The government agrees that it would be appropriate to amend the standard commencement time for ID scanning to 10 pm from 8 pm as it is not the government's intention to inconvenience patrons who are genuinely only interested in having dinner. The 10 pm commencement time will ensure that a large majority of diners are not captured by the ID-scanning requirement. Individual regulated premises will of course be able to exercise their right to commence scanning IDs earlier than 10 pm if they wish. Similarly, local boards will be free to reach an agreement with their members as to whether ID scanning should commence earlier than 10 pm. However, given the cooperative nature of the boards and the government's intention that safe-night precincts be managed in a mutually collaborative way, the government does not consider it would be appropriate to formally and directly empower the boards to compel regulated premises within their precinct to commence ID scanning at an earlier time. I would like to point out that the commissioner will have the ability to condition an earlier or later commencement time on a licence where circumstances warrant.

The committee also requested four points of clarification. The first of these seeks clarification as to how many health professionals are intended to be on duty in sober-safe centres at any one time. I can confirm that two appropriately trained and qualified healthcare professionals will be on duty

at the sober-safe centres. The second point seeks clarification as to how the provisions relating to the drug and alcohol assessment and referral courses will operate for people in rural or remote communities given the mandatory nature of the bail condition and the difficulties such persons may have in complying with the condition of bail.

The bill adopts a flexible approach to the implementation of this new mandatory bail condition to facilitate the delivery of drug and alcohol assessment and referral courses state-wide. A defendant who lives in a rural or remote location will be able to complete a drug and alcohol assessment and referral course by using a range of communication methods to enable them to engage with the approved course provider. The bill does not prescribe the means by which a defendant must complete the course. Accordingly, that could occur via face-to-face contact, or videoconferencing, or through other online options such as Skype technology. Further, the bill does not require the defendant to complete the course at the location where they have been charged with the prescribed offence or where it is alleged that the offence was committed.

The third point seeks clarification as to how the ID-scanning policy will operate for hotels situated within a safe-night precinct. The committee has also sought clarification on the process for an exemption from or applying for individual conditions so as not to be subjected to the ID-scanning requirements. The government recognises the importance of ensuring that the legislation is sufficiently flexible to cater for the range of different types of premises and operating circumstances that may arise. Accordingly, proposed amendments to the bill will exempt the following persons from the requirement to present their ID for scanning before entering a regulated premises: persons attending a function within a regulated premises; persons wishing to have a meal in an area ordinarily set aside and used for dining in a regulated premises; exempt minors as currently defined under the Liquor Act 1992; and temporary and permanent residents of a regulated premises. Additionally, it is proposed that persons attending a regulated premises or part of a regulated premises that has been conditioned out of the mandatory ID-scanning requirements will not be required to present their ID for scanning. Apart from those proposed exemptions, the ID-scanning requirements will not apply to certain classes of licensed premises exempted by regulation, for example, those classes of licensed premises considered low risk unless a premises within the class is otherwise conditioned by the commissioner.

The final point of clarification sought by the committee relates to whether a cross-reference in section 602W(1) of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 is correct. I can confirm that the cross-reference in section 602W(1) to section 602T is incorrect and I will be moving an amendment during consideration in detail of the bill to correct the reference to section 602U.

Additionally, I will also be moving a number of other amendments during consideration in detail of the bill which I will outline briefly to the House. In terms of commencement, the bill currently provides for the majority of provisions to commence on a day fixed by proclamation. After further consideration, it has been determined that those number of provisions can instead commence on assent or on a particular date to expedite the government's implementation of the Safe Night Out Strategy. In terms of the amendments to the Liquor Act, I will also move a number of additional amendments in relation to the ID scanner provisions for clarity. Mandatory networked ID scanners in safe-night precincts are a key component of the Safe Night Out Strategy. Therefore, the government is keen to ensure that the ID-scanning framework is workable and sufficiently flexible to cater for the range of different types of premises and operating circumstances that may arise.

To that end, it has considered feedback from the Safe Night Out Strategy implementation panel, which is chaired by the honourable member for Brisbane Central, Mr Robert Cavallucci MP, as well as from other stakeholders. In light of their comments, I will propose a number of amendments to the bill, including amendments to clarify that the compulsory ID-scanning requirements will be imposed only for regulated premises on days that the regulated premises holds an approval to trade past midnight; the compulsory ID-scanning requirements will not apply to those licensed premises that have an extended hours permit, which is a permit of temporary duration; minors ordinarily allowed under the Liquor Act to be on a licensed premises, for example, for employment purposes, persons attending a function in a regulated premises and persons wishing to consume a meal in an area normally set aside for dining in a regulated premises will not be required to have their ID scanned; persons re-entering a regulated premises on the same night will be required to present their ID for scanning; approved ID scanners will be able to record only certain permitted information; approved operators will be able to share the banning details of a regulated premises with the commissioner, the police and other regulated premises; and the commissioner may have regard to a

number of matters in deciding whether an applicant is suitable to be an approved operator of an approved ID-scanning system, including whether the applicant has the requisite skills, knowledge and experience to operate an approved ID-scanning system.

I will propose amendments to the bill that will additionally provide the commissioner with the power to issue a direction to a responsible person to alter, adjust, repair or maintain an approved ID-scanning system. I also intend to propose amendments that will provide the commissioner with the power to immediately suspend an approval relating to an approved operator, ID scanner or ID-scanning system if harm may be caused to members of the public if urgent action to suspend the approval is not taken.

In relation to noise, which is a matter that I know concerns a lot of members of parliament who write to the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation and to me about noise emanating from particular premises, I will move amendments in consideration in detail to enable the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation to take appropriate action in response to unreasonable noise emanating from licensed premises. Many Queenslanders are frequently subject to unreasonable noise from venues and the OLGR has faced difficulty in addressing the offending noise owing to limitations in the legislation. I will move amendments to allow the OLGR to stop all offending noise at the source until such time as proper and professional noise attenuation work can be carried out at the premises. I will also move amendments to link the issue of an order to stop noise directly with the existing licence conditioning process under the Liquor Act. Although these are new amendments, they are consistent with the provisions in the bill and the strategy as they reinforce the obligations of licensees in preserving the amenity of the surrounding area.

A new amendment will also be moved in relation to commercial special facility licences. This is a technical amendment intended to clarify and confirm that commercial special facility licences trading beyond midnight since 1 January 2009 are, and have always been, required to hold an extended trading hours approval and pay the associated risk criterion fee. A number of procedural and technical amendments are also proposed to address potential issues in the bill or to aid implementation. I will move additional amendments to address the transition of licensees to the new nightclub licence; to provide guidance for the treatment of on-hand applications; and to allow for the continuation of late-night trading hours for restaurant and cafes if an alternative licence application is made. Minor amendments will also be proposed to clarify the operation of the new provisions in relation to responsible service, supply and promotion of liquor and preservation of the amenity and provide for transitional arrangements in relation to eligibility for exemptions from the Liquor Act. Additional transitional provisions will be moved to provide clarity as to how actions against licensees and permittees for contravention of the Liquor Act will be dealt with if they relate to matters that occurred prior to the commencement or if the commissioner was partway through a disciplinary action process at the time of commencement.

I will also propose amendments during the consideration in detail to some minor criminal law reforms, in particular to relocate the new Criminal Code offence of unlawful striking causing death from existing chapter 28 of the Criminal Code to a newly created chapter 28A. Chapter 28A will be specific to the offence of unlawful striking causing death. Of course, when I talk about unlawful striking causing death, I am talking about coward punches. This is a technical amendment to ensure that the new offence operates appropriately within the existing framework of the Criminal Code. The new offence of unlawful striking causing death will also be amended to make clear the meaning of the phrase 'to unlawfully strike a person'. There will be other consequential amendments across the bill as a result of the relocation and renumbering of the offence.

There are also some minor and technical amendments to be moved regarding the reforms under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to enhance the drafting of those provisions. Further, a reference to the circumstance of aggravation underpinning the new mandatory community service order regime established by the bill will be included in each of the prescribed offences of violence to which that new regime is to apply. This is a drafting issue to ensure clear cross-referencing.

In relation to police powers, I will be seeking to amend the sober-safe centre trial provisions contained in clause 113 of the bill to ensure that the manager of the centre does not have to issue a cost-recovery notice where it is unlikely that the charge will be able to be recovered from the person. I will also be seeking an amendment to allow a person to apply to the Commissioner of Police for the waiving of the cost-recovery charge if the payment of the charge would cause the person financial hardship. Amendments will also be moved to clarify that a police banning notice without a photograph attached can be distributed in the same way as an imaged order may be distributed under part 5B of chapter 19 of the PPRA.

The violence has to stop in Queensland. Too many Queenslanders have suffered the devastating effects of drug and alcohol related violence and coward-punch incidents. It is time that the minority of people who think that it is okay to get drunk and throw a punch take responsibility for their actions and understand that their actions are not tolerated by the Queensland community and are certainly not tolerated by this government.

Unlike the opposition—who woke up one morning with a thought bubble; a magic silver-bullet solution, they said—we have looked at this issue of how to best address alcohol and drug fuelled violence over the last two years. When I became Attorney-General we inherited the drink-safe precinct trial that was established by the former government. We always said that we supported the drink-safe precinct model which focused on increased high-visibility policing, rest and recovery services and collaboration between licensees, businesses and local and state government agencies as part of the place based management approach. We extended the trial through a thorough and proper evaluation when it was undertaken, the parameters of which were established by the former government. I travelled the state and met with local governments, drink-safe precinct boards and visited two of the three precincts in Surfers Paradise, Fortitude Valley and Townsville to see what was happening on the ground. I travelled to New South Wales. I met with state ministers to talk about what they were doing to address the issue. I did a tour of Newcastle to see what they have done—the so-called Newcastle solution which many people talk about but not many people actually understand.

If we compare and contrast what we have done as a government, I visited Newcastle during consultation with the Queensland community. The Labor Party, in contrast, announced its policy and then visited Newcastle without due consideration, without due thought, as to the whole issue and coming up with a collaborative government approach to the issue of alcohol related violence. The Newcastle solution is a solution for Newcastle, not for Queensland.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! Members on my left, you can get on the speaking list. The Attorney-General has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: Talking about speaking lists, I note the shadow Attorney-General is not on the speaking list. I thought the shadow health minister would have taken a particular interest in alcohol and drug related violence, but I note the de facto shadow health minister is on the list to speak. I look forward to that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Those on my left, the Attorney-General has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: In Queensland we have come up with a common-sense, comprehensive strategy after talking to Queenslanders. In fact, it is the most comprehensive strategy dealing with alcohol and drug related violence in this country—more than Newcastle and more than Sydney. If we look at the New South Wales solution, we see through media reports a decrease in violence in the CBD but an increase in violence in the suburbs. The silver-bullet solution is not so silver. It is the easy solution that those opposite offer.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the honourable member for Gregory in terms of if it happens in their back yards. It was important that we listen to Queenslanders on this issue. Let us look at the facts. I will give credit where credit is due. The former government set up the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee that inquired into alcohol fuelled violence. We travelled the state with the Labor Party members in government at the time and looked at this issue. We came up with a bipartisan approach to the issue of alcohol fuelled violence. The former government responded by setting up the drink-safe precincts which, as I have said, we have extended from time to time and are now extending to night safe precincts, the number going from three to 15.

This issue has been debated in Queensland for many years. The former Labor government set up a parliamentary inquiry and responded with the establishment of drink-safe precincts. It was not a knee-jerk reaction, as this government's is not. The opposition, through what it perceives as popular policy, throws out these ideas without actually visiting the areas where these initiatives have been implemented. We undertook a separate review early on in our term of red tape in terms of the liquor industry and general regulations for the gaming and liquor industries with assistance from an expert panel that we established and a public discussion paper was issued to seek feedback from

Queenslanders. While our legislative focus has been on red tape and reducing the administrative burden on industry, we have continued the review of the drink-safe precinct trial and looked at the various policy considerations both nationally and internationally to see how other jurisdictions have addressed the issue of alcohol and drug related violence.

The 24-month evaluation report speaks for itself. In Fortitude Valley all types of offences are down 11.5 per cent. Good order offences have decreased by 20.5 per cent and offences against police are down 29.5 per cent per weekend drinking night. Ambulance statistics also show the percentage of most relevant calls for service occurring during weekend drinking nights also decreased by 7.9 percentage points. Rest and recovery services provided for care and assistance to over 6,000 clients and close to 145,000 free waters were issued to patrons. In Surfers Paradise the results are even better. All types of offences are down by 22.6 per cent. Assaults have decreased by 23.7 per cent, good order offences are down by 24.3 per cent and offences against police have decreased by a massive 41.9 per cent. Ambulance statistics reveal that the most relevant calls for service occurring during weekend drinking nights reduced by 12.3 percentage points. Rest and recovery support services provided care or assistance to over 5,386 clients and handed out nearly 115,000 free water bottles to patrons. In Townsville all offences per weekend drinking night are down by 1.5 per cent including, in particular, good order offences, which decreased by 18.4 per cent, and offences against police are down by 3.6 per cent. There has been a decrease in the rate of assault offences by 25.3 per cent, driven in part by a decrease in the percentage of grievous serious assaults occurring during weekend drinking nights. Across the three safe precincts, non-government groups helped 16,000 patrons and handed out more than 300,000 free waters.

Those are the results and they speak for themselves. Clear evidence, strong research and evidence based policy is what is making our entertainment precincts safer for those who want to have a good night out, but also for the thousands of people who rely on the industry for employment. Earlier this year we said that we would develop a comprehensive package of reforms to deal with this important social and community safety issue. We sought feedback from Queenslanders, not once but twice, as we released a draft strategy and then the final Safe Night Out Strategy. The strategy itself focuses on three main issues: changing the culture to make everyone responsible, bad behaviour will not be tolerated and providing safe and supportive environments. The strategy is all about better prevention through education and awareness, targeted policing through ID scanners and banning orders and stronger penalties with a new penalty to address coward-punch deaths and a greater focus on drug and alcohol rehabilitation. If the members opposite have not read it yet, this is the final Safe Night Out Strategy that we developed in consultation with Queenslanders. Over 13,000 Queenslanders had a say on the Safe Night Out Strategy. It was not a knee-jerk reaction to the issues in the community; it is a comprehensive strategy developed after the government listened to Queenslanders. The people of Queensland have made this strategy through their input.

If we go through the strategy in some detail before we get into the debate on the bill today, as I said, one of the elements of the strategy is changing the culture to make everyone responsible. The strategy sets out what Queenslanders expect. Queenslanders expect the minority of people in these environments who do muck up to be held responsible for their actions. Why punish the majority of young Queenslanders who are doing the right thing for the sins of a few?

Mr Byrne interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Those on my left will cease interjecting.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stafford!

Mr BLEIJIE: Why punish every tourist who wants to come to Queensland to appreciate our vibrant life for the sins of a few? I am looking forward to the debate to find what research members opposite will rely on. When I finalise the debate, one question I will have for them is this: how will trading hours be the silver bullet to fix this issue, considering that most violence occurs well before 3 am in a nightclub? What do they propose to do? Do they propose to shut the clubs at midnight? Do they propose to shut down our entertainment precincts? That is a very different view to the former Labor government. I have to say that it took this issue a little more seriously than does the current opposition. The former Labor government set up the drink-safe precincts under a two-year evaluation trial and I will be releasing the results of that evaluation process.

You cannot deal with social issues by rushing in with knee-jerk reactions. There is no single solution to solve this problem. Members on this side of the House take this issue very seriously. I am the father of three. I have an 11-year-old daughter. In five or six or seven years time, either on her

own account or through peer pressure from school friends, she will be experiencing night-life in Queensland. I want my daughter Taylor to be able to enjoy a safe night out. No parent wants to receive a call telling them that their child has been subjected to a coward punch or, worse, that their child has lost their life because of some thug at an entertainment precinct. The people who engage in that particular behaviour are in the minority. Therefore, we are not going to punish the majority of young Queenslanders, or any Queenslanders for that matter, who want to go out and enjoy what Queensland has to offer in our great entertainment precincts. We cannot punish the majority for the sins of a few. We are not going to make that knee-jerk reaction. This issue is too serious for that unnecessary action. The former Labor government appreciated that, which is why it did not go down the route of a silver bullet. There are no silver bullets. Every government in Australia has recognised the fact that there are no silver bullets. Governments have tried various things. In the past couple of years we have had extensive consultation and research into this issue. Not only have we looked at the 2009 inquiry conducted by the former government into alcohol fuelled violence, but also we have done research in relation to the Safe Night Out Strategy. We have developed a plan in consultation with not only young Queenslanders but all Queenslanders. All Queenslanders have had input into this strategy.

The second element of the strategy, after we change the culture, is to send the clear message that bad behaviour will no longer be tolerated in this state. We have to give the police the power and resources to do their job. We will introduce tougher penalties as part of a strong plan to deal with antisocial behaviour. We are going to introduce what I think is the best crafted offence of unlawful striking causing death, to deal with coward punches. Currently, people are not charged with murder because intent cannot be proved. At the moment they are charged with manslaughter, which makes available a series of defences. Under the new offence of unlawful striking causing death, people will be held responsible for their actions if they partake in that sort of criminal activity. We will change the laws to make it easier to prosecute licensees who disregard our responsible service of alcohol requirements. Everyone will take responsibility: the patrons, the licensees, the government agencies and the not-for-profit sector.

Importantly, the third element of the strategy is the provision of safe and supportive environments. We will set up 15 safe-night precincts throughout Queensland, starting in Cairns. Townsville has a drink-safe precinct and it will now have a formalised safe-night precinct. Other precincts will operate in the Airlie Beach CBD, the Mackay CBD, the Rockhampton CBD, the Gladstone CBD, the Bundaberg CBD and the Sunshine Coast, which other honourable members and I represent. We have seen firsthand the problems with coward punches. We have lost people on the Sunshine Coast because of coward punches. In this debate I will not let the opposition get away with saying that we do not take this seriously enough, because Sunshine Coast members know just how much it has impacted our community as people have lost their lives because of coward punches. The Toowoomba CBD will get a Safe Night Out precinct, as will the Ipswich CBD, the Brisbane CBD, Caxton Street and Fortitude Valley, the Gold Coast, the Broadbeach CBD and Surfers Paradise. A good mixture of safe-night precincts will follow.

We will facilitate improved safety conditions for venues. We will provide additional support and services for patients, rest and recovery services, transport, amenities and lighting. Of course, we will introduce an enhanced licensing and compliance regime. In this strategy, we are going to empower communities to take charge of the issue. The safe-night precincts will not be like the drink-safe precincts, where a committee was established. There will be a committee, but it will be an incorporated association. There will be a board and members who will be representatives from licensees, government departments, local government and the not-for-profit sector. They will collaborate to come up with issues to solve these problems. The best way to solve these issues is to have everyone working together. I have no doubt that the licensees, as much as anyone, want to solve the problems. They do not want incidents happening in their clubs.

This is not a new issue to Queensland or to the globe. Honourable members, particularly those on this side of the House, will know that my uncle owned the Ettamogah pub. I grew up in a pub. Alcohol related violence was around then, as it is now. However, it has become more profound, which is why we have to deal with this issue, although not through taking knee-jerk populist decisions. We are going to look at this properly. I thank the committee, in particular, for having gone into the issue in great detail, despite the fact that one of the committee members, and it might have been the deputy chairman, was running around the Sunshine Coast saying that he had not had an opportunity to talk about the issue. Two strategies have been released, we have had community input from 13,000 Queenslanders and the committee, under the chairmanship of Ian Berry MP, has investigated this

report, yet still the deputy chairman of the committee says that he has not had time to have input into it. I would suggest that this strategy has received the most comprehensive response of the many strategies undertaken by Queensland governments in the past 15 to 20 years. It has been drafted with safety in mind and with the collaboration of industry, patrons and the wider community.

Looking into the strategy a little further, I turn to the survey of Queenslanders that was conducted. In this place, we represent Queenslanders and we represent electorates. As I said, we have received over 13,000 submissions on this issue. In that survey, Queenslanders said that they are most likely to drink alcohol at pubs, clubs or private parties; patrons feel most safe getting a lift home and least safe walking; more than half of all entertainment precinct patrons have witnessed violence in and around venues and public events; 75 per cent of Queenslanders consider alcohol related violence to be a problem in the nightclub districts; 78 per cent of patrons who witnessed violence said it was between people they did not know; two-thirds of Queenslanders attend a venue or event where alcohol is consumed once a week or once a month. That is what we are being told by Queenslanders. The whole strategy is based around that feedback that we have had from Queenslanders.

When we developed this strategy, at the forefront of our minds was young Queenslanders. Young Queenslanders want to be able to go out with their friends, perhaps to celebrate a birthday, without the government telling them what they can and cannot do. That is what the Labor Party does; it is not what the Liberal National Party government does. We will make offenders take responsibility for their actions. We will have clear standards about what people ought not do when they go to premises. We will have the punishments and penalties applicable if they do the wrong thing. However, when a person goes into an entertainment district, they will know that they can have a great night out and a safe night out. That is what this strategy is about.

I suspect that the biggest element in this strategy to change culture is education. It is too late to educate young kids on the impacts of drug and alcohol related violence at schoolies. We have to go in early; we have to go in to their classrooms. The strategy mandates that we will have programs about culture, attitudes and social expectations of alcohol consumption, including the risks of binge drinking, illicit drug use and alcohol and drug violence, available each year to every student in years 7 to 12. That has never been done before. That information will be available to students in years 7 to 12, so that when kids hit year 12 they will know the issues and risks associated with this. I talked before about my daughter Taylor. She will be in year 7 next year. My daughter will be in year 7; she is growing too fast.

Mr Berry interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Middle school, high school. She will be in year 7 next year. I am proud that as part of this government's Safe Night Out Strategy we will, through the curriculum, start talking to students about the issues of drug and alcohol related violence. But it is not just the school's responsibility; there is a parental responsibility too. Sally and I will do what we do at home. We will raise the kids to the best of our ability. Even though there are external forces, such as from friends and those they hang around with, I am satisfied that when my daughter goes into year 7 she will start to get education about binge drinking from that early age that she would not have otherwise had unless the government had implemented the Safe Night Out Strategy.

I think for parents this is a great thing. Parents must not say, though, that the schools must do it all. Parents have to take responsibility for their own children. They have to teach their children about the antisocial problems associated with alcohol and drug abuse. Of course, the strategy deals with the penalties. I think they include the most comprehensive penalties, including penalties for licensees who do the wrong thing.

Colleagues may have read in the newspaper recently reports about the mystery shopper process. That is about making sure that not only liquor and gaming officials go into premises but also people who are not known to the industry or licensees go into premises and deliberately try to catch those who are not serving alcohol responsibly. Nothing will work on its own. Nothing will work in singular isolation. But this plan will work when it comes together.

I think what we have developed over the last couple of years is pieces of the puzzle. Once pieces of the puzzle come together they develop the Safe Night Out Strategy. If anyone around Australia has looked at our strategy compared to other strategies, they would come to the conclusion very quickly that this is a comprehensive strategy—probably the most comprehensive strategy—in Australia dealing with these issues.

In terms of education, we have already taken up that opportunity. We have already started a targeted media campaign of television, radio and print advertisements with the message that we are red carding antisocial behaviour. Members may have seen the advertisements on TV and in print and heard them on the radio. We are red carding antisocial behaviour.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Stafford who says, 'Yes, that will work, Jarrod.' We take this issue seriously. As I have said over the last 40 minutes, nothing will work in isolation. This is part of a strategy. This will not work in isolation—we know that. In terms of educating young Queenslanders, when we allow them the opportunity to see this sort of thing on social media sites and have it in their face, when we add the education that we are going to start next year for students in year 7, when we add the responsibility that they have when they are in our safe-night precincts, when we add community ownership of the issue at the safe-night precincts then we will have a real plan to tackle alcohol and drug related violence.

Can I pay tribute today to people like Ross Thompson and the Queensland Homicide Victims Support Group for their strong advocacy and support on these issues, including the One Punch Can Kill campaign, which has been quite successful in its own right. I also acknowledge Paul and Kay Stanley who lost their son Matthew in 2006 to alcohol related violence. While these laws will not bring Matthew back, I can say on behalf of this House that their advocacy has contributed to measures that are aimed at preventing these types of incidents happening in the future. That is something that the Stanleys can be proud of. That is something that Ross Thompson and the Queensland Homicide Victims Support Group can be proud of.

Can I finally thank the 13,000 Queenslanders for their feedback and assistance in creating the Safe Night Out Strategy. After all, this is a state-wide strategy for Queensland designed by Queenslanders. The government is committed to preserving a diverse and vibrant night-life economy and supporting the overwhelming majority of Queenslanders who do the right thing rather than punishing them for the sins of a few. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.54 pm): The Labor opposition believes that young people should have a safe night out. In fact, all people should have a safe night out. But the opposition rejects the government's approach. If we are going to tackle alcohol fuelled violence we must tackle the core issue, and the core issue is trading hours. The opposition welcomes debate on the Premier's Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. At the outset, I wish to advise that the opposition will be opposing this bill.

The time has come for the people of Queensland and the government to take real action. This government has failed because this government is failing to listen to the evidence. Time and time again parents are concerned about whether or not their young person is going to come home safe in the early hours of the morning. Families are concerned whether or not their son or daughter is going to end up in a fight or brawl or end up in hospital.

There will be a speaker this afternoon, the newly elected member for Stafford, who will talk firsthand about seeing the devastating impacts of alcohol fuelled violence on young people. Alcohol fuelled violence destroys young people's lives. The time has come to tackle the core issue of trading hours because we as a community must reduce alcohol fuelled violence in this state. The time has come to stand up and take real action not bury our heads in the sand and pander to the interests of a few rather than look after the safety and protection of all in this state. There is no greater contrast than the policy put forward by the Premier but argued in this House by the Attorney-General and the policy put forward by the opposition and argued by the Leader of the Opposition and members of the opposition.

This is an issue that as a community we must come together as one on. The time has come for us to say to our hardworking police officers, our hardworking men and women paramedics out there, our hardworking men and women nurses and doctors in our hospitals that we must tackle the core issue. If we leave it any longer more deaths will occur and more injuries will occur.

The government's policy does not tackle that core issue. Because it does not tackle that fundamental issue of reducing the trading hours, the opposition cannot support this bill. This government has failed to listen to the evidence—the evidence that is coming out of Sydney, the evidence that is coming out of Newcastle, the evidence that is coming out of the rest of the world. This government is failing to listen and by doing so it is pandering to the interests of a few. We all know who those interests are.

Before I discuss some of the concerns in relation to this bill, I wish to declare that the Labor opposition is committed to reducing violence in our communities. We are committed to ensuring that when young people go out for a night of entertainment they come home again to their families. Labor is committed to real, practical measures that research from all over the world has shown will work to reduce violence. We are committed to following sound advice based on the experience in other jurisdictions which is to adopt a tried and true method rather than the solution preferred by people who have a financial interest in the method adopted.

I wish to address the core issue of this bill, the core issue that will protect Queenslanders—reducing trading hours. That will come as no surprise to anyone who has been following this debate. Just as it will come as no surprise to the mums and dads who wait up every night or in the early hours of the morning worrying about their children as they enter our nightclub precincts.

The LNP government, under the failed leadership of the Premier, has failed to act decisively on trading hours. Expert peer reviewed research from around the world states that to prevent injury, assault and death governments must reduce the availability of alcohol by reducing trading hours.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

EDUCATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (2.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2001, the Education and Care Services Act 2013, the Education (Capital Assistance) Act 1993, the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, the Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005 and the Further Education and Training Act 2014 for particular purposes, and to make minor and consequential amendments of the acts as stated in schedule 1 for purposes related to those particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Education and Innovation Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 [[5741](#)].

Tabled paper: Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [[5742](#)].

I am pleased to introduce the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. The bill is a miscellaneous amendment bill, with the majority of amendments being to the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006 and the Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2001. However, the bill also contains various amendments to other acts within my portfolio. The bill represents, in part, the next wave of work undertaken to support key Queensland government initiatives to enhance school autonomy, localise decision making and reduce red tape.

The bill contains many reforms which have these aims at their very core. The Queensland government is committed to supporting principals and teachers to focus on their core business of educating students. The bill also focuses on ways to improve student outcomes, especially for disengaged youth. The Queensland government knows the importance of education and the tangible benefits that education can bring to the lives of all Queenslanders. The bill seeks to ensure the portfolio's legislation is contemporary and meets the current operational needs of the Department of Education, Training and Employment.

Let me outline the significant amendments contained in the bill which align with these objectives. To increase school autonomy, the bill includes a range of amendments to enhance the principal's role as decision maker. The bill will enhance powers of principals to deal with 'hostile persons' on school premises—for example, persons threatening the safety of students, damaging property or disrupting the good order and management of the school. The amendments will give state and non-state school principals the power to give a verbal direction to a hostile person to immediately leave and not re-enter the school premises for 24 hours. Currently, a principal is required to give a written direction to the hostile person. As you can imagine, requiring a written direction to be given can often be impractical when confronted with difficult and sometimes rapidly evolving situations. The ability to resolve this with a verbal direction is a common-sense solution that ensures principals can continue to keep their school community safe.

In addition, the bill contains amendments to enable state and non-state school principals to give a written direction to prohibit a hostile person from the premises for up to 60 days. This ability presently resides with the director-general or a non-state school's governing body. Again, this

amendment is proposed to support and recognise that principals are best placed to manage their school. For similar reasons, the bill also includes amendments allowing the director-general or a non-state school governing body to issue a written direction to ban a hostile person for 60 days up to one year. Presently an application is made to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal for an order to be made. These decisions will remain externally reviewable by QCAT. To be clear, verbal and written directions available for issuing to hostile persons cannot be given to students of the school. Principals have other disciplinary approaches available to address student behavioural issues.

The state school principal's role as primary decision maker for critical decisions is enhanced by the tranche of amendments relating to the enrolment of mature-age students at specified mature-age state schools. The bill will restrict mature-age student enrolments to state schools of distance education or prescribed mature-age state schools. These will include the four schools at Kingston, Eagleby, Coorparoo and Townsville that are commonly referred to as Centres for Continuing Secondary Education. These schools are specifically established to cater to adult students, unlike what could be termed 'mainstream' state schools that predominantly cater for students under 18 years of age. Also, adults can enrol with registered training providers, including TAFE Queensland, to undertake vocational education and training that will assist them to gain the knowledge and skills required for employment. In addition, many vocational education and training qualifications can provide pathways to further study at university.

The bill will enable the principal of one of these schools to make decisions on enrolment of a mature-age student. This will remove red tape by ceasing the current requirement for a mature-age student to obtain a mature-age student notice from the director-general of my department. Currently, an adult student can enrol in any state school provided they have a positive mature-age student notice which declares the person to be suitable to be a student of the school based on consideration of the person's criminal history. This has raised considerable issues for state schools that are not appropriately equipped, through their learning environment and pedagogy, to provide education to adults.

The bill will provide that a principal of a mature-age state school will consider the adult's suitability for enrolment at the mature-age school taking into account any criminal history, if any. In addition to considering the criminal history, principals will determine whether to enrol a mature-age student based on the requirements that apply to all students—that is, if the principal believes the prospective student would pose an unacceptable risk to the safety or wellbeing of members of the school community because of the criminal history, or for other reasons, the enrolment decision will be referred to the director-general. As well as empowering principals, this reform supports the government's aims to improve educational outcomes of children and mature-age students and create safe environments in our state schools.

According to 2012 completion data from the former Queensland Studies Authority, adult learner completion rates are at approximately 80 per cent in the Centres for Continuing Secondary Education, whereas this falls to 50 per cent in other state schools. Transitional arrangements are contained in the bill to ensure that existing mature-age students will be able to continue their education at their current school. The bill specifically overrides the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991. The measure is considered appropriate as the amendments relating to mature-age students are made for the benefit of all students.

To enhance local decision making for school communities, the bill will expressly enable non-state school principals to grant exemptions from compulsory schooling, or the compulsory participation phase, for a period up to 110 school days—approximately two school terms—in a calendar year. Exemptions can be sought for a range of reasons including illness or travel. Presently, exemption decisions can only be made by the director-general or his delegate within my department. State school principals are able to make exemption decisions in relation to students at state schools through this delegation. However, non-state school principals must apply to the department for exemptions on behalf of parents of students at their school, even for short periods of absence.

The government proposes to reduce this double handling, recognising that non-state school principals, like their state school counterparts, are best placed to make such an assessment in relation to their student and context. Suitable safeguards will be retained over the exercise of these exemption powers. Exemptions sought for more than 110 days will still be determined by departmental officers on behalf of the director-general. The director-general will have the power to

review a decision of a non-state school principal, for example to refuse an application for exemption. Also, non-state schools will be required to maintain a copy of their exemption decisions and provide the director-general with access to the decision on request.

Another initiative in the bill that accords with this objective is the amendment that enables the director-general to delegate to appropriately qualified departmental officers, such as regional directors, the power to commence prosecutions against parents for the offence of failing to comply with compulsory schooling and compulsory participation requirements. Regional directors, in consultation with principals, are in the best position to make decisions about prosecution processes as they have access to detailed knowledge about the student, family circumstances that impact on school attendance and local community issues. Of course, it is recognised that school attendance is a complex issue that requires multiple approaches. The amendment is one of a number of strategies, including intensive case management and utilisation of remote student attendance officers, being adopted to improve state school attendance. Before a prosecution can be commenced, the legislation requires certain steps to occur, including notifying parents of their obligations and meeting with them to discuss their child's absenteeism. The amendments do not alter these prerequisites.

Improving educational outcomes for disengaged youth is at the heart of proposed amendments to the Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2001 relating to special assistance schools. Special assistance schools are provisionally accredited or accredited non-state schools that cater specifically for children and young people who have disengaged from mainstream education and who are also not participating in vocational education or work. Critically, special assistance schools do not charge tuition fees.

The bill amends the accreditation act to specifically recognise the existence and operation of special assistance schools. This will enhance the powers of Queensland's independent Non-State Schools Accreditation Board to ensure that special assistance schools comply with accreditation criteria and deliver a quality education program. The proposed amendments to the accreditation act will permit a special assistance school to operate, for a limited period of time, from temporary non-accredited sites in order to re-engage disengaged children and young people into education and training. The proposed amendments will provide added flexibility to respond to the needs of this cohort. It is hoped that initiatives like this will see re-engagement with education and ultimately result in benefits for the student and society.

These amendments will also streamline existing processes for recognising schools as special assistance schools. Currently, schools must be at least provisionally accredited and have commenced operating to apply for special assistance school status, which generally entitles the school to a higher level of state government funding. The minister considers applications for recognition of a school as a special assistance school based on criteria prescribed in policy.

The amendments will remove the discretion from the minister's decision. Instead, the minister will recognise the school as a special assistance school based on the decision of the accreditation board. In addition, currently a special assistance school must operate for the sole and specific purpose of special assistance—a two campus school cannot comprise one special assistance campus and one conventional campus. The amendments will enable an existing non-state school to maintain conventional educational offerings on one site while establishing another campus for special assistance.

Opportunities to reduce the regulatory burden have also been taken. The bill includes amendments to repeal chapter 18 from the Education (General Provisions) Act that regulates the establishment of international educational institutions. This is an institution offering an overseas school curriculum of a foreign country. The legislation currently requires the approval of the Governor in Council in order to operate an international educational institution. The repeal of chapter 18 will not impact on the ability of international educational institutions to operate in Queensland. On the contrary, it removes the unnecessary regulatory burden on these businesses. Of course, any such institution will continue to be regulated under corporations and child protection legislation. I need to stress here that this amendment has no impact on the provision of Queensland education to international students studying in Queensland under student visas. A joint national and state regulatory scheme aims to ensure the safety of international students and provides that they are only able to study approved Queensland and Australian courses with approved providers, including state or non-state schools.

The bill will also remove the existing requirement for the Queensland College of Teachers to disclose to applicants for renewal and restoration of teacher registration and permission to teach police information that has previously been provided to the applicant. This will apply where the police

information will not adversely affect the college's decision about the person's application, for example, where the information relates to a minor matter, such as a traffic infringement. This will assist in reducing the resource burden on the college in processing these applications. Importantly, it will also reduce the regulatory burden and anxiety for applicants who have previously made representations to the college about the police information and been granted registration or permission to teach.

The bill also includes amendments to ensure current provisions within my portfolio's legislation meet contemporary needs, operate to meet their policy objectives and support current operational requirements. For example, the bill supports enhanced school disciplinary powers introduced last year by giving the director-general statutory power to request confirmation from the Queensland Police Service that a student has been charged or convicted of an offence and to obtain a brief statement of the circumstances of the charges or conviction. This power will be limited to supporting suspension and exclusion decisions based on charges and convictions.

Also, the bill inserts new exemptions to the confidentiality provisions in the Education (General Provisions) Act to allow for the release of information for research and law enforcement purposes, subject to appropriate safeguards based on those in the Information Privacy Act 2009. The bill makes further amendments to the accreditation act to recognise modern governance arrangements for non-state schools established by letters patent for the purposes of accreditation. The bill makes other technical and minor amendments, including amendments to remove duplication with the recently revised civil liability indemnity provisions in the Public Service Act 2008 and amendments to align criminal history screening practices for statutory bodies within the portfolio.

While the bill is miscellaneous in nature, the reforms epitomise commitments to key initiatives that have been at the very centre of the Queensland government's education reforms—school autonomy, local decision making and reduced red tape. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (2.47 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Education and Innovation Committee

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

SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2663, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.47 pm), continuing: I was concluding just before lunch that expert, peer reviewed research from around the world states that to prevent injury, assault and death, governments must reduce the availability of alcohol by reducing trading hours. Simply, the Premier has failed the leadership test. He has put his own political interests ahead of the interests of Queenslanders. You cannot tackle alcohol fuelled violence unless you tackle trading hours.

The Premier has bowed to pressure from vested interest groups who are more interested in making massive profits which are subsidised by the taxpayer—subsidies in the form of the cost of providing police officers to maintain law and order in the nightclub precincts. The government subsidises the hospital services as nurses and doctors patch up the wounded, who are only looking for a good night out. The council subsidises the industry when it is left to mop up the mess left around the streets and around our local businesses. Money is being spent on CCTV in every council area, mainly to help identify offenders who misbehave after drinking too much. People are seeing insurance

premiums rise as drunks walk from pub to nightclub, smashing shopfront windows early in the morning. Who pays in the end? That is right, it is the taxpayers and the ratepayers who are paying through the nose to fix broken jaws, to police the streets, to clean up the mess and to combat many of the side effects of an open slather approach to alcohol in our community.

It is true that the former government did not tackle trading hours in the same head-on way the current opposition proposes to, but the moratorium on late night licences prevented many assaults and even deaths. That suite of measures has played a part in combating the problem of alcohol, and I am proud of the former government's measures surrounding drink-safe precincts and banning orders, which have been useful tools in reducing alcohol fuelled violence; however, the increasing incidents of violence means that tougher measures must be taken to prevent the further escalation of this type of conduct.

The clear difference between this government and the opposition is that we are prepared to listen. I am prepared to listen to the experts rather than the alcohol industry. My team has listened to the Coalition for Action on Alcohol and to professors who have devoted their lives to researching ways to reduce crime, violence and the harm caused by alcohol. The evidence is clear, and no credible expert will say that there is no link between the excessive consumption of alcohol and violence.

Research from around the world has shown that reducing trading hours is the most important measure a government can take to combat alcohol fuelled violence; for example, the crime statistics are now available for the first month of the trial in Kings Cross and they are startling. In one month, non-domestic assaults on licensed premises dropped by 33 per cent compared with the same time last year. That is what reducing trading hours in licensed premises to 3 am could do if only the LNP and Campbell Newman had the courage. Assaults not on licensed premises—that is, on the streets—have reduced by 37.5 per cent in one month. At the same time there was around a 50 per cent reduction in alcohol related presentations to the nearby St Vincent's Hospital—50 per cent fewer people injured so severely that they required hospital treatment. Similar figures can be seen in the Newcastle statistics for the first three years of their trial: a 35 per cent reduction in night-time non-domestic assaults requiring police attention; a 50 per cent reduction in night-time street offences requiring police attention; and a 26 per cent reduction in night-time assault related injury presentations to hospitals. The five-year figures show a similar trend.

International peer reviewed research from 15 cities around the world indicates that there is a 22 per cent reduction in assaults for every hour that you reduce trading, and that is consistent with the Australian experience. Let me just say that again: international peer reviewed research from 15 cities around the world indicates that there is a 22 per cent reduction in assaults for every hour that you reduce trading. Research also shows that voluntary trading hour reductions and ad hoc geographical boundaries do not produce these sorts of results. I expect that government members will cherry pick the results from some of these trials to justify their policy, but if they are honest they will look to systemic reviews of the research literature in this field and not simply choose ones that support their policy.

These are not just statistics; these are young people's lives. These are the children of Queensland families whose lives are destroyed by the senseless violence that this government does not have the stomach to tackle because of its links to vested commercial interests. The LNP will declare that reducing trading hours is no magic bullet. Of course it is not. No single measure will tackle the entire problem, but it is not a single measure standing alone. Labor announced a suite of measures when we announced our Tackling Alcohol Fuelled Violence policy, and we are happy to see the Premier adopt some of our suggestions. Things like streamlining the banning system were proposed by the opposition. We suggested that it should operate in the same manner that applies to drink drivers. We outlined our policy to breath test offenders, which has been included in part throughout this bill. Anyone who suggests that we had 'one shot in the locker' is misleading Queensland and misleading this parliament, which is why we would be happy to support some of the measures in the bills. But this government's bill fails to address the key fundamental issue, and that is why we as an opposition cannot support this bill.

While I am talking about the history of this bill, we should all remember the Premier's view in 2010 when he was the Lord Mayor of Brisbane. I seem to recall that from a personal perspective the Premier was leaning towards the view that trading hours in the Valley and the CBD may need to be reduced, and he took great pleasure in informing an inquiry into alcohol that he had written to the relevant minister to oppose the proposal of the ALH to extend trading hours for all of their venues across Brisbane. The Premier has told the police union president that if the Safe Night Out Strategy

does not work, then trading hours will be back on the table in a year's time. This appears to be a quick political fix by a Premier who will do anything to cling to power at the expense of young people being bashed to within an inch of their lives on the streets. The Premier has even promised the police union that he will tackle the trading hours issue in 12 months. That is because the police union supported reduced trading hours and has given their support to the LNP plan based on that promise. That the LNP could look at reducing trading hours next August is something that the opposition applauds, but why wait until then? It is because the LNP wish to placate the political masters who donate to their election campaigns and they have no intention whatsoever of making that change. The same thing happened with the bikie laws: announce the policy and then when people express their total dissatisfaction with it say, 'It's okay, we'll be changing it sometime in the future.'

The Attorney-General put his feelers out after his expert panel recommended reducing trading hours in September last year. This panel included industry members who backed the plan, and for some reason that has never been adequately explained by the LNP. When in opposition, numerous senior members of the now LNP government were supportive of reducing trading hours. What are their views now and has the change in donation policy had anything to do with it? I will also be looking very closely to see if there are any conflicts of interest for the members who speak on this bill and whether or not they have received any political donations.

I would like to contrast the Newman government's flawed plan with Labor's detailed, evidence based approach. Labor has the courage to address the heart of the issue: trading hours. That is why we announced our plan in January, some seven months ago, to help stem violence. I stood with members of the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol and announced our detailed policy for tackling alcohol fuelled violence. I doubt that the Premier or any of his ministers have read it, so let us go over some of the main details.

A future Labor government will legislate to stop the service of alcohol in nightclubs, pubs and other licensed premises at 3 am and will introduce a 1 am lockout. The evidence shows that this type of action is required to effectively tackle alcohol fuelled violence head on. Those opposite have tried to portray our position as some sort of attempt to stifle the club industry, but nothing could be further from the truth. We want a vibrant night-life where everyone can go out and have fun safely until the early hours. Young people and their parents who go out to nightclubs and entertainment precincts deserve to know that they can have a good night out and a safe night out as well. Labor knows that people want action on the sickening problem of young people having their lives ruined by alcohol fuelled violence. All they are getting from the arrogant Newman government is simply a lack of leadership.

Labor's wide-ranging policy will tackle the problem at its core. Anyone who works on the front line and deals with the results of alcohol fuelled violence knows that the most damage is done in the two hours after 1 am. That is why it is imperative that we tackle this growing problem by introducing the 1 am lockout and stopping the service of alcohol by 3 am. The nightclubs will not have to shut their doors; those with extended licences will still be allowed to trade until 5 am, offering coffee, food and entertainment. Our policy is more than just a change to trading hours, although it is the key component necessary to be successful. Our changes to trading hours will be complemented by a multifaceted strategy designed to tackle this complex issue head on.

Labor will also continue the operation of the drink-safe precincts established by the former government in Fortitude Valley, Townsville and the Gold Coast, consider their expansion to other areas and give police the power to breathalyse intoxicated and disorderly patrons, leading to the possible prosecution of patrons, staff and licensees. Labor will maintain the current moratorium on extended licences rather than the open slather approach that will be allowed if this bill is passed, and we will ban the sale of high alcohol content drinks after midnight. We will introduce mandatory bans for repeat offenders similar to the disqualifications that apply to drink drivers. We will also conduct a multimedia education and awareness campaign for young people, particularly male drinkers, about safe drinking practices, the impacts of alcohol related violence, the changes to alcohol service times and the increased enforcement of existing regulations.

As our policy states, we will support federal opposition leader Bill Shorten's call for funding for boxer Danny Green's national coward's punch campaign. Public education is the real key to reducing the incidence of violence in our community. Prevention is better than cure, and that applies to this issue with the same intensity.

Our policy is based on evidence and supported by research, not on whoever is prepared to pay the most money. I add: under the LNP's new electoral donation laws, we will no longer know who is donating to the LNP. As we know, the secret bags of cash, of up to \$12,400 that does not need to be declared, will start flowing in.

Professor Jake Najman, director of the Queensland Alcohol and Drug Research and Education Centre at the University of Queensland, has also supported our plan. He states—

As a member of Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol, I welcome Ms Palaszczuk's sensible approach to alcohol policy.

More police and stiffer penalties are a simplistic, costly and ineffective approach to preventing alcohol related violence.

The alcohol industry needs to accept the evidence for limited trading hours and adhere to the regulations for responsible service.

These regulations need to be effectively enforced.

Parents and the wider community rightly expect the Premier to put the safety of young Queenslanders first.

Unlike the Newman government, we have accepted the advice that more police and stiffer penalties are ineffective in dealing with alcohol related violence unless they are accompanied by reducing trading hours.

Let us reflect on some of the facts. Between 2010 and 2012 more than 76,000 alcohol related presentations and admissions were made at Queensland public hospitals. The Chief Health Officer in the 2012 *Health of Queenslanders* report found that harmful consumption of alcohol is responsible for 30,000 hospitalisations in Queensland each year. That is more than 80 a day—every day. Media outlets earlier this year also reported that the number of facial surgeries conducted at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital rose from 295 in 2011 to more than 500 in 2013. Many relate to alcohol fuelled violence. Labor's policy will reduce the human cost of this violence to individuals and their families and make it safer for young people to enjoy a night out without the fear of being harmed or assaulted by troublemakers.

We are privileged to have in this House as the new member for Stafford highly acclaimed maxillofacial surgeon Dr Anthony Lynham. I had the privilege of campaigning with Dr Lynham earlier this year and also during the Stafford by-election. He is passionate about this issue. If the words and personal reflections of Dr Anthony Lynham later today do not resonate with every member of this House and every member of the Queensland community, I do not know what will, because Dr Anthony Lynham is prepared to listen. Dr Anthony Lynham is prepared to stand up for the evidence based facts around this very issue. He is a tireless campaigner in relation to tackling alcohol fuelled violence. Members will hear how this government failed to listen to Dr Anthony Lynham. Dr Anthony Lynham is now the member for Stafford, and I am sure that in this House he is now a voice for Queenslanders. He is a voice for all those people who have been injured by alcohol fuelled violence. He will recount what he has had to experience firsthand. I am quite sure that will be a wake-up call for members of this House and members of the cabinet.

Mrs Stuckey interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So your husband is a specialist, isn't he?

I will now address the substantive issues contained in this bill. One thing this bill has made very clear is that the meetings with the legal profession have simply been for show. The Premier has left these meetings full of promises to listen but has not changed a single clause of his legislation, despite the strong concerns of the Bar Association, the Queensland Law Society and Legal Aid Queensland. He is hearing without listening. I understand the frustration the legal profession must have with this LNP government, and I thank them again for their extremely helpful contributions to the committee process. Even though they have been ignored I think, member for Rockhampton, again, I can assure them that their contributions have not been wasted. They have formed part of the policy development for the Labor Party, who are committed to righting the wrongs of the LNP into the future. And boy, there are a lot of them!

As we have said on many occasions, discretion for magistrates and judges is the cornerstone of a functioning democracy. Despite the warnings of the Bar Association, the Queensland Law Society and many other stakeholders, the LNP has simply ignored legal expert advice. For example, the provisions relating to the imposition of mandatory community service restrict the instances in which a court may decide not to impose the otherwise mandatory order to instances where the court is satisfied that, because of any physical, intellectual or psychiatric disability of the offender, the offender is not capable of complying with the order. The court should retain a discretion in when it is appropriate, in all the circumstances, to impose a community service order outside these legislated circumstances.

An example of an unintended consequence of these provisions could be that dangerous sex offenders are not exempt from mandatory community service orders. I cannot believe that the Premier or the Attorney-General would want dangerous sex offenders who commit a further qualifying offence to be required to complete a mandatory community service order. Again, a person may be prone to violent outbursts or may have drug dependence or other problems which may mean they are totally unsuitable to complete a community service order. Other than for murder, which carries a mandatory penalty of life imprisonment, there is never a situation where a one-penalty-fits-all approach will be appropriate. The circumstances of each offence and each offender are so many and varied that the court should always retain a discretion in sentencing.

In the vast majority of cases the opposition supports community service orders. Frankly, I welcome violent offenders performing community service as some form of recompense for the victims left injured and maimed by violent attacks on our streets. However, the sex offender example illustrates how a good idea can lead to an undesirable consequence when expert advice is ignored.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee in its report on the bill adequately outlined the problems associated with the mandatory drug and alcohol assessment referral course being mandated as a condition of bail, whether by a court or on watch-house bail. The opposition believes that judicial officers should always maintain a discretion because if they know that the person is unable to properly utilise this service and if completion is a condition of their bail then the only result can be that the person ends up being arrested for a breach of bail down the track. This could unnecessarily tie up valuable police resources processing and charging offenders for relatively minor breaches of bail when they never had any hope of complying with the condition.

More importantly, a person may have absolutely no problem with alcohol dependence. They may be intoxicated but it may be the first time they have been intoxicated, or they may have become intoxicated and committed the offence as a one-off response to a severe personal tragedy. The court could retain a discretion to not impose a condition to complete a drug and alcohol assessment referral course where there is clear evidence that the person would not benefit from participation in such a course. Similarly, problems could arise when a person from a remote or regional centre is visiting a tourist destination. If they cannot be released on bail without undertaking to complete a course but there is no such course available where they live, they cannot be admitted to bail and thus will be detained in custody.

This bill also introduces the trial of a sober-safe centre in the Brisbane CBD. When an intoxicated person commits a minor public order offence such as public nuisance, urinating in a public place or disobeying a police move-on direction and they are behaving in a way that poses a risk of physical harm to themselves or another person, police can detain them in the centre for up to eight hours. There is a cost associated with the detention, and the person must pay an amount equal to two penalty units. If they have been taken to the centre previously, the cost is equal to two penalty units plus one penalty unit multiplied by the number of previous times they have been admitted, up to a total of six penalty units.

Some concern has been expressed in relation to the calculation of the cost. It is submitted that it appears to be more in the vein of a penalty rather than a cost recovery, particularly as the cost is calculated in terms of a penalty unit. Similarly, if it is pure cost recovery, as the bill states, how does the cost increase based on the number of previous times the person has been admitted?

The Queensland Nurses' Union made a submission on the bill. It has some real concerns about the safety of its members who might be involved in the sober-safe centres trial. It said—

Of prime concern is the fact that the legislation appears to have one HCP working as the sole health practitioner at the sober safe centre. This transgresses every unwritten rule about the safety of nurses working alone in the practice setting. The QNU does not support 'single nurse posts'. It is our position that minimum safe staffing is two nurses e.g. in rural and remote settings. Even with a minimum number of nurses, it can commonly result in unsafe workloads—the demand versus supply.

I note from the Attorney-General's comments—and he might clarify this in his response—if I heard him correctly, that he is actually increasing that from one nurse to two. I am not getting any response.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: But, Minister—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, this is not a debate.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I just want him to answer the question, but obviously—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is fine. He can answer it—

Ms PALASZCZUK:—he is choosing to be boring. That is okay.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is okay.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me!

Ms PALASZCZUK: We welcome it!

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me! Leader of the Opposition, I think you have been given a very good run in terms of being able to present your point of view, so please let us continue. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is a new look for the Attorney-General and I welcome that new look. The union is also concerned that if a nurse applies reasonable force they may threaten their registration. Its submission goes on to say—

When persons are in custody, it is appropriate that where restraint is required to perform clinical procedures, such restraint is applied by the police officers present, who have been extensively trained in performing such procedures safely.

The *Mental Health Act 2000* does allow nurses to use 'reasonable force' as necessary ONLY under strict provisions and regulations and in circumstances of imminent risk. There are other legislative provisions that may be enlivened when persons lack capacity. However, the nexus between capacity and intoxication remains a highly contentious area. Nurses do not exercise restraint simply to perform an examination on an unco-operative patient.

I now turn to the consideration of the ID scanner provisions. Clause 74 inserts a new part 6AA into the Liquor Act to provide for the use of approved ID scanners in particular licensed premises and for the approval of ID scanner systems and operators. A system for the approval of networked ID systems is currently being determined by the department. However, concerns have been raised by some of the operators. For example, many premises have already voluntarily introduced ID scanners. They may not be able to be networked or may not fit in with the system eventually adopted. This means that operators who have already taken steps will be penalised by having to purchase and install new operating systems that are consistent with those determined by the department.

Another concern is that the venues that will be required to introduce scanners are not the venues intended to be captured by this legislation. Any licensed premises in a safe-night precinct may be required to install scanners. This will include family restaurants in Caxton Street or the CBD areas. This has the potential to dramatically affect business. Customers will dine elsewhere if they have the inconvenience of having to be scanned as they enter premises after 8 pm, as was originally planned in the bill. Many of the submissions referred to this provision, so it is pleasing to see that the government has taken on board these concerns and changed the starting time to 10 pm. Another concern is in relation to accommodation providers in the safe-night precincts. These will frequently have bars in the lobby which remain open late to provide service to late-arriving guests. Will guests entering the lobby to check-in have to be scanned?

Another concern raised in relation to ID scanning is in relation to privacy concerns. The Privacy Commissioner raised a number of concerns which are valid and give cause for caution. The Acting Privacy Commissioner was concerned that there be adequate safeguards in respect of the following: the value and sensitivity of personal information collected by ID scanners; the vulnerability of the information to breaches of the Australian privacy principles; the possibility that the personal information may be misused for criminal purposes such as identity theft, fraud, blackmail or finding out addresses of persons that are not publicly available, for example in domestic violence or witness protection contexts; whether the scanned images of the IDs will be 'read only' or whether they will be recorded; and whether there will be adequate approval checks on operators and staff. There is a real possibility that IDs such as licences, which have a person's address on it, may be used by a staff member to find the address of a patron. That could give rise to real safety concerns. Similarly, how can a person be sure their information will not be misused for criminal purposes? Identity theft is becoming more sophisticated and the networking of the ID scanners means more than just the people working at the premises you enter have access to your personal information.

This bill has some valuable provisions which may well have some effect on the rates of violence in our community. There are others which are merely window-dressing and will not fix the problem at all. In conclusion, the major problem with this bill is that it sidesteps the one proven method of reducing alcohol fuelled violence in our community, and that is reduced trading hours. A reduction in trading hours will reduce violence in our community. It will reduce violence in our streets and it will reduce violence wherever it occurs. It is disappointing that the LNP government has not had

the courage to tackle this problem where it really needs to be addressed. It is too caught up in its obligations to the liquor industry to have the courage to say, 'We don't care what support you may have given to our candidates. Our policies just cannot be bought.' I know that many members opposite would love to support reduced trading hours. They believe that, based on all of the evidence, it is the best solution to the problem. Unfortunately, the government has gone down the wrong track.

In conclusion, the opposition is passionate about this issue. We want to make sure that we have a community that is safe so that young people can go out for a safe night out and that their families can have some satisfaction knowing that their son or daughter will come home safely in the early hours of the morning. Alcohol fuelled violence is a growing issue in our community. We have seen clear evidence from Sydney and in New South Wales that by reducing trading hours the levels of violence decrease. There is nothing clearer. The evidence states it pure and simple. If we are going to address this issue as a community, we must address fundamentally the trading hours issue. Trading hours are crucial. The opposition is not supporting this bill because the government fails to address the core—the very central heart—of this issue. If we want to tackle alcohol fuelled violence, we must tackle trading hours pure and simple. I support the evidence. I support the leading academics. I support the reports that I have seen. I support Dr Anthony Lynham. I support the coalition on this. This is the right step that we as a community must take, but the LNP government in ignoring this central key fact is burying its head in the sand. It is burying its head in the sand and it is putting the lives of our young people at risk. As I say, it is putting the lives of our young people at risk. I really ask every member to think long and hard about this issue. It is something that I am very passionate about and it is also something that all of the members of my caucus feel very passionate about, because if this means that one life can be saved it is worth doing. I do not want to be in the situation in the future where we have to confront the parents and explain to them that they lost a loved one's life because the government failed to act.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stevens, adjourned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Comments by Member for Gaven

 Hon. JJ McVEIGH (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (3.18 pm), by leave: I refer to the outlandish speech made by Dr Douglas, the member for Gaven, in this House earlier today in which he attacked me but more importantly he attacked my family and my community of Toowoomba. He referred to the burgeoning Charlton Wellcamp industrial estate and he correctly stated that I have been championing that estate for many years as a local resident, as a councillor and now as a member of this House. But he went on to ask why I would do so when it is not, in his words, 'in my electorate'. If the member had completed his research properly he would know that I proudly promote agriculture in our region, I promote education and the health service sector, resource industries, construction and, of course, most of all, small business.

The member should know—and I put him on notice—that I will continue to do so on behalf of our region. The second range crossing, inland rail, the Empire Theatre, the Warrego Highway upgrades, the USQ and Wellcamp Airport are all organisations or initiatives that I will promote and defend until my last breath. Again, any reference to my maiden speech would reveal that I, like other people in the Toowoomba region and the Darling Downs, see these as integrated initiatives for the whole region's future: Toowoomba and the Darling Downs, the Toowoomba Regional Council area, the Southern Downs and Western Downs Regional Council areas and the electorates of Nanango, Toowoomba North, Toowoomba South, Lockyer and Southern Downs.

As a cabinet minister in the region that is my job, particularly as the developments around Charlton Wellcamp promise so much for agriculture. To suggest that I should not speak on such issues in my region, can I suggest, is akin to suggesting that Dr Douglas cannot speak on the Gold Coast University Hospital—not, I am advised, in his electorate but a topic about which this House knows full well that he has raised so many conspiracy theories. More particularly, Dr Douglas should know that in the media and in this House the Premier has been on record asking me, as a neighbouring member, to focus on the electorate of Condamine on behalf of the LNP following the defection of Ray Hopper. So that is why I am interested in the region and Dr Douglas needs to know that.

Dr Douglas made reference to my family in the region. For his benefit, I refer to my original ancestors in the region. I talk about Patrick McVeigh and his wife, Hester Nicholson Woodhouse Dunlop. They were married in 1876 at St Mary's Church in Warwick. And guess what? They were good Catholics. They had eight sons and five daughters. Let me fast-forward to my own grandparents on my paternal side: Thomas McVeigh and his wife, Kathleen, nee O'Leary. Guess what? They were good Catholics: five children. I have tried to continue with my beautiful wife and we have six on the ground ourselves. So guess what? That means that there are plenty of McVeighs—generations and generations of McVeighs—in our region and for Dr Douglas to suggest that I am involved in pursuing the business interests of one of them is scurrilous in the extreme. If Dr Douglas wanted to conduct his research, I am sure he would have heard me refer to my family, of whom I am most proud, in my maiden speech in this House just a few years ago: the McVeigh family, the Meara family. If he wants to research them, there are lots of them doing lots of things around the region as well. Of course, there is my wife's family: the Phillips and Putney families.

Time and time again during his speech Dr Douglas made disparaging remarks regarding the family nature of our beautiful city of Toowoomba. He made a sarcastic reference to the family nature of Toowoomba, a city that I have grown up in, which I am so proud to represent in this House and which I am so very fortunate to call home. Dr Douglas needs to know that, on 30 January this year, the *Toowoomba Chronicle* reported that Toowoomba has been ranked Queensland's most family-friendly city and Australia's fourth. The latest *Suncorp Bank family friendly city report* states that Queensland, including Toowoomba, has some of the best places to live, thanks to low unemployment levels and availability of good schools. Dr Douglas could learn something about education, employment and, of course, health as we have learned in this House.

Let me sum up by saying that his cowardly attack on my family and my community based on these outlandish and unfounded claims are intended, I suspect, to drag the good name of my family through the mud when they are not here to defend themselves. Well I am. I am so very proud of their achievements in law, engineering, education and financial services. More particularly, I am proud of their families—my nieces and nephews—and now I am proud to say their children as well.

This House has seen the repugnant reference to family members in this House previously, particularly the Premier's own family at the last election campaign. To see that such antics are now being employed by the member for Gaven and that he is lowering himself to that level is a sad day indeed for this House. I reject wholeheartedly the assertions that Dr Douglas has made about my activities as the local member and champion and the interests of my family. I reject them unequivocally. I demand that he have the intestinal fortitude to repeat them outside this House. In particular, I encourage him to immediately refer any claims of impropriety to the Crime and Corruption Commission.

SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2672, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (3.25 pm): It is certainly a privilege for me to stand here today to make a contribution to the debate on this important piece of legislation and, hopefully, bring some balance back into the argument. I use the term 'argument' loosely, because what I have heard today is a lot of rhetoric and not so much a correlation between alcohol and crime and assault but a matter of what the cause is. We all know that there are injuries caused by alcohol. I do not think that there is any doubt in the government or in the opposition on this sphere. I do not think that there is any doubt that both the opposition and the government share the same goal in wanting to decrease the effects of not only alcohol but also alcohol fuelled violence, because there is a difference between the two. The issue is really a measured response.

On that point, and as the debate is now very wide in terms of the examples that we use, I will go back to the 1920s in America when there was a prohibition on alcohol. One could almost say that that is a reduction in hours. Yet under prohibition, people found a way to circumvent it. People also seemed to think that prohibition was a total prohibition when it was not. Some states had alcohol. For instance, under prohibition altar wine was exempt. So these ideas have been tried before. I will give members some examples of what happened in Queensland and Australia as well to indicate that to

say that evidence is research is just simply a wrong conclusion. If you want to introduce evidence, then you have to boil down what the research produces. I will give some examples of what I mean by that.

Let us look at the prohibition issue, because that was an almost total banning of the consumption of alcohol. I think it was the 18th amendment in America that was subsequently repealed by the 21st amendment. Effectively, from 1920 to 1933 alcohol was banned. What did America get for that? It got the rise of organised crime, the creation of the American Mafia and speak-easies. I think between those years in the city of New York there were something like 20,000 to 100,000 speak-easies. So to me, to simply come in here and stand up and in the first sentence say that reduced hours is going to be the silver bullet, the core promise, the one factor that is going to alter this whole debate is at the very best simplistic and at the worst naive—and this is no place for naivety.

The opposition's argument is effectively based on the Newcastle experience. The effect of that experience is that a reduction in hours means that it is a simple solution to reducing alcohol fuelled violence. I want to talk about Newcastle, because there are some interesting features there that suggest that, in fact, it is not that simple. We are talking about 14 pubs closing by 3 am and a lockout at 1 am. It was changed to closed by 3.30 am and a lockout at 1.30 am. This is the panacea. This is what they draw upon to say there has been a reduction in alcohol fuelled violence. What the Newcastle report does say, which is not mentioned here, is that those 14 pubs had to adopt a management plan and there had to be compliance orders with that management plan. It was not just a reduction in hours. There were other features that would suggest that there must be a holistic approach: there was to be a dedicated responsible service of alcohol officer to monitor the consumption of alcohol. This government has approached the issue on a holistic basis. The list goes on: no shots after 10 pm; cease alcohol sale 30 minutes before closing; no drink stockpiling; adopt shared radio procedures amongst the hotels; and all staff must know of the conditions. These things now come out as being relevant to whatever data can be taken from the Newcastle report. It is equivocal. The Hamilton experience, which is not that far from Newcastle, did not have the same results. There is some equivocation. As the government is involved—and nobody has referred to it here, the report does not refer to it—were police numbers increased or decreased and what effect did that have on those numbers? The results can be distorted. Simply taking a figure and linking to it reduced hours in itself does not solve the problem. It is research, but it is not evidence. That is the distinction between the two.

There has been much research in Australia, and in Queensland in particular. I will refer to it because it has not been referred to so far. In April 2004 on the Gold Coast there was an experiment with a 3 am lockout and a 5 am closing. There was a reduction, but again we do not know what the police numbers were before and after. Interestingly enough, the assaults were measured four weeks before and five weeks after. The alcohol related assaults dropped from 4.6 per cent to 3.4 per cent. That is a very small survey with a very small result. The issue there is, is a reduction in hours in itself worth the benefit? We need to take into account all matters. Reducing hours affects not only hotels but also the people employed at the hotels. What do those people who go to university during the day and come to work at night do? I do not think they have a job. If they are not serving alcohol they do not have a job. Again it is a matter of balance.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr Byrne interjected.

Mr BERRY: Here we go! We have a contribution from the member for Stafford. We were promised so much from the member for Stafford. Ladies and gentlemen, stay around because I think we are going to get a lecture on how to do face surgery. I am sure that is a complete and utter answer to the whole problem! The difficulty is that we know what the results are. What we want to hear is debate on the ideas. That is what is lacking with this opposition. It has no new ideas. Because the policy of the previous government was a reduction of hours, those opposite must stand by their man and continue on with it regardless. They cannot look at fresh ideas, they have to continue on with this old notion of reduction of hours and that is basically it. There are no new ideas from those opposite at all. In 2004 the Ballarat experiment with a 3 am lockout resulted in no long-term impact. In 2005 in Fortitude Valley there was a similar result. In 2005 in Airlie Beach there was a 50 per cent decrease in assaults inside the venues but no associated decrease in assaults outside the venues. It is very equivocal so far. There is a lot of research that is drawn upon which is rebadged as evidence when, in fact, it is not evidence.

Hamilton, which I mentioned earlier, was a situation where on 27 August 2002 the government required the locking of doors to new patrons after 1 am on Saturday and Sunday, ceasing serving alcohol 30 minutes before closing and closing as late as 5 am. The research papers are actually saying that research was equivocal. Is it evidence? No-one can tell. Evidence is something upon which we rely. Research is not evidence, as I have earlier indicated. The problem is that we can take whatever we like from it. It seems the opposition does extremely well with it. Effectively what it has said on the one hand is that the core to all this is the reduction in hours. That will solve everything. We then have the rhetoric about cleaning up the mess: who pays for the broken jaws? The reality of life is that most people who frequent clubs, pubs and taverns are, in fact, law-abiding people going about their business. They work hard during the week and are going out for relaxation. The amount of problems in relation to people who frequent these precincts is very, very low.

The reality of life is that what the bill has introduced by scanning and banning is having people banned from precincts and having people on bail. It is important to make sure that the offending behaviour is closely associated with the cause. It is something that has been around us for quite some time. The opposition leader has actually made the concession that reducing trading hours is no silver bullet. It is not. We accept that. We are not that far apart after all. We are simply saying that there must be a larger approach. I understand the Attorney-General referred to the amount of money going into what we consider to be that holistic approach, namely, the training. If we thought reducing hours was so brilliant then why didn't we reduce the hours in which people can buy cigarettes? We would probably have the smoking problem solved. A person can buy cigarettes between 1 am and 2 am—I have solved the problem already. Bring on the next argument. I will be happy to solve it. We will just make a reduction. Life is not that simple. The reality of life is that the opposition has not really come up with anything new. I was listening to the debate and the opposition leader did actually say there are some things that they are prepared to support. The only problem is she did not say what they were. Are the penalties associated with coward punches going to be supported or are those opposite just picking out all those things that go against Labor policy?

The Auditor-General gave my committee a briefing on safe drink precincts. To paraphrase what was said, it was a disaster. Three or four government departments were using the safe drink precinct, with one department not knowing what the other department did. The bill was \$12 million. The difference between us, the government, and the opposition is that the opposition just keeps putting the money in with no outputs, no results. That was the reality. There were simply no results. With the amount of money spent on safe city precincts, we do not know what the result is. There was never—

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BERRY: I apologise, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I think I may have hit a nerve. Obviously the opposition leader has not read the report and, frankly, I would be embarrassed if that was from my government, but let us move on. They say they would not reduce hours because of big business. I do not quite know where the logic of that lies, because then we hear the rhetoric about donations. All they are doing is muddying the waters. If they do not have a good argument, they just make everything murky so that we cannot tell the bull from the argument. Frankly, that does not do much to support the opposition's case which, effectively, would hurt only the young people who require a second job. I have heard the mantra. There were one or two policies, which effectively were about training people and getting them jobs, but there is no balanced approach. If you are going to bring in a policy, you must weigh up the implications. I ask somebody in the opposition to tell us what will be the effects of bringing in reduced hours? The young people in Ipswich want to know whether their hours would be affected.

Dr Lynham: What about youth unemployment?

Mr BERRY: On the issue of youth unemployment, the opposition will train people. There will be no jobs, but they will train people. I thank the member for the interjection. At this stage, we do not know what the implications are. As I said at the beginning, prohibition brought about consequences that nobody foresaw. That is exactly the position of the opposition, because they do not know what will be the implications of reducing hours. They have no idea. There is no unequivocal evidence to support their proposition. However, there is evidence to support taking a range of measures, but they have not done that because it does not suit them to do so. They muddy the waters, downplay the holistic approach of the government and hope that when they get to power the problem will be solved and they can sweep it under the carpet, as we know will happen with most legislation. I heard the bikie laws being mentioned. I remind members that the opposition voted for the bikie laws. They are

all over the place today, as they have been for the past two years. It is a pity that they cannot centre on a winning policy as this government has done with this policy, which deals with the problem in a holistic manner.

I am looking forward to the operative procedure of the member for Stafford. I hope he has a few facts to keep us entertained and maybe we might learn a thing or two. The opposition leader referred to 500 maxillofacial surgeries, but she did not tell us how many of those related to alcohol fuelled violence. It was just a big figure to muddy the waters. The reality is that this bill is a balanced approach for not only young people but also hoteliers, who need to make a profit in order to survive. It is also balanced in the sense that we are encouraging young people to frequent entertainment precincts with a responsible attitude. We all know what happens when you impose something harsh. If the price of alcohol is put up at the cricket, heaven's above, one would have to be an idiot not to know that young people simply inject oranges with vodka and take in those oranges. They will always find a way, unless we have a balanced approach. That is all we are asking for. Of course, we cannot be too simplistic about this.

Ms Palaszczuk: This is embarrassing.

Mr BERRY: I cannot really let the opposition leader go when she says this is embarrassing. I agree, but she must not be so hard on herself. Her speech was not that bad. Yes, she mucked up a few things. The Attorney-General answered two or three of her questions, but still she had to go over and question him again because she was not listening properly. Frankly, this is embarrassing. Can I suggest to the opposition leader that she apologises for not listening. Perhaps she simply was not paying attention. We can forgive her occasionally, but usually one listens to the Attorney-General when he is making a major speech. He spoke in great detail about the bill and the measures contained within the report. He spoke about the referrals in country areas being flexible, state-wide in scope, et cetera. He spoke about exemptions, functions, meals, minors and them being temporary and permanent. I repeat that, simply because the Leader of the Opposition may not have been listening.

That is my contribution to the debate. Frankly, I thank the opposition leader. Probably I would not have spoken for half as long if she had not interjected so much. It is always a pleasure hearing her, if not listening to her.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (3.45 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill, which was introduced to the House by the Premier, the honourable member for Ashgrove, on 6 June 2014. The bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, which tabled its report on 18 August 2014. Alcohol and drug fuelled violence is not a new dilemma. However, it has crept into Queensland's vibrant night-life and become more serious, with potentially fatal consequences on the increase. Whilst I have always believed in personal accountability for one's actions, it was evident that government action was needed to address this growing threat in our communities. I am very proud to say that it has taken this LNP government to tackle problematic issues such as these after years and years of head-in-the-sand, do-nothing treatment from successive Labor governments. Following a string of tragedies and incidents, this government has taken decisive and measured action and drawn a line in the sand through provisions contained in this bill. The Leader of the Opposition and the others opposite can bleat all they like as we debate this bill, but what were they doing for all those years that they were in government? Where was the legislation? Granted, they did start some drink-safe precincts, but very little else happened, even as the problems escalated.

The Safe Night Out Strategy is a comprehensive package of initiatives to address violence, antisocial behaviour and safety issues around licensed venues. It is about patrons, venues, communities and the government coming together to create a safe, co-operative and exciting culture for Queensland's night-life. It has come about following extensive, lengthy and detailed community and stakeholder engagement with over 13,800 responses to surveys. Our Safe Night Out Strategy is three pronged: we are going to change the culture, through awareness campaigns and education; we are going to change the environment, through Safe Night Out precincts and supportive spaces; and we are going to change the law, which is the purpose of this bill before the House today. The bill makes amendments to 12 pieces of legislation. Primarily, the passage of the bill will see an increase in police powers, a strengthening of liquor licensing compliance measures and stronger local management of entertainment precincts. All of those objectives share the common purpose of reducing drug and alcohol fuelled violence in Queensland.

The bill will create a new offence of unlawful striking causing death and principally targets the devastating coward punches that have, sadly, taken too many innocent lives. The offence will be punishable with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. If the offender is sentenced to a period less than life, they will serve a mandatory 80 per cent of that sentence before they can apply for parole. This particular offence has been introduced because the law currently requires the Crown to meet the specific requirements of murder, namely intention, beyond reasonable doubt. In those instances this can be difficult to establish and, therefore, the lesser offence of manslaughter is often charged in those cases. Queensland will be brought into line with other states where one-punch laws have been enacted to circumvent the difficulties in adequately sentencing offenders. It comes back to the old adage that if you do the crime you should do the time.

Additionally, there will be an increased penalty for serious assault on public officers, such as ambulance officers, hospital staff and nurses. Where the offender spits, bites, applies bodily fluid, causes bodily harm or is, or pretends to be, armed, the new maximum penalty will be increased from seven to 14 years imprisonment. We recognise the danger public officers face, having already passed a raft of legislation to provide adequate protection for police. Passage of this bill will ensure other officers are also suitably protected. It would appear, though, the opposition does not want to protect our front-line officers.

In an extremely alarming and worrying trend, the use of steroids has become more prolific in recent times. Yesterday officers from the Gold Coast Major and Organised Crime Squad, together with Task Force Maxima officers, arrested two people after executing a search warrant at a Tugun residence, in my electorate, in relation to dangerous performance and image enhancing drugs. I commend them for their diligence and dedication in ridding our neighbourhoods of drugs and other illegal activities.

This bill addresses this issue with an increase in penalties for trafficking, supplying, production, publishing or possessing steroids, ensuring the penalties are more closely aligned to other drugs such as methamphetamine and ecstasy. Again, the opposition would have these people spared extra punishment. Fines will also increase for a range of antisocial behaviour to deter people from committing these offences, as well as adequately holding them to account for their actions.

Another noteworthy aspect of this bill is the amendments that make it absolutely clear that intoxication cannot be used to mitigate an offender's sentence. People choose to drink alcohol in excess and if they make dangerous and harmful choices whilst under the influence they should face the full force of the law.

Community awareness and education campaigns are already in circulation, spreading messages that this behaviour will not be tolerated. Courts will also be able to ban patrons from certain venues for any period of time, including life. Police will now have the ability to issue immediate sanctions for anyone behaving unacceptably in a public premise.

As part of our wider commitment to finding a long-term solution to substance abuse and violent behaviour whilst under the influence, the bill will require the court to impose drug and alcohol assessment and referral as a mandatory bail condition where there is a serious offence under the Criminal Code. Failure to participate in such a course will be a breach of bail. This will be coupled with mandatory community service.

Through the passage of this bill the responsibility of curbing this emerging culture also lies with licensees in Queensland. The licensee will be required to ensure the safety of patrons in and around the licensed premises with greater powers to impose conditions and take disciplinary action where this is not being adequately sustained. Some 15 safe-night precincts will be established throughout Queensland under this strategy.

This government has been unapologetic in our commitment to cleaning up our streets and making Queensland the safest place to live, work and raise a family. We have empowered our police men and women, giving them the funding, legislative backing and increase in numbers they cried out for under years of Labor. On behalf of Currumbin residents, I would like to acknowledge the stellar efforts of our local police officers. Recently released figures show downward trends right across the state. In Currumbin we are seeing particularly pleasing results. Total reported offences are down 12 per cent, assault is down 24 per cent, robbery is down five per cent, unlawful entry is down 40 per cent and the unlawful use of a motor vehicle is down six per cent.

Having been the local member for over a decade, I know safety is important to the good people of Currumbin. After years of incompetence by those opposite, we finally have a government unwavering in our resolve to rid our streets of crime and antisocial behaviour. As the Minister for Tourism, I am pleased to say that this bill is very good news for the millions of tourists and visitors who flock to our state to holiday in a safe environment.

People have a right to feel safe in their homes and communities and our actions since coming into government in 2012 have been focused on achieving this. This bill is one part of our comprehensive approach to addressing a serious issue. To make sure we get this right we have committed to reviewing the Safe Night Out Strategy after 12 months. This is not just a quick fix solution. We will monitor the initiatives and make any necessary adjustments. We have taken the first steps, but government cannot do this alone. I hope that patrons, venues, the community and even members opposite will all work with us to create a safe, vibrant culture for Queensland's night-life.

Anyone who has worked in an emergency department—and I am one of those—has seen horrific and shocking injuries to children and adults and almost every single one of them is avoidable. This legislation takes significant steps to reduce the incidence of these injuries, but it also places considerable responsibility onto individuals themselves—something Labor governments never had the intestinal fortitude or plain old-fashioned courage to do despite being in power in Queensland for 18 of the 20 years before we came into government. I commend the bill to the House.

 Hon. JM DEMPSEY (Bundaberg—LNP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services) (3.55 pm): It gives me great pleasure to speak on the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill is evidence of this government's strong commitment to ensuring Queensland is the safest place to live and to enjoy a safe night out. As a former police officer, I have seen the carnage and despair caused by alcohol and drug related violence. As a parent, I have had restless nights concerned that a fun night out with friends may be ruined by the appalling behaviour of intoxicated people who take it too far. As a local member and minister, I am acutely aware of the community's concerns about the vicious and loutish behaviour that all too frequently occurs in, or within the vicinity of, licensed premises.

Tragically, people have died as a result of such violence. In addressing the deplorable incidents of the fatal coward punch, this bill inserts into the Criminal Code the new offence of unlawful striking causing death, imposing a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. No longer will persons who kill others by unlawfully striking them in the head or neck be able to escape significant punishment because it could not be proven that the offender intended to kill the victim or that death was foreseen as a probable consequence of their violent actions. Society rightly expects that if someone is killed, the offender will be appropriately punished for their crime.

To ensure people get to enjoy a safe night out, not only has this government increased police numbers by well over 800, towards our commitment of 1,100 additional police, but it is providing police with the necessary powers and resources to respond rapidly and effectively, to stop violent and antisocial behaviour impacting on Queensland's night-life. These new powers enable police to impose immediate sanctions to hold those persons to account for their offending behaviour.

Persons who commit public nuisance offences within or in the vicinity of licensed premises will now face a maximum penalty of approximately \$2,850 or six months imprisonment. Police will be able to issue on-the-spot fines of approximately \$340 for language based public nuisance offences. Where the public nuisance relates to disorderly, offensive, threatening or violent behaviour, the on-the-spot fine will now be approximately \$680. Anyone who assaults or obstructs police officers within or in the vicinity of licensed premises will now face a maximum penalty of approximately \$6,830 or 12 months imprisonment. The on-the-spot fine for obstructing police has been increased to approximately \$680.

The bill amends police move-on powers to ensure police officers can direct persons to leave a safe-night precinct for 24 hours due to their behaviour in any public place within the safe-night precinct. Persons who breach a move-on direction from within or in the vicinity of licensed premises or a safe-night precinct will face a maximum penalty of approximately \$6,830. Persons who behave in a disorderly, offensive, threatening or violent way—in addition to other enforcement action police officers may take—face immediate 10-day bans from entering, or being within a specified distance of licensed premises, events or safe-night precincts. The initial police banning notice can be extended up to a maximum period of three months by police officers of, or above the rank of, senior sergeant. Persons contravening a police banning notice face a maximum penalty of approximately \$6,830.

The bill also amends the Penalties and Sentences Act to enable the court to issue a banning order prohibiting a person from being within, or in the vicinity of, licenced premises for any period of time the court deems appropriate including a lifetime ban. To improve the enforcement of the police-

banning notices, court-banning orders and special bail conditions, these orders including photographs of the banned person will be linked into networked ID scanners in licensed venues trading past midnight in safe-night precincts.

The bill also establishes a 12-month trial of a sober-safe centre in Brisbane. Intoxicated adults posing a risk of physical harm to themselves or other persons, causing a public nuisance, urinating in a public place or disobeying move-on directions will be able to be detained for up to eight hours. Persons who have been detained in the sober-safe centre will be required to pay a cost-recovery charge of approximately \$230. Where the person is detained in the centre on multiple occasions, the charge will increase by approximately \$115 each time up to a maximum charge of approximately \$797.

The Queensland community expects a night-life that is safe for all. This is a government that listens to the community and commits to stopping the violence, addressing antisocial behaviour and changing the culture that creates it. Queenslanders and its visitors deserve to have a good night out and a safe night out.

In closing, I, like the Attorney-General, have visited a number of sites in different parts of Australia. As a young person growing up I had the opportunity to travel to many countries to see different Safe Night Out strategies and see how we can best reduce acts of violence while still allowing people to go out and have a good time. I believe this is one of the most comprehensive initiatives Australia-wide, because it involves education, enforcement as well as changing environmental factors to look at not just changing what happens in safe-night precincts but also addressing the scourge of violence within our communities both here in Queensland and interstate. By everybody working together and by early intervention in schools, we will not only sort out the issues in our Safe Night Out precincts but also change the culture of our young people.

This government looks forward to working with other community groups and non-government agencies to not only address educational factors to keep our young people safe but also change their culture of going out and thinking they can simply inflict their violence on others. If it were easy, everyone would be doing it. This state government is putting up its hands and making sure that its citizens are protected on all aspects and that we have a cultural change not just for the years ahead but for the generations of Queenslanders who will implore a personal or private message in relation to violence that it is not on. This will save the lives of many, many Queenslanders.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (4.03 pm): I vaguely remember thinking to myself when this bill was introduced by, I believe, the Premier that it would be great to see the Premier run a second reading debate where there would be a bit of a contest. But once again, as we witnessed earlier this morning, we saw the Attorney-General lead what I consider to be a forlorn hope of this LNP government. The Attorney-General will again be publicly eviscerated in the breach of community reaction to this bill. To my recollection, this is the fourth time I have spoken in this parliament on matters associated with alcohol consumption in this country and some of the highly detrimental social implications evident in all our communities. No-one can accuse me of being a Johnny-come-lately to this debate or the issue.

I am very pleased to be opposing this bill because it is weak, wishy-washy and will be ineffective. The funny thing is that, out of all of this I have never had anybody at 3 am walk up to me in any bar or pub in Queensland and say to me, 'Crikey, I'm thirsty. I have to keep this bar open until 5 am because I am dying of thirst.' That is the whole point. The issue of trading hours is the central problem.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rockhampton has the call.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr BYRNE: You can quote any recollection you like from the casino, Attorney-General.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr BYRNE: You can have a run on that any time you like. I say very complimentary things about you, I can assure you. Well prior to my entry into this House I endeavoured through Labor Party branches and conferences to change the existing Labor policy. I recall sponsoring motions at regional

conferences specifically intended to address this burgeoning problem, particularly in nightclub precincts. I can say quite frankly that I was disappointed with the then Labor government's response to me and that motion. I believed then, as I do now, that the previous government's policy setting was inadequate and history has proven me to be correct.

That is why I am so proud to be associated with Labor's policy of tackling alcohol fuelled violence. I am proud because I know it will work with a positive effect and it is fully supported by evidence, although it is quite evident that many government members who have spoken previously do not understand what evidence is. We have heard government members simply cherry picking statistics from poorly designed schemes while never admitting the fact that peer reviewed research from 15 cities around the world, including cities in Australia and Norway, indicate that for every hour of reduced trading there will be something like a 22 per cent reduction in assaults. That is called evidence—peer reviewed academic research that demonstrates absolutely.

I would like to refer to some comments made by the Attorney-General on ABC on 30 September last year. This is what was reported—

Earlier closing times, extra police and public transport are among a number of recommendations from an expert advisory panel.

Not that any of us ever saw those recommendations, but clearly they were enough for the government to be briefing journalists about it. Attorney-General Jarrod Bleijie says that he will make a decision. He is quoted as saying—

There has been a similar intervention in Newcastle and they have certainly had quite a lot of success down there on a range of issues including trading hours. They have also had a reduction in serious assaults of about 37 per cent in alcohol related violence.

I did not hear any reference to silver-bullet solutions from those comments made 11 months ago by the Attorney-General which reflect evidence which is based on fact. Despite what we hear from government members, these remain uncontested facts. It is clear that the centre of gravity for this entire debate is the government's refusal to address trading hours and, more broadly, the availability of alcohol in our communities 24/7 in ever-increasing volumes.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee heard that 70 per cent of alcohol consumption in this country and in this state occurs off licensed premises. No wonder pubs in regional Queensland are closing. Thirty years ago no such notion would have been thinkable. In terms of history it was thoughtful and useful for me to look back at what members said on this subject in previous parliaments. There was a particular gem delivered by the now Attorney-General on 4 August 2010—four years ago. The Attorney-General, in speaking to the Criminal Code Amendment Bill, said—

Earlier this year, I participated with other honourable members in the Law, Justice and Safety Committee's inquiry on alcohol related violence. We toured the state and I can tell the House that what I saw out on the streets when we were touring nightclub districts all around Queensland was appalling. There were thousands of young Queenslanders lining the streets with rubbish, assaulting police officers, having no regard to what the police are there for, having no regard to their fellow Queenslanders. There was absolute garbage on the street, absolute mess and mayhem.

Perhaps for the first time, and probably the only time in this House, I am in complete agreement with the Attorney-General. What I want to know is why has it taken the government a full term to bring this legislation to the House? I want to know why the government is so fixated on pure politics and has failed to act when clearly it was well aware of the situation and has been for years. There are some points of agreement in all of this. Certainly, there is an agreement across the chamber that there is a problem. Certainly, there is an agreement that something must be done to spike the trends in our communities that we are all witnessing. One would think that, given agreement about the fundamental situation and agreement that action must be taken and earlier commentary that I will reflect on in a moment, this would translate into a sensible, adult discussion, particularly in light of the overwhelming majority of seats held in the parliament by the government and the confidence that such should engender when engaging in serious public policy development. Maybe even, dare I suggest, there could be some bipartisan, apolitical consideration of the practical measures that could be taken short term and over the longer term. Unfortunately, this has not been the case. The fact that the government is finally bringing this bill to the Queensland parliament, well into its third year in power, demonstrates just how committed this government actually is and what priority it has apportioned to this matter. Some of the measures in the bill reflect the opposition's released policy, and we accept that. Sure, some have been tinkered with and others set up mandatory sentences in a purely political agenda to create conflict. If the government was sensible and it wanted a unified, bipartisan stance, it could have got around that if it was really interested in a cultural shift, which is what I believe is required.

It is not as though this issue has suddenly arisen in our communities. I have taken the time to look at what transpired in the last parliament. My initial point of reference was to reread the law, justice and safety committee's final report on the inquiry into alcohol related violence of March 2010. That was report No. 74. It is a cracker of a report and Barbara Stone, the then member for Springwood, did a particularly thorough job. I think all who were part of it would acknowledge that. It was also interesting for me to note the members of the committee who now hold senior executive positions within this government. Naturally, I took great notice of their contribution during the second reading debate of the legislation that followed, being the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I reflect on Ms Stone's foreword to the report in which she said—

What has happened to Australia's drinking culture? Australians were once known for our knock 'em down attitude, and seen as a nation of drinkers who could hold their own when it came to alcohol. Mates would look after mates and take them home when getting to a point of inappropriate social behaviour. Today the research indicates binge drinking has become a prominent part of our drinking culture and with that has come some changes to our drinking behaviour.

...

Currently, alcohol related violence is a hotly debated topic and seen as being on the rise. It is not new. Some argue that there is not enough research to support the view that there has been a large increase in alcohol related violence but what no one disputes is that the severity of the violence has dramatically increased.

I honestly think that is the point: the severity of the violence has dramatically increased and the shift in the culture must be addressed. Fast-forward five years and I could use exactly the same language today. I would submit that, despite all the huffing and puffing consultation and some genuine efforts on behalf of many, the problem has become more poignant.

The committee, chaired by Barbara Stone, made 68 recommendations. Frankly and honestly, it was difficult to refute the common sense and logic contained within those recommendations. Many who participated in the debate of the enabling bill reflected on that truth and the missed opportunity of trading hours. The then member for Mermaid Beach, now Leader of the House, said—

I state at the outset that the opposition has reservations regarding the effectiveness of this bill, but, on the whole, agrees with the intent and legislative direction of the proposed amendments ... which are a minuscule movement to address alcohol related violence in our community.

At that time the member for Mermaid Beach, now Leader of the House, went on to say more, and I thought his speech at the time was really very thoughtful and reasonably well informed. He made mention of bottle shops and trading associated with those and what he described as the then government's Clayton's approach to the committee's recommendations. He also made extensive comment about issues surrounding the 5 am trading hours and the detrimental implications such licence arrangements have for particular communities. In a very considered fashion, he was critical of the whole notion of extending trading hours and commented on the pleasure in seeing that Coolangatta was not in the frame for extended licenses. By the way, this bill removes the moratorium on extended licence trading hours et cetera. Now, it is effectively open slather on this matter—quite counter to what common sense suggests should be the case. I found most interesting this comment from the current Leader of the House at that time—

... I was disappointed to see that 68 recommendations could have been adopted by this minister and this government in this legislation, yet, quite clearly, they ran away from those recommendations as they were too hard, too costly or not in their political interests.

Once again I agree with the member for Mermaid Beach. His words remain as relevant today for this LNP bill as they did for the previous Labor effort. To his credit, the member for Mermaid Beach has stood fast and as late as January this year he backed a proposal to curb trading hours in Broadbeach.

It is also interesting to read the now tourism minister's comments, and she spoke earlier in this debate. Back in 2007 she basically bagged the government for its failure to embrace all of the recommendations—and fair enough I say. She chose to mention those recommendations not embraced. I choose to highlight some of those: recommendations 43, 44 and 45 to wind back late-night trading hours and lock-out times. At the time the now minister was highly critical of the then government's inaction in this area. It is interesting to see today her total lack of consistency with the point of view expressed during that debate—again, evidence of a government that lacks conviction on this issue with no consistency whatsoever.

I would encourage members to look at the contribution of the previous member for Toowoomba South. He makes some very valid points about trading hours and the genuine private sentiments of industry operators, particularly regarding trading hours. These are sentiments that were echoed by

members of the LNP expert panel on alcohol last year. That release that I just referred to showed that nobody makes any money from 3 am to 5 am. That is what most operators operating in that environment will tell you privately without the industry looking over their shoulder.

A government member: Bullshit!

Mr BYRNE: That is exactly right; I can take the member to talk to people. He needs to do that.

I look forward to the day when I see a member of the LNP stand up in this House and actually say what they think rather than support every ludicrous, undercooked or overpaid piece of legislation the ministers dump on them. It will not happen in this debate because we have an arrogant Premier and an Attorney-General who sit back and crush dissent across Queensland and even crush what I think is well thought through, evidence based policy positions clearly articulated by their own colleagues in previous parliaments or more recently. I remind members of the Premier's own personal view on trading hours in 2010 when he was Lord Mayor, which has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. I am wondering what has changed his mind from when he was the mayor, what has changed the Attorney-General's mind since as recently as 11 months ago and what has changed the mind of the member for Mermaid Beach this year? I certainly cannot see any evidence that would change their point of view. It is definitely not any visible evidence that has caused this dramatic change in sentiment.

In summary, essentially after four years we have not improved anything. The situation in some respects is worse and we are confronted with a weak government unable to make the decisions—the strong choices—so blatantly obvious and necessary in our communities. If members opposite want some evidence, they should go and talk to the ambulance officers on a Friday or Saturday night. They should talk to the police officers, who are the punching bags of these clowns roaming the streets at 4 am. They should talk to the emergency department nurses, the ones to whom I spoke yesterday who told me about the ambulance ramping at their hospital simply because this government allows this sort of nonsense to continue.

Government members interjected.

Mr BYRNE: That is what is happening. Members opposite do not want to go and talk to anyone. They do not know what is happening on the ground. Why don't they go and spend a weekend in an emergency department? Then they can talk to me about what this is going to achieve.

We have a government that is held to ransom by its own special interest supporters. This is a government whose every member knows what needs to be done. However, it refuses to do it and instead wants to play politics with this topic. There can be no greater indictment of a government than when it is presented with the facts and very clear, difficult choices it refuses to act in order to protect the interests of a few.

Specifically, the bill before the House admittedly has some useful measures—and we have reflected on that—but, in the main, it is pure politicking and has been condemned by anyone who understands the issue and points out that the LNP is still not listening to the legal fraternity, who all oppose elements of it, or anybody else. This is a marshmallow tough government; that is about as good as you are. Unlike many in this House, on numerous occasions over the term of this parliament I have put my views regarding alcohol fuelled violence on the record. Nothing that has been provided as evidence to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has shifted me from that conviction one iota. If anything, the committee process has affirmed everything that has previously been presented by me in this House. Any assertion that the material provided to the committee in some way validates a different perspective is a gross prostitution of the evidence and the facts and cannot be sustained in the light of serious rigorous cross-examination.

I am sure that there will be some members of the government—we have already seen a bit of it here—some credible LNP backbenchers who will stand in this House and argue the toss about trading areas. I bet some would even be so foolish as to put themselves on the public record permanently undermining the values of their conservative colleagues in New South Wales. But that would be a foolish enterprise indeed. To those members I would just counsel this point: they will be permanently marked in the history of this state by their contribution to this debate on an issue which has destroyed the lives of so many Queenslanders and their families. I say to all who are speaking here tonight that they should pull the rein on the politics just this once and be sure that you are saying what you know to be true. Do not become the cannon fodder of the LNP by joining this Attorney-General's forlorn hope.

I must also comment on the \$44 million allocated in the last state budget. This money apparently enables much of this legislation. It was almost the same amount of money that the LNP ripped from the hands of pensioners—and we still do not know how that is being replaced—before the glorious backdown. Through the crime inquiry I have endeavoured to find out where this money is intended to be spent. I have been unable to get a clear answer from anyone involved in the operation or implementation of these programs as to where the money is going to and what it is for. This raises a couple of issues with me. Firstly, where is the \$44 million estimate coming from if no-one on the ground can explain to me or the committee what the money is actually intended to deliver? Where is the publicly identified and verified baseline statistics that will determine success? Secondly, why is this government forcing Queensland taxpayers to sell assets against their will and then stumping up \$44 million of taxpayers' money to support an industry that already costs this country billions more than it generates? Why isn't the industry, which derives direct benefits from this product, being forced to meet the real and full costs of hospitalisations and policing? Why is it being dumped back on taxpayers by this government to the tune of \$44 million? I look forward to any member of this government standing up and explaining why Queenslanders should be paying again to manage the aberrations of this industry on the margins.

The committee received a large number of submissions and these revealed a variety of perspectives, but it would be entirely inappropriate to say that those submissions are in any way in the main supportive of this bill. I think you should particularly reflect on the submissions of the Bar Association and the Law Society. If anyone needs any evidence that some people do not fear being caught, I would challenge you to go to the *Townsville Bulletin* website and have a look at the 'punishment shocks coward punch victim' video. That pretty much says it all as far as trading hours and whether any deterrence value will work. I oppose this bill.

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (4.23 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Shortly after midnight on Friday, 21 February this year, local Brisbane north AFL identity Bruce Steensen was spending some time on the Sunshine Coast catching up with footy mates when he came across a young man allegedly verbally attacking a taxidriver. From all accounts it appears that Bruce asked the young man to settle down. He then turned and walked away. Bruce was then chased, punched in the face and died from head injuries the following night. This behaviour is unacceptable by any measure. We are well aware of this case and too many others like it. It was an incident such as this that led to our government announcing our intention to take strong measures to tackle coward punches and all alcohol and drug fuelled violence.

In the days following Bruce Steensen's death, ABC Sunshine Coast radio carried an interview with a friend and former colleague of Bruce, Derek Delaney, who said of Bruce—

Bruce was as tough and strong and as brave as any other footballer on the field, but if there was any sort of unneeded or unnecessary violence, he would bring down some very strong penalties on any players ... that wanted to show any sort of aggression or violence. He just didn't stand for it.

As a government we have repeatedly signalled our position, and that is that we simply will not stand for this type of behaviour either. It is unacceptable on the football field or anywhere. Much like what happens on the footy field, we are taking the sensible approach that it is the individual who commits the crime who should suffer the consequences. I find Labor's position, that the best way to deal with the behaviour of a minority of individuals is to shut down the whole show, untenable. Can you imagine if you applied this to the sporting arena? There would be absolute outrage if a player was sent off for foul play and then they shut the game down completely. You do not punish the many for the sins of the few.

The measures put forward in this legislation are sensible, and they offer a multifaceted approach to dealing with those individuals, organisations or establishments who are ruining things for others and who in some instances are inflicting lasting and permanent damage on other individuals. Let me touch briefly on some aspects of this bill. Firstly, let me say that education for teenagers and students is crucial to ensure that there is a long-term change in attitudes to alcohol and alcohol fuelled violence. We need to ensure that the current generation and future generations of youth clearly understand society's expectations around behaviour that is affected by alcohol. I fully endorse further education in schools about the culture, attitudes and social expectations around alcohol consumption.

In relation to the introduction of new categories of crime and the strengthening of sentences contained in this bill, I again add my wholehearted support to these measures. As many MPs did earlier this year, I undertook a series of community consultation exercises in my electorate on this issue. As part of my community consultation earlier this year I undertook a survey in my electorate. Of

the nearly 1,000 responses, 95 per cent of respondents were supportive of tougher laws and penalties for antisocial behaviour and alcohol fuelled violence. Let me again contrast that with Labor's position of effectively closing pubs and clubs earlier. In the survey that I conducted this was not supported by over 50 per cent of respondents. This position would not only have a negative impact on patrons who are doing the right thing but also would negatively impact on the jobs of many Queenslanders who work in pubs, clubs and associated industries.

Whilst I am addressing the opposition's position on this matter, I want to briefly address some remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. The rank hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition in standing before us today and lecturing us, in her misguided belief that somehow we are beholden to the alcohol industry for the way that our strategy has been formulated, is simply unbelievable. If the alcohol and hotel industry ever have the opportunity to provide one third of the vote in a future vote for the parliamentary leader of the LNP, then maybe we will give some credence to the wafflings of the Leader of the Opposition. For her to get up on her high horse and lecture us on vested interests, when she herself is at the beck and call of unions to keep her own job safe—pardon me while I scoff. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, we on this side of the House do not believe that business is intrinsically evil. We do not believe that 'Lord Business' is some evil tycoon who wants to destroy the world. We recognise that business provides the very jobs necessary for the constituents who we serve in this House, and we will consult businesses just as we consult other stakeholders to come up with sensible solutions to issues such as this. We cannot go around punishing those who are doing the right thing, as Labor wants to do. I believe that we are rightfully targeting those who are choosing to act in an unacceptable manner.

Another measure I enthusiastically support is the compulsion for particular venues to utilise ID-scanning technology. Eatons Hill Hotel, which is one of the largest, if not the largest, suburban hotels in Australia is located in my electorate. Earlier this year I spent a Saturday night with the duty manager, observing how this particular hotel manages their patrons and particularly how they manage unruly patrons.

Eatons Hill Hotel already operates an ID-scanning system. It is a system that is linked with other venues up and down the east coast. I have been informed that over the past three years their hotel alone has banned over 900 people from their establishment, some for a defined period of time and some for life. But here is the great thing, I think, about these networked ID scanners. I was told a story about a patron who was removed from the hotel one night for unacceptable behaviour and placed on the banned-for-life list. His expletive-laden rant to staff went along the lines of, 'I don't need your stupid hotel anyway. I'm moving to Cairns and I'm never coming back here again.' A couple of weeks later the hotel received a phone call from a very repentant man asking that his ban be lifted. This same man had indeed moved to Cairns. He had subsequently tried to get into a venue up there for Friday drinks with his work colleagues. He was refused entry based on the event at Eatons Hill Hotel several weeks earlier. The networked ID scanners mean that, wherever this man travels, where there is a scanner linked to that system he will not be able to get into that venue, whether it is for after-work drinks or a work Christmas function or a family birthday. His unacceptable behaviour has lasting consequences for him, the individual committing the crime, and that is exactly how it should be.

Some time after the death of Bruce Steensen I met with Bruce's mother, Gloria. Gloria is a constituent of mine in Pine Rivers and she has become very heavily in the One Punch Can Kill campaign. She is now putting significant effort into ensuring Bruce's death is not in vain and that others do not suffer the same consequences. After hearing the stories of Gloria's heartache and hearing what her family have been through and continue to go through, then for the sake of Gloria, for the sake of the extended family and friends of Bruce and to ensure more families are not put in the same tragic position in the future, I support the multifaceted approach that this bill puts forward. Alcohol fuelled violence and drug fuelled violence are a scourge on our society that must be stopped, and I am pleased to support this bill.

 **Mr LATTER** (Waterford—LNP) (4.32 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. As has been said in a number of speeches given today, and most recently by the member for Pine Rivers, this is a multifaceted bill. It is not a bill that is encumbered by any one particular issue.

Today I had the distinct pleasure of having lunch with two of Logan's finest police officers and having a lengthy discussion about this particular matter. Indeed, the general agreement around the table was that this is not an easy issue to address and that, indeed, it cannot be addressed by any

one measure. I am a little disappointed that the premise of the opposition's position in relation to this matter is based on one particular deliverable in this space, that being the reduction of trading hours for venues, when the bill does actually address a number of different issues I think particularly well.

Before I go into what is my passion in this space, and certainly the message that is coming across to me from members of my community, I reiterate what the Attorney-General and the member for Pine Rivers had to say, that is, this bill takes an approach whereby children and youth are educated in responsible community behaviour and in the responsible consumption of alcohol. Indeed, this is something I felt strongly enough about to both fund and support the provision of life education programs in some of my schools in the electorate of Waterford.

I refer to the introductory speech made by the Premier. I note that the committee report also quotes the Premier stating—

Fresh measures are called for to counter the dangerous trend of innocent people falling victim to senseless violence at the hands of people who are drunk or high on illicit drugs.

The committee report goes on to say—

Currently, in Queensland, when a person kills another person in the circumstances of a fatal 'coward-punch', the only available offences are murder (section 305 of the Criminal Code), or manslaughter (section 310 of the Criminal Code). However, as noted in the Bill's Explanatory Notes, "in the absence of overt evidence that the offender intended to kill the victim, a conviction of murder is difficult to secure".

Additionally, it is difficult to secure a conviction for manslaughter during to the operation of section 23(1)(b) of the Criminal Code. Section 23(1)(b) of that code provides that a person is not criminally responsible for an event that the person does not intend or foresee as a possible consequence and an ordinary person would not reasonably foresee as a possible consequence. Accordingly, as highlighted in the Explanatory Notes:

Section 23(1)(b) will exempt an accused from criminal responsibility for the consequences of their actions (example, death resulting from a punch), if the consequence was not intended or foreseen by the offender and would not reasonably have been foreseen by an ordinary person.

The frustration that is expressed to me in the community towards people who are not being held to account for their actions is overwhelming. Whilst this bill takes a multifaceted approach through education, through awareness campaigns, through working with industry partners and through identifying areas of need and in those areas of need instituting requirements such as ID scanners—I thank the Attorney-General for discussing that earlier and providing some clarity as to the safety measures around that—I think we as a society are reaching a point where we have to stand up and say that enough is enough. It is time the message is made clear that committing actions such as coward punches is not the right way to be in community. It is not good enough. It is not acceptable.

As tempting as it may be from time to time, I cannot walk into this place or any other and punch someone in the face and think that is okay by any standards, because it is not. We need to make it very clear in the community—indeed, the constituents of Waterford are telling me that we need to stand up and take back our streets—that it is not good enough to behave in such a manner.

Despite what the member for Rockhampton would say in terms of shying away from the strong choices, I think this is a strong choice. I think the government is doing the right thing in this space. On that basis, on that measure, whilst it is one of a few, I support this bill.

 **Mr DILLAWAY** (Bulimba—LNP) (4.37 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I congratulate the Premier on the introduction of this bill to the House as the government's response to the issue of alcohol related violence throughout Queensland. I acknowledge the hard work of my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee in the examination of this bill and thank all who were part of the process, including the Attorney-General, who is looking after the second reading stage of the debate. I also thank the significant number of Bulimba constituents who actively engaged with me in the discussion and formulation of the strategy.

We are all aware that over the past year alcohol related violence has received a lot of media attention. It has been a hot topic of discussion following some tragic events. It was clear to the Newman government that something had to change. Incidences of coward punches and the like should not and will not be tolerated by this state. In stark contrast to the comprehensive strategy we have developed as a government, the Labor Party came forward and offered a bandaid solution that would impinge on the freedom of the majority who are doing the right thing. The opposition believes that this problem can be fixed by concentrating only on drinking hours, whereas the issue needs a more widespread approach including firmer penalties, education, stronger liquor-licensing measures as well as action to change the culture to restore responsible behaviour and respect, to ensure Queensland's night-life is safe for all to enjoy.

At the outset I thank the Premier for his sensible approach to this issue and the significant time he devoted to listening to the broad-ranging views of Queenslanders. Queensland was actively engaged in the debate, with some very good points being raised on social media, on talkback radio shows and in other media outlets.

Overall, the message from the community was clear: the issue had to be addressed in a sensible, broad-ranging manner. This sentiment was reflected in my own electorate of Bulimba and during February I personally wrote to over 400 of the 18- to 25-year-olds to get their views in relation to the alcohol related violence survey. I was very impressed with particularly the young demographic in my community who took the time to share their views with me. Many of their responses were very thought provoking based on their firsthand experience of nights out in Brisbane and suggesting the roots and causes of alcohol related violence and, most importantly, offering potential solutions. The results from the Bulimba alcohol related violence survey strongly mirrored those across Queensland, where 82.3 per cent of respondents agreed that the government must do something about alcohol related violence but at the same time 89.5 per cent agreed that the community also had a role to play in responding to alcohol related violence. As a result of the depth and extent of this community consultation, as a government we have been able to develop, refine and now provide a well rounded, holistic solution that incorporates and addresses the many factors that constitute this complex issue we face in our society today.

It should also be noted that 74 per cent of respondents to the survey on the draft Safe Night Out Strategy believed that the strategy provided a comprehensive range of responses that are likely to be effective in addressing alcohol and drug related violence. The Safe Night Out Strategy focuses on changing the culture, changing the law and changing the environment surrounding drinking behaviours in Queensland. Through changing the culture, the strategy will enhance the social disapproval of intoxicated violence so that offenders are not only punishable by law but are punished through loss of association with friends and, sadly, also a loss of respect. To achieve this, education and awareness campaigns both within schools and the wider community will be crucial to promoting the importance of responsible behaviour. An education campaign will become part of the curriculum for state school students in years 7 to 12 to make sure our kids are aware of the dangers of binge drinking and drug use.

The Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill is the legislative aspect of the strategy. It was evident in the Bulimba electorate and across Queensland that there was significant support for tougher penalties and sentences for law-breakers affected by drugs or alcohol. The bill contains a number of significant criminal law reforms including the introduction of a new offence of unlawful striking causing death. This specifically targets the intolerable and cowardly acts of violence within our communities that have tragically taken the lives of innocent victims—too many innocent victims. Seeing the offender time and time again get away with a soft punishment has simply been rubbing salt in the wounds of the families of the victims who have been devastatingly impacted. This new offence will be punishable by a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, which accurately reflects the severity and cowardly nature of the crime. It will also reinforce that the familiar phrase 'one punch can kill' is just not rhetoric; it will have a wide range of consequences for the perpetrators. It also fills a current legislative gap and ensures that the community is better protected from such cowardly acts of violence.

Additionally, the bill proposes to change sentencing rules to ensure that intoxication will not be able to be used as a defence to reduce a person's sentence. As adults we must take responsibility for our actions and 'I was drunk' should not be an available excuse for violent, antisocial behaviour. Firmer penalties will also be introduced for people behaving badly around licensed venues, including higher on-the-spot fines for offences like causing a public nuisance and refusing to leave a licensed premises. Some offenders will also be required to perform community service work as part of their sentence such as cleaning up areas around entertainment precincts, working in rest and recovery services or may need to undergo alcohol or drug counselling. Penalties are also increased for the offence of serious assault of a public officer such as an ambulance officer or one of our dedicated emergency department nurses and doctors. The increased penalty will apply where the assault involved the offender biting or spitting on the officer, or throwing or applying a bodily fluid on the officer, or causing bodily harm, or where the offender is or pretends to be armed. The increased penalty from seven to 14 years imprisonment is justified to protect Queensland's front-line officers from the dangers inherent in their duties and to ensure the appropriate punishment and deterrence for this kind of behaviour.

It is important to acknowledge here today that, sadly, alcohol alone is not the sole cause of this violent behaviour. In many situations previously people committing acts of violence on nights out are also under the influence of drugs. This was constantly pointed out to me by respondents to my survey who drew my attention to the emerging ‘bruss’ subculture—a term I have been told is used by our younger generations to describe a person who devotes his entire time shredding and mass bulking at the gym and may use steroids to enhance this process. The unsupervised use of such substances can potentially harm the individual and has been linked to aggression and violent behaviour. In response to the community’s concern, the bill increases the penalties for the unlawful possession and supply of steroids. The strengthened penalties will be similar to those that are applied to other dangerous drugs such as methamphetamines and ecstasy. This provision was strongly supported by the Valley Liquor Accord that acknowledged in its submission that—

These drugs are an insidious thing which adds to a poor culture in the youth of Australia, a culture which is not welcome in our precinct.

I also welcome the 12-month trial of sober-safe centres in the Brisbane CBD as part of the strategy to change the environment. Police will have the power to detain an intoxicated person who is behaving in a way that poses a risk to themselves or others for their own safety for up to eight hours. This preventative measure will provide an alternative to the person being charged with a nuisance or public intoxication offence. In effect, the scheme is designed to divert the person from the criminal justice system. Additionally, it recognises that, whilst violent, aggressive or nuisance behaviour by intoxicated persons poses a risk to the safety of other persons, an intoxicated person may also be vulnerable to harm. A healthcare professional will be required to be present the entire time that the centre is operational and will provide advice to the manager of the centre if there are health reasons the person should not be admitted. They may recommend that the person should receive urgent medical attention at a medical facility. I thank the Attorney-General for his point of clarification on the number of healthcare professionals who will be on duty as two, as this concern was raised by the Queensland Nurses’ Union.

The bill seeks to address alcohol and drug related violence by providing safe and supportive precincts through the establishment of Safe Night Out precincts across Queensland. Each precinct will be managed by a local board association that will be responsible for coordinating initiatives to address alcohol related violence. Members of the board may be local businesses, members of chambers of commerce and community organisation representatives in addition to licensees of the precinct. The board will empower local communities to ensure the effective management of key entertainment precincts in Queensland to safely deal with patrons at peak times. It is envisaged that they will work closely with Queensland government agencies such as the police, emergency services and also our transport network. Local board associations will work with the TransLink division that will continue to provide secure taxi ranks and will continue to operate a number of new NightLink bus services to provide further public transport options for patrons of late-night entertainment precincts and security on late-night bus services where appropriate. As the member for Bulimba, an issue that was repeatedly highlighted to me during my consultation with the young people of my area was the public transport options available coming home from the Brisbane CBD or Fortitude Valley late at night. As part of the strategy, TransLink will work with the safe-night precinct boards to ensure public transport in the precinct is managed safely and effectively. It will monitor actions undertaken against the Safe Night Out Strategy objectives and evaluate the NightLink trials on a yearly basis and will monitor and evaluate through patronage, customer feedback and incidents on the network. Funding assistance will also be provided for secure taxi ranks in all safe-night precincts.

The bill amends the Liquor Act to require licensees of safe-night precincts that trade past midnight to operate an ID scanner as a measure to manage violent or disorderly patrons. The committee was of the view that the introduction of ID scanners is an appropriate and proportionate response to addressing alcohol and drug related violence. ID scanners are already in use at some entertainment venues and entertainment precincts such as the Valley, but this mandatory requirement will further protect patrons to have a safe night. I again thank the Attorney-General for his response to the committee’s report on the start time and the clarification on who is required to have ID scanners available for their patrons. The bill also introduces new police banning notices to enable the police to issue on-the-spot banning notices if an individual is behaving in a disorderly, offensive, threatening or violent manner and poses a risk to the safety of persons or disrupting the reasonable enjoyment of licensed premises, events and people within a safe-night precinct. In combination with changing the culture and changing the environment, this legislation will assist in deterring people from irresponsible and antisocial drinking behaviour whilst allowing Queenslanders to enjoy a safe night out which, of course, will be a good night out.

The Safe Night Out Strategy is the collaboration of patrons, venues, communities and the government to create a safe, cooperative and vibrant night-life culture in Queensland. These measures are designed to change the culture associated with irresponsible alcohol consumption rather than punish those who wish to drink responsibly. I thank our government for its approach to this issue. I know that the Premier has earned the respect of a lot of young people in the Bulimba electorate who appreciated his time in listening and acting on alcohol related violence. They appreciated being treated as the adults they are and not strictly controlled with an earlier curfew, as is the plan of the members on the left. I look forward to seeing this bill and the additional elements of the strategy being implemented in stages over the coming months. I support the bill and I commend it to the House.

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (4.50 pm): I rise to oppose the bill. If members present could have walked a day in my shoes. Every Monday, I witnessed the ever-increasing queues of kids beaten to a pulp, with their mums and dads in tow. Unfortunately, a morning always started in ICU where we saw the worst of the worst cases. Fortunately, I was insulated from the very worst, because those children never made it to my care. Kids suffered from permanent physical disability. Kids lived with the memory of this assault for the rest of their lives. I saw those kids afterwards over many months, including the subsequent legal cases where I often had to give expert medical evidence. I heard about them being thrown out of the clubs only to meet their assailants once again on the footpath where the violence would start again. It was off the club's premises. They had no responsibility. They were on the footpath. I have seen cases where the CCTV footage is magically missing from the very spot where the assault took place and, therefore, there was not enough evidence to convict the assailant.

I knew that there were available solutions—solutions trialled not only in Australia, not only in Newcastle, which everyone quotes, but trialled overseas—proven to work over many years of evidence, many years of data collection, consultation and with much more community involvement than this state did for its flawed strategy. This bill is no such solution. I hear the empathy of the members of the House—members representing their communities. I hear them pleading with their Attorney-General to do something about this. I am disappointed to inform them that, despite all of these measures, it simply will not work. I am with them in trying to get a solution to this problem, but I hate to tell them that I know through my evidence that I have looked at, through the evidence of others and through my own research that these measures simply do not work. They do not work on the preventive end. This is a flawed strategy. It is controlled by the nightclubs and the hotels. They got exactly what they wanted. They got longer trading hours. How is that supposed to fix the problem? They have no responsibility for their actions; all the responsibility goes to our kids.

For some time I personally negotiated with the Attorney-General on this issue. Initially, he was supportive of the solutions that now form the core of Labor policy. Then one day—I could virtually give members the date—it all changed. I was devastated. We were missing an opportunity to lessen suffering, decrease violence and make Queensland a safer place. Imagine that: tourists coming to Queensland because it is safe.

Why introduce this flawed plan? It is nothing new. It has failed in other cities. It has failed in cities in Australia. Why try it here? What has worked are the solutions implemented in Newcastle, Kings Cross and overseas. Labor's solution is a comprehensive solution that includes as one element only the two-hour reduction in trading. It is only one element. I agree with members: if it is that only, it will not work. A two-hour reduction in trading hours by itself will not work. We heard other members speak about the Newcastle solution and what it entails. That is embodied in Labor's solution.

But no solution is possible without considering the two-hour reduction in trading or considering some reduction in trading, because a reduction in trading means less availability of alcohol, which means less alcohol consumption, which means safer streets. I ask members to remember that we are asking for only two lousy hours for a two-year trial. The nightclubs do not want that, because they know that it will work. It is effective and of minimal cost to the community. It supports nightclubs and hotels with good business models and increases their viability, as in Newcastle where the nightclubs are flourishing.

This government's plan is costing \$45 million. For what? Nothing. The Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education has stated that it will not work. No reputable body anywhere suggests that it will work. Worse still, we cannot even check if the government's measures are working. One of the first things that this government did was destroy the Queensland trauma database. My own research

was affected in this area because I had no relevant up-to-date data to see if the problem was improving or decreasing. We had only our own data through our own unit. The first thing they did was axe the Queensland trauma database.

We do not have access, as in Victoria, to any independent police assessment of the data. We have none. We are just going to have further manipulated data from this government. So in 12 months time I can tell members what the data is going to be. It is going to be a massive improvement, because it is manipulated data. It is not true data. It is not independent data. Forty-five million dollars: why are the mums and dads of Queensland paying for this? Why are the nightclubs and the hotels not paying for their own problems? To throw their own rhetoric back at them, why are the rights of so many—the mums and dads, all of Queensland—being affected by so few, the pubs and clubs of Queensland? Why are the mums and dads being forced to pay for the actions of the hotels and nightclubs? Why is this government putting the profits of hotels and nightclubs above the safety of our children? Worse still, because of the cover-up of electoral donation laws, the people of Queensland are asking: how many brown paper bags did it take to put the safety of our children at such unnecessary risk?

 **Mr SYMES** (Lytton—LNP) (4.58 pm): As the youngest member of this House, I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Attorney-General's Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. After hearing about the issues and seeing many a media story about alcohol and drug related violence throughout Queensland's entertainment precincts, the Newman government decided that enough was enough and conducted a widespread and comprehensive consultation process to hear the views of the Queensland community around ways to improve entertainment precinct safety so that young Queenslanders could go out at night-time with friends and family and have a good time, but a safe one.

The main objective of this bill, as outlined by the Attorney-General, is to reduce alcohol and drug related violence in Queensland's night-life. Under this amendment bill, the Safe Night Out Strategy will be a multipronged plan to achieve the policy objectives of this bill, and it includes changes to the Criminal Code, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and the Liquor Act 1992, just to name a few, whilst also identifying the main entertainment precincts around the state, which will see part of the \$29.1 million over four years of the program going to police resources and the installation of CCTV footage in the public spaces of those precincts.

Under the Attorney-General's proposed amendments, changes to the Criminal Code will include the creation of a new offence of unlawful striking causing death, which will carry a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. Changes to section 340 of the Criminal Code will increase the maximum penalty for serious assaults to public officers, including the actions of biting, spitting and application of bodily fluids that will cause bodily harm.

Mr Pucci interjected.

Mr SYMES: I take that point from my parliamentary colleague from the electorate of Logan: these are not kids, these are young adults. Only the LNP is fair dinkum about protecting our front-line services that work in potentially dangerous situations, especially our police, hospital staff and ambulance officers. It is on the public and parliamentary record that the government brought in legislation to protect our law enforcers from serious assaults and increased the penalty for offenders who commit crimes against police. This can be compared with Labor's soft-on-crime policy direction that it has voted on accordingly in this parliamentary term.

Under the Safe Night Out Strategy there has been widespread consultation, both in Lytton as well as across the state. From February 2014 in my electorate we have surveyed local residents from the ages of 18 to 35. I have personally spoken with the local police and some liquor licensees to hear potential issues in the local electorate and ways both operators and the police would and are dealing with the issues relating to alcohol and drug related violence in their entertainment precincts and areas. It should also be reported in this House that 75 per cent of all Queenslanders who responded to the survey believed alcohol related violence was a problem in our nightclub districts. After March 2014 when the Newman government released the draft Safe Night Out Strategy, which proposed a range of initiatives that are embedded in the explanatory notes but also in the legislation, a whopping 83 per cent supported the introduction of tougher penalties for those affected by alcohol or drugs in and around licensed venues and public spaces. This shows the Newman government actively engaged with the community, especially our younger people who frequently utilise such entertainment precincts. I congratulate my parliamentary colleague the member for Brisbane Central whose electorate has the highest density of nightclubs in Brisbane and its surrounding areas and who held

numerous community forums with great success. This community engagement process showed that the general public is strongly supportive of the draft as it mirrors the sentiment of Queenslanders around this important issue.

Let us look at the alternative from Labor, which is establishing a lockout from 1 am. As a criminologist, I see this potential solution as nothing but a bandaid solution to a wider problem. If patrons are locked out early then the potential problem is moved out of the precincts, out of the pubs and clubs, and onto suburban streets to disrupt families going about their business peacefully. Why should the actions of a few troublemakers, who normally have the intention before even going out and having a few drinks of wanting to make trouble, punish the silent majority of young people who go to the nightclubs in Brisbane's CBD or other parts of this great state to celebrate milestones such as graduating from university, seeing a friend off before they go overseas to start their career, or who go to the local hotel to see a performance from a live band? Why should those young people be told by a government that they cannot go out and celebrate a milestone or even have fun by reducing the times of operation of these venues? If we reduce the operating times young people will find ways around it, including preloading before heading out into the city. History shows that forms of prohibition similar to the 1 am lockout do not work and, if anything, can breed criminality through innovation around the regulation. One example that shows ways around a lockout is the aspect of access to venues that are not regulated or licensed being set up similar to what happened in Western Europe back in the nineties, with vacant industrial sheds being purchased or rented by entertainment managers who subsequently organised rave parties and other forms of entertainment which had an adverse effect on those communities, especially with the experimentation and production of party drugs and alcohol flooding the market through the process.

In closing, I congratulate the Attorney-General for continuing on with getting tough on antisocial behaviour while also improving the regulation of venues that provide night-life in Brisbane and throughout this great state. I support the bill as it provides tough but fair changes to the Criminal Code so that if you do the crime you will be doing the time whilst at the same time regulating the pubs and clubs to better manage and reduce the potential for problems on their premises, which will make entertainment precincts around this great state a much safer place to go out and have a good time.

 Hon. JJ McVEIGH (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (5.06 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. As the House has heard on a number of occasions, the LNP government is committed to making this state the safest place to live and raise a family. This bill is just another way that this government is demonstrating that aim. The Safe Night Out Strategy includes more than 60 initiatives that are all designed to change the drinking culture that has developed in Queensland and to prevent further deaths and violence. This bill will help to change the current culture, restore responsible behaviour and respect and, of course, stamp out alcohol and drug related violence. I repeat that: changing the current culture and restoring responsible behaviour and respect are amongst the aims of this bill. Most of the population in Queensland knows that a safe night out represents a great night out. That is exactly what this government wants for Queensland.

Mr Bleijie: Hear, hear!

Dr McVEIGH: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General, because that is very important in Toowoomba. I look forward to having an opportunity to take him on a safe night out in Queensland when that opportunity presents. This legislation will create locally managed Safe Night Out precincts within key entertainment precincts throughout the state, not only in my home town of Toowoomba, that will be supported by the introduction of tougher penalties for those who simply want to do the wrong thing. As I mentioned, Toowoomba is one of the centres that will have locally managed Safe Night Out precincts within our key downtown entertainment precinct. I know that is important for my family, for me, for those I represent and for the many families in Toowoomba given that we are a family-friendly city.

I, along with many other regional Queenslanders, visited Brisbane in recent weeks for the annual Ekka where country Queensland meets city Queensland here in Brisbane, our capital. I enjoyed many good times at the Ekka itself and observed many going on to have a good night out, a safe night out. This legislation is not about targeting those who drink responsibly, as I saw through the Ekka and as I see regularly in Toowoomba in the majority of the population, but it targets the actions of an irresponsible minority who are simply behaving badly and risking such death and destruction to their local communities based on alcohol and drug related violence that ruins it for everyone.

This legislation is Australia's most comprehensive plan to tackle alcohol related violence and restore standards of responsible behaviour and respect, which I emphasised earlier in my contribution. In terms of the process thus far led by the Attorney-General in the development of this bill, I reflect on the consultation and education aspects that he has quite rightly focused on. Firstly, the bill has taken into account the opinions of Queenslanders through an online survey that identified that the three main areas of concern were a lack of respect for others, penalties for failing to deter bad behaviour and, of course, irresponsible binge drinking. Again, that is why I have picked up on the themes of a lack of respect for others, the current culture that must be changed and, of course, the need to restore responsible behaviour, which are at the heart of this bill. The results of the research that I have referred to were released back to the community for comment. The feedback received was in favour of and strongly supported the strategy that the government has developed. The legislation will be released with an education and awareness program for schools and the wider community. That will be crucial to promoting the importance of responsible behaviour, changing the culture and ensuring that people respect others when they are having a night out in our cities and towns across the state.

In addition, the bill gives the police the ability to deal with people who are intoxicated and behaving violently. That is important to our front-line police officers across the state and I know it is important to the police minister himself. Too many young people have been killed or permanently disabled by a coward punch administered by someone who has had too much to drink or who has taken an illegal substance. I note that no-one in this debate is ignoring that simple fact. Part of the Safe Night Out Strategy is the unlawful striking causing death provision, which will deal specifically with coward-punch deaths that have been hard to prosecute under current laws. The new offence will be punishable with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, which sends a very strong message. Firmer penalties will also be introduced for people behaving badly around licensed venues, including higher on-the-spot fines for offences such as causing a public nuisance and refusing to leave licensed premises. The bill will enhance the compliance with liquor licensing requirements and, of course, strengthen the liquor licensing system. As I said, the education program for school students in years 7 to 12 will teach our kids from an early age about the dangers of binge drinking and drug use, supplementing the efforts of others in the community, particularly families and parents who are fair dinkum about the welfare and development of their children.

The opposition believes that this problem can be fixed simply by concentrating on the opening hours of drinking establishments. However, winding back trading hours simply punishes those who act responsibly. That is where I believe the opposition has this back to front. The majority of Queenslanders drink responsibly. They want to have a safe night out and they want to have a good night out. They should not be punished for the bad behaviour of a few. Again, and in conclusion, I emphasise that the government wants to encourage a positive culture around nights out and alcohol while, of course, making sure that everyone can enjoy a good night out and a safe night out. The LNP government has pursued this strategy and developed this bill because we want to ensure that Queensland is the safest place to live and raise a family.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (5.13 pm): I am delighted to make a contribution to the debate in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Frankly, this is good and sensible legislation, because we are drawing a line in the sand and we are telling people, locals and visitors to Queensland alike that you can have a great night out and a safe night out in Queensland. Certainly, that is very important to the communities that I represent in both Mackay and the Whitsundays, as well as to many other parts of our state. I am no different from the average Joe: I like to go out and a few drinks. I always have and I always will. I have done that for many years, particularly in our regional centres in Central, North and Far North Queensland and in our great provincial cities with which I am familiar. I see the member for Barron River is nodding his head. I have had a few nights out on the Esplanade, Abbot Street and Sheridan Street in Cairns. I see the member for Thuringowa with a smile so wide that we could put an apple in his mouth. In his city, up along Flinders Street East places such as Bullwinkles, the Bank Niteclub and many other establishments come to mind as great places to be, especially after a Cowboys win such as that famous win over Minister Walker's beloved Broncos many moons ago. Whether it is Airlie Beach's main street, which obviously nowadays I am very familiar with in my role as the state member of parliament for Whitsunday, or Mackay's CBD, it is important that you can go out with your loved ones or your mates and have a great night out and a safe night out.

In recent years in cities and communities right around Queensland we have seen some tragic events. While this legislation cannot guarantee stopping that, I am very confident that it will go a long way to curbing the scourge that is alcohol and drug related violence in our party precincts across the

length and breadth of Queensland. One of the great planks of the Safe Night Out Strategy is the introduction of safe-night precincts. I am really pleased that two precincts are being established in the communities that I represent, one in Airlie Beach's main street and the other in the Mackay CBD.

As members could well imagine, at times Airlie Beach can go off like a frog in a sock. People go there from around Queensland, around the country and around the world. They come from different cultures and different backgrounds. They can all have a great night out. However, they want to be able to go home to their loved ones without thinking about what the heck may have happened. In my electorate a lot of people have been doing great work to try to combat the scourge of alcohol and drug related violence in our party precincts. Straightaway I think of people such as Stacey Harvey from the Liquor Accord in Airlie Beach. For a long time she has been making our community a safer place, particularly for those people who love to have a night out on the town. Stacey's leadership has been noted by many people in Airlie Beach and, indeed, the wider community. You just need to ask the shopkeepers in the main street, the licensees, the patrons, the local councillors and the list goes on. I am sure that what the LNP government is delivering in this space will deliver on the good work of Stacey Harvey and her team. In March of this year I was delighted to be with Stacey, Trevor Moore of Mackay Whitsunday Taxis and Acting Inspector Steve O'Connell from the Queensland Police Service to make this important announcement for our local community.

Similarly, I was at the announcement of the Safe Night Out precinct for the city that I represent in this place, Mackay. I was joined by Inspector Andy Graham from the Queensland Police Service and Reverend Ann Dittmar-McCollim, the first lady priest at the Holy Trinity Anglican Church in Mackay. She has held down that job for five years. I commend the reverend on her work in the city heart on Friday and Saturday nights, where she cares not only for young people but for all sorts of people. She looks out for people who come out for a great night out, but clearly also want a safe night out. I acknowledge the contribution and the leadership of Mark Laffin, a prominent licensee in Mackay. Mark, Inspector Graham, the good reverend and Gary Button, the former boss of Mackay Whitsunday Taxis, joined us to make the announcement about the safe-night precinct for the city of Mackay.

I would like to compliment the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and also the officers from his department and the other agencies for their work on this worthwhile project, which I am sure we will all look back on in time and say, 'Hey, that was a great thing for Queensland—and not only Queenslanders but also those people who visit our state.' I note the Attorney's intention to move amendments to reflect the issues concerning noise. I think all honourable members know—and I see the Leader of the House nodding—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: Not much noise is coming from the front bench. The issue of noise is one that goes back a long time, particularly for those people who live within close proximity of our party precincts.

We have heard about the lockout approach of the Australian Labor Party. I, like other government members, agree that it is completely flawed. It was very interesting to hear the member for Lytton's contribution to this debate earlier. A lot of young people do not go out early. If you go to a nightclub at 10.30 or 11 o'clock at night you sit around feeling like 'Nigel No Friends'.

A government member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: There are probably a few honourable members who could relate to that. I will not mention names. A lot of young people today wait until the footy is over before they go out. People's drinking habits have changed. On that note, we are in the business of changing culture. We have heard that from the Attorney-General and other members. We need to change the culture. Everyone needs to take responsibility for their actions.

I would also like to touch on a couple of points that have been made by previous speakers, without duplicating their lines. It was interesting to hear the Minister for Agriculture's contribution, knowing full well a couple of the nightspots in the great city of Toowoomba. Going back to my days on local television there we did not mind a cold drink on a frosty night in the garden city.

Mr Cripps: I can see you at the Mad Cow.

Mr COSTIGAN: I have been to the Mad Cow. I acknowledge the contribution from the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. I can remember the Mad Cow before it was the Mad Cow. I am showing my age.

I come back to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry's contribution where he highlighted the importance of educating our young ones. How important is that? It is really important. Students in years 7 to 12 will be told about the implications of alcohol use and drug use. We talk about the safe-night precincts as one of the 60 initiatives, but I think the education aspect should be amplified. I think that is a tremendous outcome. We are providing extra powers for members of the Queensland Police Service who certainly go beyond the call of duty and often deal with the calamity and chaos when things go horribly and tragically wrong. I also applaud the provisions relating to the coward punch. Anyone found guilty could end up in jail for the rest of their life.

In closing, this is a great initiative of the LNP government which has worked with all the key stakeholders to deliver a good outcome. I commend the Attorney-General on going down to Newcastle. There has been a lot of talk about Newcastle. He went down there and made sure that we have the right fit for Queensland. This legislation is great for locals and for business. In my part of the world, that rings true. Whether you are in Airlie Beach or Broadbeach, a great night out is a safe night out. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (5.23 pm): I rise in the House today to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I do so with a range of memories of times past, when as a young sailor one would often partake a little too enthusiastically in the nightly activities at whichever port was playing host at the time. I remember a time in the mid-eighties while on board HMAS *Vampire* that we visited HMAS *Moreton*. As was customary for all visiting ships at the time, the crew presented to the Breakfast Creek Hotel for a meal and something to wash it down with. Back then life seemed simpler and, sure, people drank too much on occasions, but generally their friends looked after them. There might have been the odd dust-up, but generally those nearby ensured that things did not get out of hand. Glassings, coward punches and other acts of extreme violence were never heard of.

Clearly, things have changed. I am not about to embark upon a generational rant, reflecting on the good old days or rebuking the youth of today and claim to know better, but as a parent of a young man who currently gets out and about and two young girls who will, before I know it, be wanting to join their friends on a night out, I have, as we all in this House have, an obligation to ensure that the environment we provide is as safe as possible for all to enjoy.

The safe night out legislation is designed with the view to provide the strategies that will deliver the safest possible environment for all persons to enjoy a night out on the town. Legislation that is centred on prohibition serves only to inflict restrictions on the vast majority of people who will drink, act and entertain themselves responsibly while having minimal effect in curtailing the actions of those individuals who are hell-bent on inflicting suffering and pain on those around them. Alcohol or drug related violence has no place in our cities and regions. Strategies contained within the safe night out legislation will create an environment where there is a clear understanding of what is appropriate behaviour and, importantly, the consequences of inappropriate behaviour.

This bill, which forms part of the comprehensive action plan, is the compilation of a significant engagement process. Over 12,000 public submissions were received through an online portal. Almost 2,000 further responses were received following the release of the draft strategy document.

Some of the key components of the legislation are: the creation of a new offence of unlawful striking causing death, known now as the coward punch; the increase in the penalty for assaults on public officers, which will provide important protections for our ambulance and emergency department personnel; the introduction of mandatory community service orders for offenders affected by alcohol or drugs; and the assurance that voluntary intoxication cannot be relied upon at sentence to mitigate an offender's sentence.

This bill will result in the trial of a sober-safe centre in Brisbane. It will empower police to undertake testing to establish whether a person charged will trigger the community service provisions. It will also amend the meaning of 'unduly intoxicated' to ensure there is more responsibility in terms of the service of alcohol. It will prohibit the use of promotions that ensure the rapid and excessive consumption of alcohol.

I believe these important changes, along with the many other changes that I have not summarised here, will go a long way towards delivering the safe night out that all people—young adults and those who are a little older, such as me—should not only enjoy but also deserve. Safety is a fluid measure. We deserve to feel safe while we are out with our family and friends.

The measure to introduce sober-safe centres will ensure that the individuals who pose a risk to either their own safety or that of the public in a certain area can be detained for a period of up to eight hours. Importantly, a qualified medical professional will be present at the sober-safe centre to ensure the detainee's wellbeing.

Public safety can often be compromised by the collective actions of individuals. It was interesting to hear this morning on 612 ABC Radio Senior Sergeant Corey Allen. He is assisting with a study currently being undertaken into the issue of preloading. Preloading is a term given to the practice of consuming considerable amounts of alcohol at home prior to going out on the town. During the interview, Senior Sergeant Allen called upon us all to have a measure of personal responsibility in this regard. I echo the statement that a great deal of the issues can and should be addressed through personal responsibility.

I should also acknowledge at this point the fine work that our police and other emergency services personnel undertake daily on our streets. Before prohibitive and legislative actions should be called upon, individuals should be able to rely on responsible parenting and mentoring. Sadly, not all individuals are raised within an environment where the responsible consumption of alcohol is practised and they are instead surrounded by the actions and effects of substance abuse.

Often this environment is perpetuated and dysfunctional behaviour that is witnessed becomes normalised. It is this cycle of dysfunction that must be broken. For this or indeed any change to be sustainable in the long term, there must be an educational component to ensure that the cultural norms are challenged and restructured in line with community expectations. It is pleasing to see that education forms a major component in the delivery of this overall strategy.

Education and other actions that will be undertaken to turn this around will be mandatory community service, drug and alcohol counselling and education of high school-age students beginning with the development of education programs for seniors in time for the end-of-year schoolies event this year. The remaining education programs will be developed in time for commencement of the 2015 school year.

Of course, not all measures are focused on an individual. There are also measures that manage the role of the licensee. There will be penalties that will apply to venues that engage in promotional activities that encourage and support the practice of excessive consumption over compressed time frames. Additionally, I would like to state my strong support for the planned implementation of networked scanners that will ensure that an individual who receives a ban order at one location is also excluded from other locations within the precinct and across the state.

Debate, on motion of Mr Shuttleworth, adjourned.

MOTION

Federal Government, Budget

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

- notes that figures released by the federal Treasury department this month (August) show that the first budget of the Abbott government will have a massive impact on low-income families;
- notes that the Abbott-Hockey budget includes the imposition of a \$7 GP co-payment and massive cuts to health, education and welfare support;
- condemns the Abbott government for its budget of broken promises; and
- calls on the Newman government to join with the Labor opposition and urge the Abbott government to scrap its unfair budget.

In the long-established tradition the Abbott government has manufactured a domestic budget crisis, has also cut public services and has been protecting the interests of the wealthy by failing to address the revenue side of the budget. It has been more than 100 days since Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey delivered the most unfair budget in living memory. It has been more than 100 days since Australians have been told they will be slugged with a new GP tax. It has been more than 100 days since families learned that at least \$80 billion would be taken from hospitals and schools. That is \$80 billion. It has been more than 100 days of blunders and broken promises from an unfair budget that nobody wants.

The federal budget proposes a reduction in agreed health spending of \$75 billion over the next decade. This includes a \$50 billion reduction in the contribution to public hospitals planned in Labor's national partnership agreements and a \$4.7 billion increase in co-payments for PBS prescription medication. What does that mean? That means that ordinary people are going to pay more for their prescriptions. There is also an \$18.6 billion reduction in medical services through the GP tax.

This federal budget is nothing more than a savage, evil assault on Medicare. Every coalition government over the last 40 years has attacked Medicare and sought to dismantle universal health care, and the Abbott government is no exception. I certainly remember when Billy Snedden was the Leader of the Opposition federally and he hated Medicare. In fact, I was so livid about it back then that I devised a song called *Hang Billy Snedden*. Malcolm Fraser also attacked Medibank, which is now known as Medicare. I can distinctly remember in 1975 the Fraser campaign which was called 'shame Fraser shame'. Of course the tories, the LNPs, hated Bill Hayden, a good friend of mine, a person for whom I was proud to work. Bill Hayden brought Medibank and Medicare into the federal parliament. Why did he do it? Because Bill Hayden stood up for workers and their families. He stood up for pensioners and for people who were poor. Bill Hayden created Medibank, now known as Medicare, in the seventies. Honourable members should think about why he did it. It was because the biggest cause of family bankruptcy was the inability to pay health bills and that is what members opposite want to go back to. It is shocking. It is absolutely shocking. It is disgraceful that the LNP, both federally and in this state, wants to go back to a situation where families may be bankrupted because of their health bills. It is a disgrace.

One international health expert has summed up the federal budget. He said—

Bulk billing is gone, health reform agreed by all states and territories is demolished, funding to the states is slashed and promises are broken.

National health reforms by Labor have sought to bring fairness and certainty to health funding through working with the state governments. This is how federal funds have been made available in Queensland to address hospital and dental waiting lists. We see Minister Springborg crowing about using federal funding to provide vouchers for private dental care. What is really happening is that the public dental scheme should be providing much needed services, but it has failed to do so. What do we see? We see in the *Torres News* the front page says 'More holes in Queensland Health dental plan'. While he crows and crows away, he has not fooled the *Torres News*. What we see is the article detailing the failure of the LNP government to provide sufficient dentists to meet local healthcare needs. As there is no-one to outsource to on the cape, perhaps employing some more staff might be useful. These short-term waiting list gains will now be lost with the Abbott government axing, taking the knife to, all hospital partnership agreements and all preventive health and oral health funding programs.

Labor committed to meeting growth in hospital costs through an activity based funding model. The Abbott government has reneged on it. What did it do? This is what the Abbott government did. It tore it up. That is what the Abbott government does. That is what the LNP government does. It does not care about ordinary people. Across the country Tony Abbott is cutting more than \$50 billion out of Australia's hospitals. That is the equivalent of closing one in 13 hospital beds in addition to sacking one in five nurses and sacking one in three doctors. These funding cuts are going to see bed closures, longer waiting times in emergency departments and longer waiting times for elective surgery. Whichever way we look at it, the LNP governments, both federally and in the states, want those who can least afford it to pay more for their health care. Increased PBS co-payments for scripts and the higher safety net thresholds mean more people with chronic illnesses are paying more out-of-pocket expenses for their health care than ever before.

The Abbott government has been successful in uniting almost every health lobby group in Australia, including the AMA, to universally condemn their \$7 GP tax as bad policy and bad for people's health. The GP tax is not just for every time you visit the GP; it is also for every time you get a pathology test or a scan. You are going to have to pay every single time. In a damning report earlier this month, the Senate inquiry into out-of-pocket expenses in Australian health care has recommended both the GP tax and hikes in the PBS prices be scrapped. It is a policy that hits middle- and low-income earners the most. It hits the most vulnerable Australians, those with chronic disease, the most. They should scrap it and do it now. The reason the Abbott government wants to impose a tax on families, on pensioners and on patients every time they visit a GP is that they want to see the end of universal health care in Australia as we know it.

They want to see an American style two-tier health system in this country where those who can afford health care get the service, and those who cannot afford health care only get part of the service. They may get five per cent of the service, they may get 50 per cent or they may get none at all. This seems to be how the LNP in Queensland believes that hospital and health services should be run. Let us talk about the waiting list. In Queensland today there are 246,970 people waiting for an outpatient appointment to get specialist medical treatment or to get on the waiting list for elective surgery, which is equivalent to three times the population of Mackay and four times the population of Rockhampton, and they are waiting for their initial outpatient appointment in the Queensland public hospital system.

This morning we saw a stunt in question time when the member for Pumicestone was talking about education in her electorate. She should be out there talking about health, because our candidate Rick Williams is talking about health; in Morayfield our candidate is talking about health; Shannon Fentiman in Waterford is talking about health, and we will continue to talk about health—

(Time expired)

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (5.40 pm): When the federal Treasurer stands before the dispatch box on the second Tuesday in May it captures the attention of the nation, but it is rare that the budget is still a matter of ongoing community debate almost four months later. The first budget of the Abbott government is, however, no ordinary budget: it is the most ideological, regressive and downright unfair budget in Australian history. It does not have the support of the Australian community and it never will. It seeks to divide Australia and concentrate privilege in the hands of a few rather than unite Australia and provide opportunities for all. It is no surprise that we are still talking about that budget, because it is contrary to the value of fairness which underpins our country.

Let us talk about school education. The former federal Labor government developed a comprehensive plan to reform our nation's educational funding system and to improve the performance of our students. It was a needs based, sector based funding model which won the support of the Catholic and independent sectors and conservative governments in New South Wales and Victoria. The Abbott budget not only ends any hope that our nation will move to a fair formula for allocating education funding, but it actively harms our education system by proposing \$30 billion in cuts to school education funding from 2018 onwards. Queensland alone will lose out on \$6.2 billion in federal funding. This is unfair, inequitable and nothing short of a complete disgrace. Every member of this House should be joining with Labor to oppose these massive cuts. Unfortunately, I doubt that there is much chance of government members doing that, because the Newman government's education record is just as bad as Abbott's.

No-one should ever forget that the Newman government refused to sign up to the Gonski education reforms and in the process cheated Queensland school students out of \$3.8 billion in funding. It was not surprising that the LNP refused to sign the Gonski reforms because they came with a few strings attached; namely, that the state government put in one dollar for every two dollars that the federal government contributed. Given that the Newman government is spending \$500 less in real terms on every Queensland student than in 2012, you can see why they do not want to commit to spending more money on education. The 2011-12 state budget, the last under Labor, committed \$5.2 billion as a state contribution to school education. That is the equivalent of \$5.61 billion in today's dollars. The state's contribution to school education is \$5.65 billion, which is an increase of only \$40 million in real terms; however, there are 26,000 more students enrolled in Queensland schools in 2014 than there were in 2011. This means that each and every student is allocated \$500 less than they were under Labor. The only thing making up the difference is the significant increase in federal spending provided by the former federal Labor government.

Let us look at tertiary education. The Abbott budget will destroy the equality of access to higher education. On this side of the chamber we believe that entry to university should not be based on the wealth of your parents or inherited privilege, but on ability, hard work and effort. That is why Labor governments have increased access to universities to students who would not have had a chance otherwise. The plans contained in the Abbott budget undermine the fair and equitable access to education delivered through the HECS system because they will result in increased student fees and loans will now grow faster than inflation. The Abbott budget rips the heart out of Australia's education system and will make it unfair, inequitable and underperforming. It should be opposed by every single member of this House.



Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (5.45 pm): I move—

That all words after ‘House’ be deleted and the following words inserted:

- notes that under the budgets of the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd Labor governments national debt increased from \$67.2 billion to \$339.8 billion;
- notes federal Labor broke their promise and introduced a carbon tax, which added \$177 to the typical household bill in 2013-14 and would have added \$170 to the typical household bill in 2014-15;
- notes Queensland state Labor supported their federal counterparts in all these actions; and
- condemns the current opposition for opposing the repeal of the carbon tax.

How quickly those opposite forget that Tony Abbott was elected by Queenslanders to fix Labor’s budget mess and end the toxic carbon tax. If there was one thing that the coalition was elected on, it was to stop the carbon tax and get rid of the job-destroying, business-destroying carbon tax that added to the cost of living for all Queenslanders. Queenslanders overwhelmingly voted to put an end to the five years of Rudd-Gillard-Rudd non-government, misgovernment and absolute failure of government that was the scourge of Australia for five years. Of the 30 seats in Queensland, 24 were returned to the coalition. That was the overwhelming message from the people of Queensland last year, and that is still the overwhelming message of Queenslanders; that is, the carbon tax needed to go to save people money.

How did the opposition comport themselves when it came to talking about the carbon tax? In April 2011, well before it came through, when the Deputy Premier moved a motion in this place asking the Labor state government to defend Queensland against the carbon tax, how did Labor vote? They voted against it. In September 2011 there was another motion by the Deputy Premier opposing the introduction of the carbon tax because of cost-of-living impacts, and what did Labor do? They voted against it. On 10 September 2013 the opposition in this place again voted against endorsing the Abbott government’s election commitment to abolish the carbon tax, and as recently as June this year they again refused to support the repeal of the carbon tax. If there is one party in this state that has consistently, deliberately and with malice aforethought chosen to increase the cost of living for Queenslanders, it is the Labor Party in Queensland which has shamelessly followed the head office—the Kremlinistas in Canberra—down the path. I note with some disappointment the new member for Stafford again kowtowing to the comrades in Canberra and mouthing the lines that are sent up from Bill Shorten’s office for him to parrot up here. Where was the comrade from Stafford back in May when it came to the budget? I did not hear him talking about it or squealing about the pain that was being suffered as he trundled into the practice that day and, I am sure, proceeded to charge the full rate for the medical procedure that he was practising on someone. Did he ever say anything about the former Labor government when they broke their promise to maintain a fuel subsidy in Queensland? Did he say anything about the 8c a litre extra that people had to pay? I did not hear the member for Stafford say anything about that. I did not hear members opposite say anything about that.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. Did he say anything when Wayne Swan retrospectively ripped over \$100 million out of the health system, aided and abetted by the member for Redcliffe last year? He retrospectively took that money out of the health system, forcing Queensland to find it. Did he say anything when the principal place of residence concession—not on the farm but on the home that most people own—was ripped away from people? Did he mention anything about that? Did he talk about the waste levy that increased the cost of business? Did he talk about the increased land and gaming taxes that the old ‘mythbuster’ talks about? Did he talk about the increased motor vehicle registration fees which made Queensland the most expensive place in which to register a car? Those opposite speak with a forked tongue when it comes to the cost of living. All they do is deliver higher taxes, more debt and more deficit.

(Time expired)



Mr DAVIES (Capalaba—LNP) (5.51 pm): I rise this afternoon to speak in support of the Treasurer’s amendment. I am quite frustrated and a little bemused yet again by the petty parliamentary games that the opposition, the out-of-touch Labor Party, is playing in the House today. Those to my right have again wasted the parliament’s time and, instead of working to better our state, have decided to use this time in parliament to grandstand. Opportunities like this, however, do permit me to indulge a guilty pleasure—that is, the study of history.

For the benefit of the House, I will examine some history. Under the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd Labor debacle that was supposedly a government, this nation's bank balance went from a record surplus to a black hole of hundreds of billions of dollars worth of debt. It is no surprise that both state and federal governments have been forced to address the financial mess created by the fiscally profligate economic vandals that are the Labor Party. Labor governments have wasted billions of dollars through mismanagement and incompetence. Take the \$1.2 billion Queensland Health payroll debacle at a state level as an example—or the school halls or the pink batts scheme—

Mrs Miller: You don't like school halls in your electorate?

Mr DAVIES: Well, the school halls cost way too much. In my electorate, yes, they did.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order! Member for Capalaba, you will direct your remarks through the chair. Member for Bundamba, the member is not taking interjections. Member for Capalaba, you have the call.

Mr DAVIES: The pink batts scheme was not only a costly financial mess; it also cost the lives of many a young man from Queensland. It was an absolute disgrace that showed once again the policy on the run of this mob.

Both governments had no credible plan to return their budgets to surplus. Federal Labor broke their promise and introduced a carbon tax that added hundreds of dollars to everyday Queenslanders' electricity and gas bills. This affected pensioners in my electorate of Capalaba. Those members on my right who condemned the necessary action of the current federal government sat idly by and raised no objection—none whatsoever, not even a whimper—while their federal counterparts hurt Australian families, and they now condemn the current government on the repeal of the carbon tax. They failed to stand up to the mining tax, which costs more to administer than it raises—a great effort—yet burdens business with millions of dollars of red tape, costs jobs and drives away investment.

They failed to stand up for Queensland when Wayne Swan announced he was cutting \$756 million in payments for specific purposes. This included a \$342 million cut to Queensland Health, \$40 million of which was retrospective. They also failed to stand up for Queensland as Wayne Swan disgracefully and cynically withheld \$725 million worth of Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements payments, demanding unreasonable levels of proof that repairs had been carried out. Again, this is a disgrace. What interesting historical subjects they make—outraged at the tough but necessary budget that only needs to exist because of their own incompetence!

If those opposite want to find the cause of this so-called pain, they need only look in the mirror and take a look at what they see. The record surplus Labor was bequeathed was transformed, as if by the Hand of Eris, into a \$200 billion deficit. The much heralded promises of surplus, earmarked over 500 times, disappeared into a puff of smoke and were replaced by more deficits—as far as the eye could see.

Unless corrective action is taken by the Abbott government, gross debt will rise to \$667 billion within 10 years. This number is astronomical. It means that every man, woman and child in this country will be carrying a \$25,000 federal debt a decade from now. Add this to the state debt gifted by those opposite, and a Queensland family of four will be shackled with over \$160,000 worth of state and federal debt. This is a disgrace.

The real irony, though, is that without Howard and Costello's prudent management and savings Labor would not have been able to write the cheques and deliver the sugar hit that they did. This ultimately needs to be paid back in spades. That is the irony and the interesting insight history permits. For the benefit of the electorate nationwide, I hope this is the last time Australians are shackled with a Labor Party government.

 **Mrs SCOTT** (Woodridge—ALP) (5.56 pm): I rise this evening to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Bundamba. The actions of the Abbott government in its recent budget are hard to believe. They are heartless and they are cruel. I honestly struggle to understand how a government can so brazenly attack the very people who elected them, without a care for how its cuts are going to affect individuals and families.

The phrase 'most vulnerable individuals' gets used a lot in this parliament, often to score political points or in an attempt to demonstrate how compassionate we are. But I truly believe that the Abbott-Hockey budget is a direct attack on Australia's and Queensland's most vulnerable individuals. The 2014-15 federal budget is going to have a devastating impact on the families who live in my

electorate of Woodridge. My electorate, like many others, is home to some of society's most vulnerable individuals. It is also home to many ordinary Queenslanders—those who are doing their best to raise families, pay the bills and make ends meet. Unfortunately, all of these will be hit hard by the federal budget.

Then there is the impact the budget will have on students in my electorate, many of whom will no longer be able to attend university—not due to their results but due to the crippling costs that the Abbott government is planning to impose on tertiary students. I have met parents whose student is the first in their entire family to attend university. They are concerned that their siblings will not have the same opportunity because the family simply cannot afford to pay the potential fees. And young people are concerned that a crippling HECS debt will continue to weigh them down financially for decades.

Pensioners are having their concessions cut. This has a significant impact on anyone on a fixed income. People who have worked hard over their lifetime and had hoped to enjoy their retirement will now be forced to scrimp and save just to pay the bills.

One thing I truly fear is the impact this budget will have on our already struggling health system. I recently met with a small business owner. One of his employees had significant mental health issues and had to cease working as she was physically and mentally unable to continue. In an attempt to support the family, he then offered to employ her 19-year-old son so that the family would have some form of income. It soon became clear that the son himself had major mental health problems. He was admitted to a mental health facility at Logan on a number of occasions and had tried to commit suicide twice, but then he was released to a mum unable to cope herself.

Regrettably, I hear of instances where a mental health unit turns people away or releases them prematurely because of capacity issues, and sadly this young man soon took his own life. His family and his caring employer are devastated. We failed this young man and we failed his family. This is an example of a struggling health system and a struggling government. Our health workers are stretched to their very limits. How is our health system expected to grow and improve and have the capacity to respond to cases like this when both the federal and state governments are stripping it of money and support? People contact me nearly every day wanting to know what they are going to do if the Abbott-Hockey budget gets through the Senate. Pensioners want to know how they will pay their bills when their concessions are cut. Students want to know what they are meant to do when they finish high school and cannot afford to go to university and cannot access any services to assist them in getting a job. People want to know how they are expected to support themselves if they become unemployed and struggle to find a job if the Newstart allowance is cut. I strongly support the member for Bundamba's motion and I believe that government members should support it too. I am certain that their offices are receiving the same phone calls as mine and it is their duty to represent their constituents, not just toe the party line.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (6.00 pm): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to stand here tonight to condemn the Labor Party's motion while supporting the sensible amendment moved by our Treasurer. I am surprised that there was not a bit of scary music playing in the background during the speeches from members of the Labor Party, because that is the story they are putting out there—the scary story about cuts here and cuts there—but there are no facts. They have given no facts. We heard the member for Bundamba tell us that there were problems in the health system. The problems in the health system were left by the former Labor government and we need look no further than what this government has done about the dental waiting list. We went from 62,000 people on the dental waiting list to zero—62,000 to zero!

Let me correct something that the member for Bundamba is putting out there. She is saying that this is Labor money, and time and time again those opposite keep saying that it is Labor money that is fixing the problem. There is no such thing as Labor money. The money in this state belongs to the people of Queensland. The money in this nation belongs to the people of Australia. It is not Labor money; it is the people's money. For years and years we have seen what incompetent Labor governments do to this country. One only has to look at when John Howard came to power. He was left with \$96 billion worth of debt. How long did it take the Howard government to pay down that \$96 billion? It took it 10 years—10 years of hard work, 10 years of getting the budgets right, 10 years of working from deficit to surplus—but it paid back the debt. That is what we in this state are now being forced to do. We are being forced to pay back debt that was put in place by the former state Labor government of around \$85 billion. I doubt if we are going to be able to do that in 10 years. Things have shifted from when John Howard was in government. It may take us longer than that and we are wasting money paying interest year after year on a debt that those opposite gave us. They

have their heads in the sand. They completely ignore the fact that they have been fiscally irresponsible with this state's money. They have completely ignored the fact that on a national level the federal Labor Party has been fiscally irresponsible.

One only has to look at the Health payroll system. Here was a system that was going to cost around \$6 million to put in place. At the last estimate \$1.2 billion has been wasted—wasted, money down the drain that we could have used to employ more nurses, more doctors and more police officers. We also only have to look at the Gold Coast desalination plant and the western corridor recycled water scheme—wasted money with no business plan. There was not even a business plan put in place to build those things. Those opposite came along and thought, 'Let's just throw money at it. We've got a problem—a problem that we didn't see coming. We'll throw money at it and we'll try to fix that problem.' The federal government has been left with \$339 billion worth of debt, and it is on its way to \$670-odd billion before we can stop it.

The Labor Party needs to appreciate that the problems that it creates now take us years and years to fix. This is not something that we can fix overnight. This is not something that the federal coalition can fix overnight. It is going to take it years and years to fix. Unlike those opposite, the people on this side of the House have business experience. They know how to read a balance sheet. They know how to pay down debt, and we will do it. Given time, we will achieve what needs to be achieved in this state. We will get this state back where it needs to be—a great state with great opportunities. I commend the Treasurer for his amendment.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (6.05 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Bundamba calling on the Newman government to stand up and be counted and actually live up to its own rhetoric. Those of us in the Labor opposition have been consistent and outspoken on the obvious and massive flaws of the Abbott-Hockey budget. Before I outline my support for the motion, I just have to comment on a few of the contributions that have been made by LNP members in the House this evening. It has been like watching an exercise of looking into a rear-vision mirror. The narrow perspective of what occurred in the recent past has become nearly a trademark for members of the government. I can recall a former LNP Leader of the Opposition saying that there was no GFC occurring across the world and it never actually touched down in Queensland. The GFC! What GFC? As far as the then opposition was concerned, it did not even exist. You can always tell when there is a tory under pressure who has nothing of substance to say, because you get these slanted views of history garnished with a little bit of personal attack—as we have just seen from a couple of members opposite—and then rounded off with these limp-wristed election slogans that translate to nothing in effect as usual.

The facts are that the Hockey budget is unfair, it is inequitable and attacks the most vulnerable in our community by rewarding those at the top end of town. Even the LNP Premier has spoken out against the Abbott budget. Let me remind the House what the Premier said just a few mere months ago. He was reported by Michelle Grattan in May this year as saying this about the Hockey federal budget—

We are all in agreement that what the government is doing in relation to health and education is not acceptable.

That is a direct quote from the Premier. I find it very interesting to stand in the House tonight to listen to this sort of nonsense going around that obviously there is now a change in spin language supporting what the future of the federal government is. Now we are questioning the commitment because it is not Labor money or it is not a future projection or commitment. So here is the chance for the Premier and members of the government to start telling Queenslanders the truth about the Abbott cuts that they have already said are not acceptable, or was it just another case at the time in the immediate aftermath and at the behest of the spin masters of the government to run these crocodile tears out because it sounded good to line up with all of the other premiers criticising and critiquing the LNP federal budget? Does the Premier or any other minister have the integrity to stand by Queenslanders and condemn in the strongest possible terms these unfair and deliberately targeted cuts from this federal LNP budget? Do they have the intestinal fortitude to call on Hockey and Abbott for what it is—a full-frontal attack on working families, pensioners and others whom the federal tories seem to hold with such disdain?

Will they stand by their convictions and vote for our motion or will they squib it yet again? We have come to expect that from the government. I simply ask the Premier—in fact, any minister—to repeat in this House the same lines that he was willing to express in the aftermath of Joe Hockey's federal budget. If he does not have the courage to substantiate his lines, what is going on with this

government? All it wants to do is look in the rear-vision mirror, blame the past, talk about carbon taxes—which have been repealed—have no vision for the future whatsoever and attack working people every step of the way.

I am a member who is proud to represent a regional electorate. I would like to touch on a couple of the totemic, unfair parts of the conservatives' budget. The first one is the increase in petrol taxes. For 2½ years in this House we have heard the government members talk about a previous Labor government's removal of the subsidy on fuel excise. They talked about this terrible sin about fuel, knowing full well that a vast majority of that subsidy never made it into the punters' hands. Everybody knew that. Here we have a federal government that is happy to slam dunk every person in this country who drives a car, then criticise the poor because, apparently, they do not drive anywhere and then the members opposite stand up here and try to defend the past. It is an outrage that this government does not have a consistent position on fuel. It has not made one criticism of the elevation of the fuel excise by the federal government. It shows us where its heart is.

(Time expired)

 **Mr GRIMWADE** (Morayfield—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise to speak in support of the amendment to the motion moved by the honourable Treasurer in this parliament tonight. I must say that it is breathtaking and hypocritical for the members of the Labor Party to come in here and order us as a government to stand up for Queenslanders. Of course, the members of the Labor Party in this parliament have never stood up for Queenslanders. They are only ever interested in looking after their own interests.

I will give members a couple of ideas of what I am talking about. The members of the Labor Party might want to respond to some of this. They did not stand up against the mining tax and the impact that it would have on Queenslanders' jobs. Where were they calling on the Labor Party in Canberra to abolish the mining tax? In regard to the carbon tax, in this place we debated a motion about the carbon tax similar to the motion that we are debating tonight. In that debate we called on the members of the Labor Party to support us in opposing the federal Labor Party's carbon tax, which would have saved the average consumer about \$170 on their electricity bills and over \$550 a year in total off their household bills. Where were the members of the Labor Party then standing up for Queenslanders and saying, 'Enough is enough when it comes to the cost of living'? No, they voted against that motion as well.

The members of the Labor Party failed to stand up for Queenslanders when former federal Treasurer Wayne Swan announced that he was cutting \$342 million out of Queensland Health—\$40 million out of that retrospectively. It was money that we had already spent. Where were the members of the Labor Party standing up for the people of Queensland then? They were nowhere to be seen. They failed to stand up for Queenslanders when Wayne Swan withheld \$725 million worth of natural disaster and recovery arrangements payments, which we had to wear in the budget. Where were the members of the Labor Party then standing up for Queenslanders? They were nowhere to be seen.

When it comes to looking after Queenslanders, I want to give a compare and contrast of what this government has been able to achieve as opposed to what the Labor Party achieved. When the Labor Party was in government, the average Queensland family saw \$700 added to their household electricity bills after former Premier Beattie promised that, under deregulation, electricity prices would not go up. Under the Labor Party, Queensland was the most expensive state in which to operate a vehicle. The cost of registration of a six-cylinder car ballooned from \$107.55 to \$443.45. Queensland became the most expensive state in which to register a car. Driver's licence fees doubled from \$73.70 to \$152.50. After the Labor Party had broken its promise to never remove the fuel subsidy, we saw Queensland motorists paying another 9.2c a litre for their fuel. In 2010 and 2011, we saw public transport fares increase by 35 per cent and another 15 per cent was planned in January 2015. Those increases made our public transport system the most expensive in Australia.

Queenslanders will remember that, under Labor, we also had the highest unemployment rate of all the mainland states. There is a whole bunch of other things on which the members of the Labor Party failed Queenslanders. They included water bills rising by \$200 between 2009 and 2012 because of Labor's failed water grid. The job-destroying waste levy that Labor imposed on small business also contributed to the Queensland unemployment rate going up. Where were the members of the Labor Party standing up for Queenslanders then? They were not to be seen.

In contrast, this government has over \$5 billion in concessions to help Queenslanders, which is 3.7 times more than what the members of the Labor Party had in their last budget. We have doubled the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme. We have doubled the Home Energy Emergency Assistance Scheme, which is giving low-income households emergency payments of up to \$720 to help them out. We have frozen the cost of car registration for three years, which is helping out people with their cost of registering the family car. We have reinstated the stamp duty concession for the principal place of residence for people buying a home, saving them around \$7,000. We have put in a one-off water rebate of \$80 to the residents of South-East Queensland. We have halved public transport fares and offered free trips after nine trips, saving public transport commuters in the Morayfield electorate around \$920. We have given families a \$150 voucher in Get in the Game support to help their kids play sport. In 2012 we froze electricity tariff 11, which saved households money on their electricity bills. Of course, when it came to pension concessions, we stood up to Canberra and we reinstated those concessions that had to be removed owing to the very tough financial situation for the federal budget.

That is how this LNP government, through cost-of-living initiatives in a number of different areas, has been able to stand up for Queenslanders. The members of the Labor Party in this place have always been interested in only themselves. They have never stood up to Canberra. They have never stood up for Queenslanders. I will always stand up for my community in this place, I will always stand up for Queensland and this can-do government will as well.

 **Mrs D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (6.16 pm): I have to say well done to the four speakers from the government side. They all managed to make a speech and not one of them mentioned the \$7 co-payment. So well done for managing to avoid what is such an important issue for the people in each of their communities: a \$7 GP tax that is seeking to be imposed by the Abbott government.

We heard the four government members talk about a whole range of issues—the cost of living, we heard the carbon tax mentioned over and over again and the fuel excise. I find it hilarious that the Treasurer would mention the fuel excise when the other day Joe Hockey made those offensive comments about the fuel excise really going to hurt only high-income people because low-income people either do not have cars or do not drive very far. That might explain what this GP fee is all about. Maybe Joe Hockey and the Abbott government think that the \$7 GP tax is going to hurt only high-income people? Maybe they think that low-income people cannot afford to go to the doctor already—‘They don’t go to the doctor, so this won’t hurt them, or when they go they don’t go and get their medicines because they can’t afford them.’ That is probably the mindset of the federal LNP.

It is appalling that the government members in this parliament would sit here and not condemn the Abbott government for the cuts that it is making in health, education and welfare payments because of the impact that it is going to have on Queenslanders right across this state. The government members love to brag about their statistics in Health. They love to talk about their surgical waiting lists. They love to talk about their dental waiting lists. Of course, they do not talk about the money that was put in by federal Labor to address those issues, such as the \$1.6 billion for the dental scheme. In fact, the only mention of dental waiting lists and the reduction of dental waiting lists in press releases issued by this state government is when it brags about how it got extra money from the federal government to achieve and exceed the Commonwealth’s performance targets. The government is acknowledging that it got money from the federal government.

Let us talk about statistics. Let us talk about the fact that, in February, the statistics for Redcliffe Hospital had the specialist outpatient waiting list at just over 7,000. Now there are 9,815 people waiting for their first appointment as a specialist outpatient just at Redcliffe Hospital. Of those, 8,227 are for surgical procedures. For orthopaedics, only 11 per cent of category 2 patients are being seen within the required time; for urology, 14 per cent of patients are being seen; for general surgery, 33 per cent of patients are being seen. But let us put aside the statistics and let us talk about real people in our community.

Let us talk about the kid who went to the emergency department with a broken arm, had an x-ray and was told it was just a sprain. He was sent home. He was at school all week, went to sport that weekend and took another fall. He went back to the emergency department and had X-rays taken again. The dad said, ‘Oh, it’s broken this time, isn’t it?’, only for the hospital to say that it was already broken but no-one had actually rung the parents during the week to say, ‘We’ve checked these X-rays and your son’s arm is broken and you need to come back in’. This kid played sport with a broken arm potentially ending up with more serious injuries because no-one bothered to let them know.

Or let us talk about the mum I met in Gladstone whose son also had a very serious break in his arm. He was admitted to hospital and put on an IV drip for pain relief. The hospital said he needed to be transported to Rockhampton Hospital. Did they put him in an ambulance and transport him up there? No. They told the parent to take him home and to drive him up to the hospital themselves the next day. The mum said, 'Well, hold on. He has been on an IV drip for pain relief. What am I supposed to do to provide relief for pain?' The response was, 'Give him some Panadol'.

Let us talk about real stories. Let us talk about those on the waiting list. Let us talk about the contract that this government made to reduce costs of living. Let us talk about the statement by the Premier that after two years there is no more blame game, his ministers will be held to account if they do not deliver. It is about time that government members stood up for people in Queensland, stood up for their communities and condemned the Abbott government for its cuts.

 **Mrs FRANCE** (Pumicestone—LNP) (6.21 pm): Labor's hypocrisy must be heard to be believed. The fact is that those opposite failed to stand up for Queenslanders; they failed to urge their federal Labor mates to get rid of the carbon tax that impacted on the cost of living, jobs and prosperity. Indeed, Labor insisted on supporting a tax which harmed Queensland's economic growth, reduced the living standards of everyday Queenslanders and increased the financial burden on those people already struggling to make ends meet. Whichever way you look at it, this carbon tax was bad for Queenslanders. It was a tax that Julia Gillard said she would never introduce, that Labor said would have financial impacts that we would never feel and that Kevin Rudd said he would amend—but only if you gave Labor another go. Thankfully, Tony Abbott made it very clear throughout last year's election campaign that one of his key policies was to abolish the carbon tax. Voters emphatically endorsed that policy and Labor could be in no doubt Australians wanted the carbon tax gone.

What is really disappointing is that Labor's Queensland senators yet again voted against the repeal of the job-destroying carbon tax, showing that their green mates, not Queensland families, are their priority. Appallingly, those opposite also refused to support the repeal of the carbon tax as recently as June this year in a motion that implored Labor's Queensland senators to vote in favour of abolishing this tax and offering cost-of-living relief for Queenslanders. Even the opposition leader's father, Henry Palaszczuk, was against the carbon tax. In 2006 he urged Prime Minister John Howard to rule out consideration of the carbon tax, saying that a carbon tax is a tax on coal and any move to introduce a coal tax will not only threaten jobs in the coal industry, but it will make Australian manufacturers less competitive and mean more job losses. A carbon tax could cost Queensland billions of dollars.

The verdict is in and the result is clear. The Queensland Labor Party has failed. It has failed to stand up against a carbon tax. It has failed to stand up to the mining tax that raises a fraction of what was promised, costs jobs and drives investment overseas. It failed to stand up when former federal Treasurer Wayne Swan cut \$324 million from Queensland Health. It failed to stand up to Wayne Swan when he withheld \$725 million worth of natural disaster and recovery arrangement payments by demanding unreasonable levels of proof that repairs had been carried out. We know the Labor Party are good at one thing: running up debt and slugging taxpayers with higher taxes to cover its budget shortfall. We have seen it here in Queensland, with debt increasing from almost \$18 billion in 2005-06 to more than \$69 billion in 2012-13.

What did the previous Labor government do when the budget started bleeding red ink? It slugged Queenslanders with higher taxes. Labor broke its promise on the fuel subsidy. It scrapped the principal place of residence concession. It introduced a waste levy. It increased land and gaming taxes. It increased motor vehicle registration and scheduled a 15 per cent public transport fare increase. True to form the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd Labor governments also delivered record debt and record deficits. The National Commission of Audit found that debt could reach as much as \$667 billion in the next decade unless action is taken. That would mean every Australian would be shouldered with around \$24,500 of debt a decade on from now. Let us not forget that this is why Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey are taking action. This year the Australian government will have to pay \$12 billion in interest on Labor's debt. That is \$12 billion in dead money, money that cannot be spent providing the services and infrastructure Australians expect and need.

We have made significant progress here in Queensland, with Queensland set to become the fastest growing state in Australia next year. We have also seen the Abbott government's resolve at a federal level through the abolition of the carbon tax. This is all about delivering a stronger Queensland and a stronger Australia. The LNP will continue to stand up for Queenslanders and, unlike the Labor

Party, we will continue to outline our positive plans because we are the only party with a plan for taking this state forward. I thank my federal member, Wyatt Roy, and the Abbott government for doing what it said it would do. Thank you for repealing the carbon tax and delivering cost-of-living relief for our community. I support the Treasurer's motion before the House.

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

AYES, 62:

LNP, 62—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Latter, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

NOES, 12:

ALP, 9—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

PUP, 1—Judge.

INDEPENDENTS, 2—Douglas, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

AYES, 62:

LNP, 62—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Latter, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

NOES, 12:

ALP, 9—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

PUP, 1—Judge.

INDEPENDENTS, 2—Douglas, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

- notes that under the budgets of the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd Labor governments national debt increased from \$67.2 billion to \$339.8 billion;
- notes federal Labor broke their promise and introduced a carbon tax, which added \$177 to the typical household bill in 2013-14 and would have added \$170 to the typical household bill in 2014-15;
- notes Queensland state Labor supported their federal counterparts in all these actions; and
- condemns the current opposition for opposing the repeal of the carbon tax.

Sitting suspended from 6.34 pm to 7.35 pm.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (7.35 pm): I advise the House of determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved that, pursuant to standing order 136, the Finance and Administration Committee report on the Queensland Plan Bill by 7 October 2014; the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report on the Major Events Bill by 20 October 2014; and the Education and Innovation Committee report on the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 20 October 2014.

SAFE NIGHT OUT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2694, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (7.35 pm), continuing: Prior to the 5.30 debate, I was talking about the need for sustainable change in terms of providing long-term educational components to ensure that cultural norms are challenged and restructured in line with community expectations. It is pleasing to see that education reforms are a major component in the delivery of the strategy outlined in this bill. Education and other actions that will be undertaken to turn this around will include mandatory community service, drug and alcohol counselling and the education of high school aged students. That will begin with the delivery of education programs for senior school students to access before the end of the year. Other measures are to be introduced for all students in the early part of 2015. Of course, not all measures are focused on the individual. The legislation will impose penalties upon venues that engage in promotional activities that encourage and support practices of excessive consumption. This will help to prevent individuals from harming themselves or others as they attempt to move from one location to another within a safe precinct.

Earlier I acknowledged the efforts of our police, ambulance officers and emergency health professionals who play such an important role in maintaining public safety and providing care to the victims of individuals whose inappropriate actions cause harm to others or to themselves. Officers must be afforded the protection contained within the bill. The bill contains a range of measures that recognises this affect and imposes significant punishment to those who assault our public officers. Sadly, when we adjourned for dinner I read in the news about a young man named Jaiden, a promising young soccer player, who is fighting for his life in Richmond, Victoria, having suffered a coward punch at a private party at the weekend. I wish him and his family all the very best. It is such actions that the legislation introduced into this House today will hopefully circumvent in the future.

It is interesting to note that Labor's quick-fix solution to this problem involves trading hours. Almost 40 per cent of coward punches and significant assaults occur between midnight and 6 am, which means that 60 per cent occur outside of those hours. That is a very interesting statistic that highlights the need for a much better thought out and strategic plan to cover a whole range of scenarios, which is certainly what this bill does. I commend the Premier and the Attorney-General for the introduction of this bill. I support its passage through the House.

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (7.39 pm): I rise to speak on the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. We all know that drunken and disorderly behaviour, exhibited by some more than others, has been around since the dawn of time. However, we need to take measures to alleviate the incidence of alcohol and drug fuelled violence across the country and, indeed, in Queensland. Our government made a commitment to make Queensland a safe place for everybody and, indeed, families. We also made a commitment to tackle alcohol and drug related violence head-on with what I think is a very comprehensive plan that addresses and changes culture, restores responsible behaviours and respect, stamps out alcohol and drug related violence and ensures that all Queenslanders can have a good night out and a safe night out.

Townsville has a drink-safe precinct. It was one of three trial sites, along with Brisbane and the Gold Coast. Our drink-safe precinct has been a success largely thanks to the efforts of our local police and the Townsville Liquor Accord participants, as well as the dedication and efforts of organisations such as Anglicare and the Townsville Street Chaplain volunteers. All those groups have been working collaboratively and synergistically. Night in and night out, they have been at the coalface providing rest and recovery services and intervention services. Their efforts in early intervention have been the reason for the success of the DSP. We have received some very positive feedback from Townsville nightclub precinct patrons, as well as the wider Townsville community, about the degree of comfort they take from the highly visible police presence, the welcoming salutations from street chaplains and the respite and refuge provided by the chill-out zone.

As I mentioned, this is a collaborative or community approach to trying to influence the cultural and behavioural choices of those who—I might add they are a very small minority—do not recognise their own physical limitations or have scant regard for those within the community in which they live. I apologise upfront if I mistakenly refer to the Safe Night Out Strategy as the drink-safe precinct as it is merely a habit. I make the point that the Safe Night Out Strategy is not just a rebadged DSP. It is far more than that. I will speak to that a little later.

The acceptance of the Townsville drink-safe precinct was high amongst the patrons who go to the nightclub precinct, the broader community and our community leaders. Since coming to this place, I have been made aware of the value of the DSP trial by numerous constituents. Hence, I have been lobbying hard for the extension of its resourcing. I am also glad to see that the Safe Night Out Strategy has been rolled out to places other than the three trial drink-safe precincts.

While the drink-safe precincts were successful in reducing unruly behaviour and providing a safe area for patrons, our communities across Queensland wanted and deserve more. They knew more needed to be done to further reduce alcohol and drug related violence and the culture that creates it. They want the program rolled out more broadly across the state.

The Safe Night Out Strategy aims to restore the standards of responsible behaviour and respect, stamp out alcohol and drug related violence and make Queensland as safe as possible for people to go out and enjoy themselves. I believe it is the most comprehensive plan in Australia to tackle alcohol related violence.

We have heard from the Premier and the Attorney-General about the breadth of the consultation on this issue. There was the online survey to which there were about 12,000 responses. The top three issues identified as most significant were: personal values—the lack of respect and concern for others; the perception that the penalties for offenders were failing to deter bad behaviour; and irresponsible binge drinking in venues.

I also recall getting out amongst the patrons within our drink-safe precinct earlier this year with my colleagues the member for Thuringowa, Sam Cox, and the member for Mundingburra, David Crisafulli, and surveying those patrons. The results we collected that evening were, in the main, consistent with the broader state survey results. The message was loud and clear from all respondents that they want to see a reduction in drug and alcohol related violence.

The draft strategy was released in March. A significant majority of respondents indicated that they supported or strongly supported the strategy. We have listened to Queenslanders. In fact, we have engaged Queenslanders on this topic. I believe we have used their feedback very well to come up with the comprehensive Safe Night Out Strategy. It is about restoring responsible behaviour, stamping out violence and ensuring Queensland is a safe place to have a good night out.

There are a number of other initiatives that form part of the Safe Night Out Strategy. These include creating locally managed Safe Night Out precincts within the key entertainment precincts and local boards. This is the strategy that we have used in many areas of government, not just this particular area. I acknowledge the benefit of the local health and hospital boards. This is very similar. This is about having the responsibility and resources at the lowest level so that people can make the decisions that will impact on their community.

Local boards will be set up to manage the precinct and make sure support services like proper transport, lighting and CCTV are available. There will be funding provided for each precinct to provide a rest and recovery area, an intervention centre or a chill-out zone—call it what you will. In my area we get very good service from Anglicare and the Street Chaplains. I note that it is not just Anglicare and the police who assist, but it is also the CBD Townsville Liquor Accord as well. They made a submission to the parliamentary committee when it was reviewing the precincts. It stated—

Keeping entertainment precincts in the one area or zoned areas, allows for better policing and emergency services access to patrons, and does not spread the services across the town or city, it also is more effective at moving large amounts of people in and out of a central area because of the centralised public transport options.

Its submission also went on further to say how the close proximity of venues allows for improved CCTV, lighting and amenities. The CBD Townsville Liquor Accord highlighted that one of the biggest advantages of the entertainment precincts was that the venues can communicate effectively with the police to reduce recidivist offenders from entry to their licensed venues.

We heard earlier from my esteemed colleague from Ferny Grove about the networking of ID scanners. That is well supported in terms of managing violent or disorderly patrons. I applaud that as an approach to assist the police.

Earlier this evening the Minister for Police, Jack Dempsey, was talking about the significant powers that the legislation will give to the police for them to provide their services in a Safe Night Out precinct. Whilst I say they are significant powers, I also believe they are entirely appropriate powers and will enable the area to be well managed.

I also applaud the legislative changes with regard to the coward-punch issue, which is a particularly abhorrent act in anybody's language. I think the new offence of unlawful striking causing death will get the message out to those few individuals who do not know how to behave in a communal setting.

There is also the issue of education. I think it is particularly appropriate to educate our youths in years 7 to 12 in the culture, attitude and social expectations around alcohol consumption. I think that will serve them well throughout their lives—particularly in their late teens and early 20s when people tend to be a little bit more willing to take risks and do not have a developed sense of judgement. Queensland will set an example for the rest of the country in that regard.

We all remember back in primary school being collectively punished by the teacher for a particular thing. This legislation speaks volumes in terms of how we are dealing with the problem as opposed to the collective punishment approach of the opposition when in government.

In conclusion, Townsville welcomes the Safe Night Out Strategy. It is a continuation and improvement on the drink-safe precinct. I thank the Premier and the Attorney-General for all their work in bringing this legislation to the House.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (7.48 pm): I rise to speak to the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. The previous speaker sought some understanding about what we called the former drink-safe precincts. They are not identical but they are both catchy. Earlier this afternoon I listened with some interest to the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition and also with great interest to the contribution of the member for Stafford given that he has been, and remains at, the coalface of this poor behaviour. I think it is really important that we listen to these people who week on week have to deal with the consequences of this type of behaviour and learn from their experience and in particular learn if they have informed suggestions to address it. Having said that, I will be supporting the majority of this legislation simply because I think any step in the direction of recognising the problems of out-of-control drinking and the behaviour that ensues—and it does not happen to everybody. I think that needs to be noted. Thousands of people go out of an evening and have a good time. They do not drink excessively. They may have a few drinks of wine or whatever it is that takes their fancy. They go out, they enjoy themselves and have a great time building friendships and relationships. Then they go home and contribute to the fabric of society, not unravel it. A lot of people are going to be impacted because of the actions of a few. Sadly, however, that few is growing in number.

When the former government introduced the drink-safe precincts, there were three trial areas: the Valley, the Gold Coast and Townsville. I remember having meetings with Paul Lucas when he was the Attorney-General about having Gladstone included because we were facing a significant increase in particularly young workers, many of whom were living away from home. They were going to have Saturday night off and there was a real risk and, as it turned out, a reality of problems occurring in the CBD. We were unsuccessful in getting that precinct declared—or the process had started for that precinct to be declared. I would have to say that in the absence of government intervention, the LNG companies funded additional police hours—it was not on-duty police, it was off-duty police on overtime—to increase the police presence in the CBD along with the cooperation of Gladstone Regional Council and, towards the end, the use of night chaplains. It is those people who have to be commended as well as the companies. Bechtel and the LNG companies made it clear that poor behaviour was not to be tolerated and that job security was on the line if people were charged with offences.

Having said that, this legislation does introduce a significant number of imposts on members of the community who go out for an evening. One such impost is the introduction of ID scanners, and other speakers have spoken about concerns in relation to personal identification matters and the way that information is held and treated. It is very concerning to me that there is a risk that identifying information might get into the wrong hands. In her contribution the Leader of the Opposition made a list of some of the areas where there could be problems. I remember that not that many years ago some police officers—and it does not happen now, so I am not making a criticism of them—were accessing private information, identifying information and locations of people. They were following up those people on a social basis. It had to be tightened up so that then police had to have a reason to access identifying information such as name, age and address. There had to be a reason for them to do that. If police are controlled in that area of information, there is all the more need for vigilance when it comes to these ID scanners where the potential access is within an uncontrolled group. I am interested in the minister's clarification of how that information will be gained, how it will be protected and how its disposal will be required.

I noted the comments by the member for Stafford in relation to the cessation of funding for the Queensland trauma data. I cannot imagine any good reason for that to occur. I would be interested to know—if not in this debate, I will certainly try to remember to ask the responsible minister—why that collection of data was ceased. Over a period of time—maybe not in one year or two years, but over an extended period of time—it has the potential to show some very important trends and very important demographic information. It is very important to drill down and find some triggers or some location consistencies that might identify reasons for this behaviour occurring. Can I also put on the record what I believe is excellent. There was the One Punch Kills campaign. There was a series of advertisements: One Punch Kills. I have noticed on TV—and I sit here and I am wondering whether it was a state or a federal initiative. It does not matter which, but I refer to the red card ads. I really think that they resonate with people in the community. We are all sports mad. We all understand the yellow cards and the red cards.

Mr Bleijie: It's state, Liz, state.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Excellent. I do not care who did it; it was good.

Mr Bleijie: We did it.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Good. I still do not care, but thank you. It is a good initiative because it is a theme that does resonate. I think if someone is going out with a group of people and they know there is one or two people who may have the potential for behavioural problems, it could be a light-hearted way to smooth that situation over. It could still be done light-heartedly because often people lose their sense of humour when they have been drinking. I commend the Attorney-General and this state government for the red card ads. I think they really do resonate with the community.

I also want to place on the record my appreciation that Gladstone is to be one of the Safe Night Out precincts. Again we will continue to have those issues of being a growth area in Queensland. Because of our infrastructure and the already existing industries, we will continue to grow and, therefore, have these pressures. I would also like to say that we are greatly appreciative that the minister's office has been, and continues to be, very collaborative in relation to the actual mapping for the safe-night precinct that is to be declared. I put on the record my appreciation to Nathan from the minister's office, who has been really good to talk with. I thank him for that.

There is one other issue that I wish to talk about before I close. There are some very strong penalties for public urination in this bill. I really do not find anything impressive about fellows in particular who decide that they cannot wait any longer and instead of going behind the shed, they stand in front of the public. They do not realise that if the sun is behind them there is a yellow rainbow. Having said that, I think there could be some reasons—

Mr Johnson: Have you got evidence?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: There is plenty of evidence, member for Gregory. There could be some reasons that people may not have taken all reasonable opportunities to get to a public toilet—

A government member interjected.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: That is exactly right—but a reasonable person would go somewhere out of sight. That is a reasonable person's action: out of sight where it is not offensive. Then it would certainly not be likely to be witnessed by families, by women, by men, by children. I think that is a matter to be discussed later on in regard to the reasonableness test.

Whilst the member for Stafford does not believe that this bill addresses the problem, from my limited experience and my great concern that is shared by everyone in this chamber that we do address the problem of alcohol fuelled violence and unacceptable behaviour, I think the bill can be recognised as an attempt to address those problems. On that basis I will be supporting it.

 **Mr GRIMWADE** (Morayfield—LNP) (8.00 pm): I rise tonight to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This government is very focused on delivering on its election commitment to ensure that our communities are a safer place in which to live. A safe night out is no doubt a great night out, and that is what we want for all Queenslanders. People in our communities have had enough of people going out to pubs and clubs to cause a ruckus when families are trying to have a good time. There are people who go out looking to get themselves into trouble so they can engage in alcohol fuelled violence and who get themselves loaded up and go out with the intention of mucking up our great communities and our pubs and clubs. I want to go through a few points. It is important that we debate this in parliament tonight and get a few of the facts about the consultation that took place in regards to the bill. I want to place some of my personal thoughts on the record as to why I think we should be supporting this bill in the parliament tonight.

In February 2014 we did an online survey on alcohol and drug related violence and over 12,000 people made public submissions. The three most significant issues that were raised throughout that consultation process were (1) personal values or a lack of respect; (2) penalties for offenders failing to deter bad behaviour; and (3), irresponsible binge drinking at venues. None of those top three issues centred around opening and closing hours, and it is important that we note the responses of the 12,000 people to the survey. I will get to the Labor Party's policy on closing hours very shortly.

People have had enough of coward punches, people who cause mischief in pubs and clubs and people who disrupt venues where people just want to go to have a good time. In my personal opinion, I think there is a cultural shift. If people go back 10 or 15 years, we did not have these sorts of issues. Sure, there was the odd bloke who will have a punch-up in a pub or who will have a bit too much liquor under his skin, but we did not have the situation where we have alcohol fuelled violence in our communities. Over the last decade we have seen that, and people in the community are demanding that we do something about it. Looking at the results of that survey, in my view it has something to do with the culture and how people are being educated, or maybe their parents set bad examples when they were children. Sometimes parents do the wrong thing, and the Attorney-General's red card campaign that is on television at the moment is great because that does resonate with people. We are a sports-loving community, so people know that when you get a red card or a yellow card, you are being sent off because you have had too much to drink and you are causing a bit of mischief. I think it is a great campaign that the Attorney-General is currently running on television.

We need to compare and contrast Labor's policy with the LNP's sensible and methodical approach to addressing this situation. We are developing school education programs for years 7 to 12. This is important, because as people are coming through school they are seeing bad things and wrong examples on television, and when they go to things like schoolies that is while they are growing up and they are binge drinking and sometimes getting themselves caught up in situations. So education programs are important. Other initiatives are creating locally managed Safe Night Out precincts—and again this is a great initiative all throughout Queensland—and introducing tougher penalties for those who do the wrong thing. It is important for people to know that there is going to be a tough penalty and they are not just going to get a slap on the wrist and be let off by the courts. If they know that there are tough penalties in place, people will start to do the right thing. This is about law enforcement, and in the provisions of this bill dealing with coward punches we are enforcing that if you cowardly punch someone you are not just going to get a slap on the wrist and get let off by the courts, but you will get a tougher sentence and there will be a consequence for your actions. We are increasing powers for the Queensland Police Service, which is again important, introducing the 12-month trial of a sober-safe centre in Brisbane, enhancing compliance with the liquor licensing requirements, increasing transport services and strengthening the liquor licensing system. ID scanners, which have been spoken about tonight, are included in that package. As members can see, it is a comprehensive task which encompasses education, law enforcement and looking at the liquor system in regards to some of the licensing requirements.

I will just touch on ID scanners. I know that the member for Pine Rivers spoke about the Eatons Hill Hotel. They have an ID scanner there, and I visited that venue to have a look at the ID scanner during the consulting period to see how it works. The owner of that hotel took me through it, and it was great. The people who were going into the hotel for a drink or a meal were there to have a good night out, and they did not mind. They rocked up, stuck their licence in the little scanner, it came up on the screen that everything was great and they went through. There were no complaints about it; it was great system. Security interacted with the customers coming in, and it was great—

Mr Mander: It makes them feel safe.

Mr GRIMWADE: I will take interjection from the member for Everton. It does make them feel safe to know that security knows who is coming into the place and if there are any bad characters who are in the system. I think it is a great system.

We have the Caboolture Liquor Industry Action Group, or the LIAG as they are now known, which is a good group of hotels around the Morayfield electorate extending into Pumicestone, Bribie and a few other places. They meet regularly for our Caboolture area, and these are pub owners who meet regularly to talk about issues and work together on things like ID scanners. The Caboolture LIAG has been a big supporter of the Safe Night Out precincts and our new legislation around the Safe Night Out Strategy, so these are people who are proactive. They are not getting a bad name for being a pub or hotel that is doing the wrong thing; these are people who are already proactively working in regards to trying to fix the situation.

I will just compare and contrast. This is the sort of strategy that we as a government think we need to do. The Labor Party's alternative is to shut pubs at one o'clock in the morning. That is it; that will fix everything. Their only policy is to turf everyone out at one o'clock. Will that work? No, I do not think it will work and I will explain why. If people are going to go out and drink, and then all of a sudden you close all of the pubs at one o'clock and throw everyone out into the streets, what do you think is going to happen? When people have preloaded with alcohol and they are all boozed up, they will become aggressive when they are being kicked out and security is asking them to leave. What do you think is going to happen then? There is going to be mischief. Let us look at some other reasons I do not think the 1 am shutdown of pubs and clubs will work and why it will be bad for industry.

The recycled failed Labor candidate who is running around Morayfield at the moment is talking about youth unemployment and jobs. Yet if you go out and speak to any person in the industry and say that we are going to shut pubs and clubs at 1 am, what do members think happens to youth unemployment? When it comes to serving behind bars, which age group do members think has the greatest number of jobs in the service industry in order to pay for their university degrees? It is young people. What happens with their jobs? Does the Labor Party's policy model show what impact that will have on youth unemployment?

Have they looked at the taxi industry? I spoke to a taxi operator in my electorate who owns 100 cabs. He said that it is great to have pubs that shut at four o'clock, and a large number of people being moved over that long period of time from 12 o'clock to one o'clock to two o'clock. The taxi operator who I spoke with said that they can move that number of people, but he told me today that if we throw them on to the kerb at 1 am and we cannot move them, it is going to be mayhem because there will be people who are loaded up with alcohol fighting for cabs in the streets and the situation will be out of control. So the Labor Party has not consulted with the transport industry.

If we look at the recent coward-punch incidents, we see that plenty of coward-punch incidents and alcohol fuelled violence incidents have not happened after one o'clock in the morning. In fact, the statistics will show that lots of them happened at 9 pm, 11 pm and midnight. Does that fix anything? No, it does not fix anything because most of them have happened before 1 am. So let us finish tonight by comparing and contrasting the LNP's strong plan with education, law enforcement and working with young people to ensure that families have a safe night out with the Labor Party's 1 am shut-out, throwing everyone out onto the streets where there will be fighting.

Just before I close, we talked about jobs today. I think it is important to note that I come from the fast-food industry. I used to own one of the local pizza shops in Burpengary. Shutting people out at one o'clock in the morning to try to fix this problem is just like owning a pizza shop or a takeaway shop and saying that kids have obesity, kids are getting fat, so let's close takeaway shops at 8 pm and not let people buy takeaway. It simply will not work. You have to have a strategy in place with regards to education through a methodical approach to penalties and setting the right example, and only this LNP government has a strong plan for a brighter future. We have a plan to fix this; the Labor Party does not.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (8.08 pm): It is my great pleasure to rise to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, which is a great step forward. It is appropriate legislation which attempts to tackle the alcohol fuelled violence on our streets. It is a clear direction for keeping our streets safe so that all of the community can experience our vibrant night-life.

This legislation is not a panacea in terms of incidents that may occur in the future. There is an element of our society who are complete idiots, and no amount of education about taking responsibility or direction will change their mentality. But what we are putting in place through this legislation is a reasonable, carefully considered and well-thought-out strategy to help protect people who enjoy the later night lifestyle from the idiots who are out there trying to ruin very enjoyable nights out.

Mr Bleijie: In Mermaid Beach or Broadwater?

Mr STEVENS: I am the former member for Broadbeach, which has been taken over very capably by the member for Surfers Paradise, who does a wonderful job looking after that area now. My electorate borders Broadbeach. As a former mayor of the Gold Coast I can say that these strategies have been ongoing for a long time in terms of hours of operation. I am also a former member of the legal affairs committee that deliberated long and hard and made 40 or 50 recommendations to the previous Labor government. They accepted about 10 easy ones, including a moratorium, and ignored the recommendations of that bipartisan committee in terms of hours of operation. Blaming problems on the hours of operation is the easy option. As the previous speaker,

the member for Morayfield, just mentioned, a lot of these unfortunate incidents in society—the coward punches and the bad behaviour—occur before one o'clock in the morning. People are loaded up and are out to do damage and they create havoc. The behaviour of a very small percentage is ruining it for the vast majority—probably 99 per cent—of the people out at night.

This legislation has three elements that I think are critical to delivering a much better outcome for our late-night revellers, to protecting people's safety and to ensuring the community is not affected by bad behaviour. The first important element is education. We are telling everyone what they should be doing, what they cannot do and what may be the effect of certain bad behaviour. We are telling people upfront that if they misbehave there will be serious ramifications for them. A great regime is being put in place by the Attorney-General, who has thought long and hard about this particular strategy—a major strategy for Queensland. The education part of this legislation is incredibly important. I think members opposite would recognise that when looking at the matter rationally. The good doctor who has dealt with all of these facial injuries would, I am sure, agree that education is an important part of this legislation.

Mr Bleijie: They are opposing it.

Mr STEVENS: I take that interjection. I understand that they are opposing it, Attorney-General, but the education part of this legislation is incredibly important to achieving successful outcomes.

The second part of this legislation that is important—and I think the good doctor, being the expert that he is on these matters, would recognise it—is the notion of responsibility for your actions. If people throw a coward punch, they can expect to feel the full weight of the law, in the heaviest possible form. That message needs to get out. I will deal with all of the peripheral matters in this legislation, but I highlight three fundamental areas that make this good legislation, which the opposition should be supporting and which the government is proud to bring to this House.

In terms of responsibility, what we are not doing with this legislation is blaming the entire group of people who go out at night to enjoy themselves but who have their nights spoiled by a few idiots in that group. We are identifying those particular spoilers of the entertainment and saying, 'We will make you pay heavily through law enforcement penalties, through policing et cetera.' Responsibility is a key part of this legislation. I cannot see how anyone could argue that people being made to take responsibility for their bad behaviour is a negative aspect of this legislation.

The third important part of this legislation is that we will ensure enforcement is a top priority. We have already heard that we have put on 800 new police. In terms of safe-night precincts, I am pleased to say that Broadbeach, the neighbouring area to Mermaid Beach, which I now represent—I work closely with the member for Surfers Paradise, who is the representative of Broadbeach—is one of those 15 areas across the state that have been identified as a hot spot of entertainment. I am very proud of the entertainment precinct that we have in Broadbeach. I contribute my dollars and my time there for entertainment as much as I can, although the later hours are not as prevalent as they used to be in Broadbeach.

I congratulate the Premier on his outstanding work in relation to tackling alcohol fuelled violence in a very considered manner—not throwing out the easy option of reducing trading hours. I will be honest: in the legal affairs committee I supported that particular easy option being recommended previously, but this is a considered approach. I admit that that particular measure was not going to reduce the actual outcomes of bad behaviour. We have had that proven time and time again.

I congratulate the Premier and the Attorney-General for focusing on police resources and powers, combined with the non-legislative action priorities of changing the culture, attitudes and social expectations through the education of our young people, particularly high school students before they start to experience the negative impacts of drugs and alcohol. I have had some alcohol; I have never had any drugs, except for my current flu condition.

The government has undertaken a great advertising campaign. I think the initiative of the Attorney-General in producing the red card for antisocial behaviour has been a brilliant exercise—

Mr Bleijie: You can hold that up if you like.

Mr STEVENS: That is the wonderful campaign. I think members will see that coming out stronger throughout the community, in association with other community groups that will progress this matter. The red card, I am sure, will be an enormous success in terms of promoting the unacceptability of antisocial behaviour. In fact, my good wife, who is a schoolteacher, said that she will even be using it in the playground, so she is after as many red cards as she can get to deal with

the bad behaviour of young students. I think we will see great success from the red-card campaign. It will grow in terms of delivering outcomes from this legislation. That is in contrast to the willy-nilly activities of the previous government, with their attempts at imposing moratoriums on late-night trading which failed miserably. That is typical of Labor in general in that they are out for the media grab and they are unfortunately short on deliverables, be it finance, social activity or good legislation.

I thank the chair of the committee, the member for Ipswich, Mr Ian Berry, and the members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, who have done a great job in analysing the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill and have made recommendations including that the bill be passed. That is very appropriate. I congratulate the Attorney-General on this great step forward. I look forward to positive outcomes from this bill being passed here tonight. I look forward to the good doctor joining us in passing this very good legislation.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (8.19 pm): I have listened to the debate this afternoon between the government and the opposition. It has been quite illuminating. Both seem to be wishing to claim that they will get to or, more correctly, are pursuing the same outcomes. The member for Ipswich and chairman of the committee that reviewed the legislation stated that we need balance in the argument. He also stated that we need new options but we, the wider community, should not use evidence. He says that this is because the evidence being used by research groups to generate both conclusions and further evidence of knowledge is not evidence. I do not quite follow the logic of that, but that was his argument. Before going any further, what does the current evidence state—that is, the basis of research? It states, one, cutting trading hours for venues reduces violence; two, reducing alcohol and other drugs preloading reduces violence; three, shutting takeaway sales prior to the closure of venues leads to a reduction of violence; four, reducing alcohol percentage drinks reduces violence; five, offenders are often recidivists and can be identified with a variety of techniques including scanners and medical health when you follow them up; and, six, the populist one-punch sentence laws give rise to adverse consequences. None of these things are in this legislation, and that is what the research says. None of those things are in this legislation. Therefore, this step is a poor legislative step and it is a waste of time. According to the approach of the member for Ipswich, this evidence cannot be accepted because he has a higher knowledge about the veracity of that research. For a solicitor and a chair of a review committee, this is disappointing and reflects poorly on this parliament.

This legislation is wrong on many levels but primarily it will do little to change the current problem of alcohol fuelled violence because its primary emphasis is on jail sentences and mandating much of these changes. It is consistent with the head-in-the-sand attitude of this ignorant LNP government, and has been so since it was elected two years ago. As one who spent a long time on policy committees and standing policy committees in the National Party and then in the LNP, to now see this populist nonsense masquerading as progress is an insult to all those who have toiled away for years going through the evidence that was supplied to them—the same people who supposedly are supporting those opposite. The challenge to this government was a need to take on the alcohol lobby, reduce trading hours, reduce alcohol advertising and increase the price of alcohol, as is occurring in Scotland, which has actually made changes, and it has worked. What we are seeing here is none of those things. It includes a new law of unlawful striking causing death, which will only go some way to reduce the number of men killing their spouses or children, as has occurred in WA since the introduction of similar laws, and getting away with it. These matters have been extensively publicly discussed including a very extensive Radio National debate well broadcast and well described in the literature right now. Those changes directed at police officers and misbehaviour as responses are well and good, but they are merely largely replicating what we already have. This new law, which is the key piece of the legislation, is populist nonsense. The existing law of grievous bodily harm and manslaughter are perfectly adequate laws and we will be able to get convictions for these where justice is applicable. This new law will do none of those things and will more likely be rarely used by both the DPP and the state and will have unintended consequences, as has occurred in WA.

The defence of accident, as was mentioned by the member for Waterford, implying that people do not know the fatal capacity of a single punch, will not get up in the future and does not now because it is well known and it is not accepted. That is what the lawyers say. That said, there is evidence of an increase in the severity of violence. The clear association between increased trading hours, the change in drinkers' behaviour, the nature of the concomitant use of other drugs and alcohol and the disproportionate falling cost of alcohol in that time is used as evidence leading to the increase and severity of the violence that we are seeing today. That is what is causing it and that is what we have to approach. If that is what we know on the basis of good research done overseas and extensive local research, including the wonderfully complete study done here in Queensland largely in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast by Dr Gillian Wortman, the conclusion of this was most interesting

when reflecting on the legislative changes here tonight. The vast bulk of alcohol fuelled violence in Queensland venues occurs within one hour of the closing time of the takeaway outlets. That is the peak of the curve and that rapidly falls away on either side of that. Binge drinking on alcohol and drugs occurred in one-third of offenders, 50 per cent are tertiary educated, the mean age is 24 and 82 per cent used other drugs including ecstasy and they all have mid to average incomes. The domestic offending rate is 20 times that of the venue rate for the same reasons, but we are not addressing that either. If that is the local experience, then we need to address changes within legislation that cover those things. The only two things in this that I see are the sober-safe centres, which appear to follow some models proposed by Sheena Aurora in papers done in both 2011 and 2012, but the tragedy is that they have not moved from the one-step process and therefore it is likely to fail, because what was shown in that research is that it needed to go beyond eight hours.

The safe-night precincts are a good step and they have been trialled before with drink-safe precincts, but the other legislative changes are just too trivial to make significant improvements on the current problem. If we are serious as a parliament in responding to the community need, we need not avoid the elephant in the room in any passage to a comprehensive solution to what is a terrible blight on our community today and has been in the past. It has certainly been to the families of those affected and also the individuals affected. I am very supportive of those businesses that serve alcohol and employ all of those people, but we do need to achieve a balance in that we need to confront the elephant in the room that is facing us. I go back to what came out of the research base out of the UK where it was shown to have worked, as it had in other parts of the world. Alcohol induced violence must stop. Solutions must include more rigorous legislation, licensing and venue controls and setting a minimum price per unit of alcohol. Alcohol consumption is dictated by price. In many cases perpetrators arrive already intoxicated in the precincts where these violent acts occur.

To make any difference, as a matter of urgency we should, one, exclude visibly intoxicated people from venues and drinking precincts; two, repeat offenders must be identified and excluded from venues and precincts using ID; three, young men with unacceptable behaviour must complete an anger management course; four, there needs to be a culture of positive protection of one another, with programs directed at that; five, violent offenders found guilty in courts should receive lifetime bans from all public areas and they can be detected through sober centres and a variety of things and even through the police; six, takeaway sales should be banned from occurring later than 9 pm or, with earlier closing times associated with pubs and anywhere where the closing time varies, one hour before, because the evidence is that that saves lives; seven, venues should only sell midstrength beer; eight, a minimum alcohol price should be set with a price point and be advertised as such. The evidence that was demonstrated in the *Economist* argument from earlier this year demonstrated that that single change will save more lives than any other step. To stop senseless violence, communities need to have a sensible and comprehensive approach. This was not covered in this legislation. This was not addressed. This is what research tells us, and we have to use research if we actually want to save lives.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (8.28 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. At the outset I thank and acknowledge my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, led by the member for Ipswich, Ian Berry. I also thank and acknowledge the secretariat for the work that they do and thank those who took the time to not only make written submissions on this bill but also appear before us at a public hearing. I believe that a safe night out is a great night out. We want people in Queensland to be able to enjoy a night-life without draconian measures that seek to limit their freedom and their ability to enjoy their night as they should see fit. This legislation is a response to the community sentiment right across Queensland. This has been one of the broadest areas of public consultation that this government has entered into, because we appreciate that this is an area where we need to listen to what people think is going to work.

Like many of my colleagues on this side of the House, I took the opportunity to engage with the 18- to 30-year-olds who live in my electorate of Broadwater. I asked them what they wanted the government to do in response to the problem of alcohol fuelled violence. Overwhelmingly, the response was that people in my electorate wanted tougher penalties. Eighty-five per cent of respondents said that they wanted tougher penalties. I think that shows that the people of my electorate of Broadwater and people right across Queensland do not believe that we should punish the majority of people who are simply looking to have a good night out. As the member for Gladstone highlighted, they are just looking to have a few quiet drinks with their friends. We should not be punishing the majority of Queenslanders for the sins of a few.

I believe that it is paramount that we as a government send a message to the people of Queensland that we believe in the restoration of personal responsibility. Perhaps the opposition does not understand this concept, because the Labor Party believes that it should control everything that people think and do. But we on this side of the House believe that Queenslanders are capable of making their own decisions, particularly 18-year-olds who are able to put their lives on the line to fight in a war, particularly 18-year-olds who are able to vote in elections. We believe that they should be able to exercise their own personal responsibility.

One of the key measures that we are seeing through this bill is an opportunity to educate young people before they turn 18. A couple of months ago members of the government who represent electorates on the Gold Coast were given the opportunity to talk about what they felt we should be doing to address alcohol fuelled violence in a series of opinion pieces in the *Gold Coast Bulletin*. One of the things that I highlighted was that I believed that we needed to change the culture.

As one of the younger members of this House, in recent times I have had the opportunity to visit pubs and clubs in both Brisbane and on the Gold Coast with my friends, always endeavouring to have a safe night out and a great night out. One of the things that I can particularly remember is that 10 years ago when I was 18 or 19 there was not the culture problem that we seem to be having that is leading to the violence that we have now.

Mr Crandon: Did you say seven years ago?

Miss Barton: Ten years ago, member for Coomera. At the time, one of the things that I saw was that people were able to come and go as they saw fit and appropriate. They were able to make a judgement call about when was the right time for them to go home. They were not being told by a draconian government at what point it was appropriate for them to have their last drink. Oftentimes you would see people talking to perfect strangers in the taxi queue, because there was no concern that someone might deck you or anything like that. It did not matter at what point you wanted to go home because, with that acceptance of the level of personal responsibility, you were able to make a judgement call yourself because people respected your ability to do that.

One of the things that this government has been particularly committed to over the past nearly 2½ years is making Queensland the safest place to live, work and raise a family. The Safe Night Out Strategy is a key component of that commitment. We have seen right across Queensland crime statistics coming down quite significantly. Having been on a tour of regional Queensland as a member of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee as part of its inquiry into crime, I can say that, from the feedback that the members of that committee have received, the only area where crime rates are going up are in police detected offences. That is why it is paramount that we continue to support not only our police but also our community. I look forward to seeing how this issue is dealt with particularly in the community.

Members of this House have spoken about the solution in Newcastle, as though what they did in Newcastle is the panacea to all the problems of the world. The reality is that, if you have a look at the statistics in New South Wales—and my understanding is that at the time George Souris was the hospitality minister, but whatever his title he was responsible for the office of liquor and gaming regulation—he indicated that it was not the panacea that people were looking for because right across New South Wales they were seeing similar reductions in terms of assaults that were as a result of alcohol fuelled violence without needing to impose such draconian measures. Indeed, I think the Attorney-General in his contribution to the second reading debate highlighted that what they saw in Newcastle was a separation of the assaults from the CBD area out to the suburbs. So clearly, what they were doing in Newcastle was simply not sufficient.

I think we also need to appreciate that what they tried to do in Newcastle was in one city. If my memory serves me correctly, we are talking about 15 or 16 areas right across Queensland where we are looking to provide a solution to the people of Queensland so that they are able to have a safe night out and a great night out. I am a strong believer in the sober-safe centres, because I think that they will provide us with an opportunity to not only educate people about the impact their excessive drinking might have but also give us an opportunity to provide them with the requisite care that they need before they either go home or, if it is needed, perhaps provide further medical treatment. In response to one of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's points of clarification, I appreciate the Attorney-General clarifying that there will indeed be two fully and appropriately qualified medical personnel at the sober-safe centre. I am sure that the Queensland Nurses' Union, which raised it as an issue when it appeared before the committee, will also appreciate the Attorney-General having made that clarification.

I also welcome the changes that we have seen with regard to ID scanning that are in response to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's recommendations. In terms of the feedback, one of the things that we heard was that eight o'clock was simply too early and it did not provide scope, particularly where restaurants were genuinely seeking to serve just meals in a Safe Night Out precinct. It did not provide them with the necessary flexibility.

I also appreciate the Attorney-General saying that we are going to allow local boards to make decisions for local communities. Over the past nearly 2½ years this government has said that it is a strong believer in giving power back to local communities to make decisions for themselves. It is not people in the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation in George Street who should be making decisions about a Safe Night Out precinct in Townsville, or in Cairns, or in Gladstone; it is the local community that should be empowered to make the decisions that it needs to be able to make for itself.

When I think about the Labor Party's opposition to this bill, the first thing that strikes me is that it is simply telling young Queenslanders that they cannot be trusted and that they cannot be respected. As a member of this House who is under 30—and I am sure the member for Lytton would join me—I condemn that concept. I find it offensive that there is a major political—

Mr Dillaway interjected.

Miss BARTON: Member for Bulimba, I said 'under 30'. I find it offensive that there is a major political party in this state that seeks to tell me that I am incapable of making a judgement call for myself.

The member for Stafford said, particularly in the lead-up to his election campaign, that tackling alcohol fuelled violence was his *raison d'être* for running for election to a seat that was located on the other side of the river to where he lived at the time. So it was with some surprise that I found his contribution dispassionate. I thought that he might have injected some vigour into the debate.

Mr Kempton: Life.

Miss BARTON: Life. Member for Cook, I will take that interjection. I thought that the contribution that the member for Stafford made oozed the passion and excitement of a man who was about to get a colonoscopy and a lobotomy at the same time, not someone who said to the people of Queensland that this was the reason he wanted to run for election to the seat of Stafford when he lived in the seat of Chatsworth. His contribution seemed to lack any real passion.

He has also said publicly that he wants the drinking age increased to 21. I find it interesting that he did not take the opportunity to put that on the record today. I wonder whether that is because he did not want to send to the people of Queensland, and particularly the young Laborites to whom he owes after they were particularly vocal campaigners in the Stafford by-election, the message that he does not think that they are capable of being trusted. I am sure that he is more than happy to accept the votes of 18- to 21-year-olds, I am sure that he is more than happy to send them away to war, but he is not more than happy to let them make a judgement call about whether it is appropriate for them to have a beer at the rugby, or a beer at the cricket.

Mr Costigan: Or the league.

Miss BARTON: Member for Whitsunday, I will take that interjection. Should they wish to go to the rugby league, they, too, are entitled to go and have a beer if that is what they want.

The member for Rockhampton spoke about making strong choices. What I would say to the member for Rockhampton is that it is very easy to simply punish everyone for the actions of a few, but it is a strong government that says, 'No, hold on, what we want to do is talk to the people of Queensland, listen to them and actually implement a measure that will work.' This government has a consistent track record of making strong choices for the people of Queensland. We will continue to do so because we believe that that is what the people of Queensland want and need.

The member for Gaven spoke about it being offensive that certain recommendations had been ignored by this particular bill, in particular with regard to former policy-makers. What I find offensive is that the member for Gaven thinks that we should completely disregard the majority view of the people of Queensland who do not want draconian restrictions on the way they are able to lead their lives. I am sure the people of Gaven find it offensive that, having elected him to be part of a strong team, he not only completely betrayed them once, he has gone and jumped ship again. I think people in this House are potentially losing track of what the member for Gaven is doing in terms of whether or not he is an Independent or whether or not he is a member of the Palmer party. Interestingly enough, my understanding is that people right across Queensland received a DVD two days after the member for Gaven quit the Palmer party suggesting that he would indeed be the next Premier.

At its heart, in this particular debate the people of Queensland have said that they want a level of personal responsibility. The opposition in this House has said that it does not believe that we should be able to have that responsibility. This government is committed to delivering a safer Queensland for people to live, work and raise a family in and that includes making sure that people who want to go out on a Friday or a Saturday night and have a drink with their friends are able to do so without the threat of being told at what point they must stop drinking, at what point they must stop purchasing alcohol to take home and at what point they must go home. It is not the role of government to tell people that they should stop drinking at 3 am. It is the role of government to make sure that if people want to be drinking at 3 am they are in a safe precinct so that they know if something goes wrong they are safe and there is someone there to look after them. I think this particular piece of legislation is some of the best and strongest legislation that we have seen come through this House because it is a response to the concerns of the community that will deliver action and positive results.

I acknowledge the member for Brisbane Central and thank him for the great work that he has done in contributing towards the preparation of this legislation. I acknowledge the Premier and the Attorney-General for the great work that they have done in making sure that this legislation not only comes before the parliament, but does so with members of this House in the full knowledge that the people of Queensland have had the opportunity to contribute to this debate and make sure that their views are heard and known. It is not a view that seeks to attack and punish the majority for the sins of a few. I look forward to supporting this bill as it continues its passage through the House.

 **Mrs RICE** (Mount Coot-tha—LNP) (8.43 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Firstly, I would like to commend this common-sense and most comprehensive plan in Australia to tackle alcohol related violence. The Caxton Street precinct, the area surrounding Suncorp Stadium, is one of 15 designated Safe Night Out precincts across the state. I know that the comprehensive nature of this strategy, which aims to restore standards of responsible behaviour and respect, stamp out alcohol and drug related violence and make Queensland as safe as possible for people to go out and enjoy themselves, is very welcome news in my electorate. It is welcome news to all those residents who just want to enjoy a great night out and all those other Queenslanders who go to games and concerts at Suncorp Stadium. It is also welcome news to all those residents who live in this precinct of our inner west.

Before looking at the specifics of the legislation, it is important to note the consultation that took place to develop this strategy. I know it has been talked about at some length already in this debate, but it is important to note that in February this year we conducted an online survey on alcohol and drug related violence that received over 12,000 responses. The top three issues identified as the most significant were: personal values—the lack of respect and concern for others; penalties for offenders failing to deter bad behaviour; and irresponsible binge drinking in venues. As the member for Morayfield so eloquently put it, it is important to note that within those top three issues there is no mention of trading hours. That is very important and an aspect that I will come back to. We did listen to the views of Queenslanders on this topic. We used their feedback to offer up a comprehensive plan which has been considered by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I note that a full review of this strategy will be held after it has been operating for 12 months. This is an enormous amount of consultation by anyone's measure. As others have mentioned, but I think is worth noting again, there are a number of initiatives that form part of the Safe Night Out Strategy. They include developing school education programs for years 7 to 12 students about the culture, attitudes and social expectations of alcohol and drug consumption, creating locally managed Safe Night Out precincts within key entertainment precincts throughout the state, introducing tougher penalties for those who do the wrong thing, increasing powers for the Queensland Police Service, introducing a 12-month trial of a sober-safe centre in the Brisbane CBD, enhancing compliance with liquor licensing requirements, increasing transport services and strengthening the liquor licensing system.

As I mentioned at the outset, there was a significant process of consultation that was undertaken to develop this strategy. I am pleased to see that the consultation has been ongoing to finesse the detail of its implementation. In my own electorate, a number of the venue owners in the Caxton Street precinct expressed their desire to ensure that the solution could be tailored to local factors, like the fact that the precinct is the only one next to a major sporting facility. I am also pleased that the local board will be able to tailor the local solution as required by the local area. I would also like to thank the member for Brisbane Central for being so responsive to the Caxton Street Precinct Liquor Accord's desire to engage on the implementation of certain aspects of the strategy. The member for Brisbane Central came and met with accord members at short notice to hear their

concerns and answer their questions. Venue owners in the precinct raised questions about the boundaries for the implementation of the strategy and expressed concern about the implementation of ID scanners from 8 pm. I am sure that venue owners will be pleased to hear that their concerns have been heard with the Attorney-General's amendment to have ID scanners operate from 10 pm. In terms of boundaries, the government is consulting with local government and key local stakeholders for each Safe Night Out precinct and it will also be based on historical evidence of late-night incidents from police. Venue owners also expressed concern about the application of aspects of the strategy to dining venues. This strategy is about common-sense regulation of high-risk venues and arrangements are flexible enough to ensure that the focus is not on venues that primarily offer food or those that do not trade past midnight. Similarly, low-risk venues that offer a small foyer bar or hold functions such as weddings will be exempt from aspects of the strategy such as ID scanners.

I cannot conclude without addressing what the opposition is suggesting is the alternative: to look at times alcohol would be served and lockout times; to take our cities and our state back in time and shut our vibrant night-life down early, punishing everyone for the abhorrent actions of a few. Winding back trading hours punishes those who act responsibly. The majority of Queenslanders do drink responsibly and our solution should not be to punish responsible Queenslanders for the bad behaviour of a few. The opposition does not have a comprehensive package of measures to deal directly with the problem of alcohol and drug related violence. They just want to shut things down early. The opposition believes that the problem can be fixed only by concentrating on drinking hours, whereas all our consultation and research shows that the issue needs a wide-spread approach, including firmer penalties, education, stronger liquor licensing measures, as well as action to change the culture to restore responsible behaviour and respect to ensure Queensland's night-life is safe for all to enjoy. Education and awareness campaigns, both within schools and the wider community, will be crucial to promoting the importance of responsible behaviour. I am looking forward to the long-term rejection of the culture of alcohol and drug related violence, and while my husband and I will certainly be educating our daughter in relation to her behaviour, I look forward to her having these messages reinforced for her and her peers through her school education.

If people do go out, get intoxicated and behave violently, police will have the powers to deal with them and firm penalties will apply. Everyone has a role to play in tackling alcohol and drug related violence. Government, local businesses and the local community need to work together to achieve this, especially in late-night trading precincts. In conclusion, the government made a very significant commitment to Queensland at the last election to make sure Queensland is the safest place to live and raise a family. This bill goes a very long way to continuing to deliver on that commitment and I add my support to the passing of the bill.

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (8.49 pm): I rise to speak to the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, which includes a raft of new initiatives to make our night-life precincts safer. My electorate of Mudgeeraba is home to many who use the Gold Coast night-life precincts in Surfers Paradise, Broadbeach, Main Beach and elsewhere for a good night out with friends. Unfortunately, as we all know there are always those rare few who try to turn a good night out into a night in hospital for those who behave well, drink responsibly and look after their mates. What we have seen in Queensland and on the Gold Coast as a result of this culture of irresponsible behaviour and lack of respect amongst some of our youth is innocent victims being unsuspectingly assaulted by cowardly individuals seeking to mask their own insecurities and lack of self-worth by hurting others. We have seen a culture of recklessness and alcohol and drug fuelled violence taking hold of our nightclub precincts and ruining the nights and, in some cases, ending the lives of those who simply wanted to party safely and enjoy themselves with their friends. Too often families hear of their loved ones, whom they know would never start a fight or become entangled in an unavoidable conflict during a night out, being brutally assaulted when they had their backs turned and were unable to defend themselves from cowardly attackers. Sadly, some are never able to see their loved ones again.

Let us be very clear about the sorts of people who would be violent, reckless and selfish enough to punch an innocent and unsuspecting young person on a night out, often resulting in serious injuries or death, solely because they are unable to manage themselves and were never taught respect. Those people are cowards, they are bullies, they are thugs and they should not be allowed on the streets. They are going to get what is coming to them under this government's sensible approach to night-life through our Safe Night Out Strategy. As a result of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill, we will restore standards of responsible behaviour and respect. We will stamp out alcohol and drug fuelled violence and ensure that Queensland and the Gold Coast are as safe as possible for people to go out and enjoy themselves. We will create a new offence called unlawful striking causing death, which will deal specifically with coward-punch deaths that have been

hard to prosecute under previously weak laws. This new offence will be punishable with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. It will be a strong deterrent to those who go out seeking trouble and a proper punishment for those who have inflicted unimaginable pain and grief on their victims and their families. This violence needs to stop. Young people need to be able to enjoy themselves freely on a night out without fear of cowards targeting and harming them for no reason other than to make themselves feel tough and because they do not have the self-control to drink responsibly.

This bill is a measured response to a deeply entrenched problem. It is a sound policy that will tackle the real issues head-on. This is because, unlike the knee-jerk reactions we have come to expect from those opposite, the Safe Night Out Strategy is the result of significant community consultation. In February, this government conducted an online survey on alcohol and drug related violence that received well over 12,000 responses from concerned members of the community from throughout the state. This provided the government with feedback that has informed this logical policy response and made the concerns of the community known. The community's feedback conveyed an obvious concern for the lack of personal values at nightclub venues, a lack of strong penalties for offenders which meant there was no deterrent for bad behaviour and young people binge drinking irresponsibly in venues and ruining the environment for the vast majority of those present. That feedback informed a draft strategy that was released in March for even more community consultation.

As a result of that extensive consultation, this bill achieves what it sets out to do. Police will now be empowered to clean up the streets and protect our young people from those who become violent. Tough new penalties will apply. Education campaigns will be launched to change the culture of our nightclub precincts and spread awareness about the importance of responsible behaviour. This strategy does not impose burdensome regulation on nightclub operating hours or impede those businesses' ability to operate, but instead goes to the heart of the problem and addresses the behaviour of a violent minority of young people. I am proud to support this bill, which will make the Gold Coast and residents of my electorate so much safer into the future. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—PUP) (8.54 pm): We must change the culture of our youth and young people who go out on a Friday and Saturday nights, as well as midweek, simply to drink. This is a cultural issue that must be fixed. It requires education, it requires the responsible service of alcohol, it requires enforcement activities and it requires the treatment of people who have drinking issues. Recently, New South Wales Police Commissioner Scipione confirmed that throwing more and more police resources at alcohol fuelled violence is not the answer and that a combination of the things I have just described is a solution. As a former police officer, I have worked in the Valley on a Friday, from 10 o'clock at night until six o'clock in the morning. The truth of the matter is that by about one o'clock in the morning through till about six o'clock in the morning, people coming out of the nightclubs are intoxicated and some of them are drug affected, and at that time they are more likely to become violent. That is a fact. At four o'clock in the morning at taxi ranks in the Valley, there can be 100-metre-long queues of people waiting to catch a cab. That is where violence occurs and it is where a heavy police presence is required.

The only way to solve this problem is through a very integrated approach. The concentration of nightclubs in Brisbane and in the Valley, for example, compounds the issue. The nightclubs have to be dispersed. Transport services have to service the areas where nightclub patrons go. Those are facts and if anyone has been in those areas at night they will know it. I am not talking about a minister taking one walk up the mall at three o'clock in the morning and then thinking that he knows all the solutions to everything. That is nothing more than a PR stunt. If you have worked in those areas, you would know the realities. It is a dynamic environment that changes from time to time. There is a consistent theme: as the night goes on and you get to two o'clock and three o'clock in the morning, that is when you see the most violence. There is no doubt that that is tied to trading hours. It cannot be denied; it is a matter of fact.

The Newman government is not very good at doing research. I want to table some information on programs that are in place overseas, which are seeing exceptional results not only in dealing with alcohol fuelled violence but also in dealing with domestic violence and drink driving and other traffic related incidents. The program involves what they call sobriety tags that test your alcohol blood reading. They are for offenders who have been found guilty of alcohol related offences. The results are quite astounding. If the Newman government had done its homework, it would have found this type of research. It has been most recently trialled in London. The program produces significant results. I encourage the young Attorney-General to read that. It might awaken him a little.

Tabled paper: Parliamentary Library research brief, dated 15 August 2014, regarding sobriety tags in other jurisdictions [5743].

A government member: Why didn't you just give it to the legal affairs committee?

Mr JUDGE: The members of the legal affairs committee are well equipped to do their own research. If they cannot do it, they should hand over to somebody else.

The entertainment precincts require dispersing. There are too many nightclubs concentrated in those precincts. The Newman government must take a more mature response in relation to the surveys that it undertakes. The Strong Choices survey has proved to be flawed. That is a fact. The safer streets survey was a bit of a joke. The youth justice survey was also a bit of joke. I do not think that any academic would say that it would hold water. In terms of a survey conducted into Safe Night Out strategies, one has to only look at research from around the world to know that this is just populist politics and poorly informed politics. It is pretty much what we have come to expect from the Newman government.

I do not have much more to offer, other than what I have stated. I regard the member for Stafford as an asset to this parliament. His contribution to this debate was very informed. He should be given a proper hearing and proper respect. I have listened to other members in the House. I do not believe some of them have moved out from their parents' homes yet because their worldly experience is pretty limited. I encourage the members of the House to listen to people who have lived, researched, done a bit of work and had a job outside of politics. In this place, too many people are worried about being politicians. I say to them: get a life. They should come in here and do the right thing. If they are not willing to do the right thing, they should get out of the road so that someone else from their community can come in here and serve the electorate. All members opposite want to do is come into this place and be politicians. It is pathetic. I say to them: get in here and serve your community or get out.

 **Mrs FRANCE** (Pumicestone—LNP) (8.59 pm): I rise to support this very significant legislation. As a government we have not shied away from tackling the issues that are challenging the safety of our communities. The bill that I rise to support tonight is another step forward in ensuring that residents of my electorate and right across Queensland can go out for a fun night and not be worried that their night out will be tragically ruined and their life changed forever by some person throwing a coward punch.

While this bill cannot guarantee that a coward punch will never be thrown again, it can guarantee that there is now a massive deterrent to those who think that this type of action is acceptable and that serious consequences exist for their actions. While I am very proud to stand in here in parliament tonight to speak in support of this legislation, I am also filled with regret that this bill is going to be introduced too late for many families.

There are three people I think of tonight as I make my contribution to this bill. They are the late Todd Parnell of Bribie Island, the late Jason Toby of Mount Morgan then Brisbane and the late Joshua Mill of the Sunshine Coast. The premature death of these three men and the impact on their families has played a big part in my contribution to this debate tonight.

In the case of Todd Parnell, he was tragically killed by a single punch at the Bribie Island Rugby League Club on 26 July 2009 while celebrating after a Warrigals game. His attacker was to later reoffend with another coward punch while out on bail. Todd's death has had a significant impact on the Bribie community and an unimaginable impact on his family and friends.

In the case of Joshua Mills, he was tragically killed while out with his friends one night in Caloundra. My husband and I happened to be staying in Caloundra that night. I remember hearing the commotion on the street below, then the sirens and then reading in horror the next day about the fight that ended Joshua's life and threw the lives of those around him into chaos. I remember the date Joshua was killed very clearly, 20 October 2007, as I gave birth to our first child that morning and wondered how the heck I was going to keep him safe.

In the case of Jason Toby, it is a tragic incident that has taken away a loveable larrikin who meant so much to so many and was unforgettable to those who knew him. Jason was tragically hit on 23 December last year and passed away Christmas Eve. His wife, Britt Potter, posted—

There are moments which mark your life. Moments when you realise nothing will ever be the same and time is divided into 2 parts—before this and after this.

For my brother and I, Jason will always be remembered as a loveable larrikin during our days in Mount Morgan, who had a beaming smile and energy that knew no bounds.

To the families and friends of Todd, Joshua and Jason, I offer my sincere sympathy for your loss and what you have endured and apologise that this legislation is being introduced too late for these three men. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KING** (Cairns—LNP) (9.02 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on what is very important legislation. I speak not only as the member for Cairns—a place that is heavily reliant on the night-time economy—but also as a member of the safe night out implementation panel chaired by my good friend and colleague the member for Brisbane Central, Robert Cavallucci.

The safe night out bill is an important piece of legislation because it addresses in the most comprehensive way that this nation has ever seen what is a very complex and very longstanding problem. It certainly cannot be solved by any one measure. There are no silver bullets. It is very disappointing to hear that, while the Labor Party claims to have a suite of measures, most people are really only aware of the one that will do the most damage to the very important night-time economy and that is the move towards earlier lockouts.

Cairns is an international tourism city. Our CBD at night-time is vibrant and thriving. It employs hundreds and hundreds of people. When we did the consultation for this very important piece of legislation and policy I spent three hours on a Saturday night in the CBD. I started out at 1 am. I made a point of talking to the range of stakeholders out and about at that time. I spoke to taxidrivers, to punters, to security guards, to police, to council security officers and also to the wonderful Street Chaplains. I spoke to people right across the spectrum.

That evening I spent in the CBD was about a fortnight after Labor's rather knee-jerk policy announcement to move towards earlier lockouts. I can tell members that everyone, including the Street Chaplains, opposed that policy for a number of reasons, but key among them was that they felt that it would dump hundreds and hundreds of people out on the street earlier and at one time. They believed it would lead to further problems when people were locked out. If people were getting into the night and were keen to get inside and their friends had got in earlier and they were locked out, the potential for violence out on the street due to that early lockout could cause more problems than Labor thought it would solve.

As a result of that night of listening and a bunch of roundtable discussions throughout the consultation period, it became very clear to me, certainly in the context of Cairns, that our policy was heading down the right track. It was not about locking people out earlier. It was not about punishing the majority of people for the stupid actions of a few. Across our state on Thursdays through to Sundays thousands and thousands of people are out enjoying the night-life. The incidence of violence is a handful on any given night. We should not punish the tens of thousands of people who are doing the right thing, who are having a great night out, for the sins of a few. That is why I fully support this policy and this legislation.

I sat on the implementation panel and had many discussions with the member for Brisbane Central. I am absolutely amazed by the amount of research he has personally undertaken. I commend him for the work he has done. He has looked around the world for world's best practice. He has not just looked at Newcastle or some other stand-out cases. He has really looked globally. I think this suite of measures captures the very best of what is happening around the world. It is a whole-of-government approach. I think that a form of prohibition by simply saying, 'We will reduce the sale of alcohol by bringing forward the hours' does not work—

Mr Johnson: It never works anywhere.

Mr KING: It never works anywhere. I will take that interjection from the member for Gregory. Prohibition never works anywhere regardless of what form it takes. It simply shifts the problem, whether it shifts it to another location or the form of violence shifts.

We have to at least attempt to change the culture. That is exactly what this legislation and this policy does. We are running the full gamut of measures. We are getting into schools. The implementation panel had a presentation last week from three experts who are already in schools delivering safe-drinking and harm minimisation strategies to high school students. We will focus on education right through to very tough penalties. There is a full gamut of strategies. It is about one or two silver bullets. It is about attempting to get to the core of this problem. It starts with the very young. It starts with education. It starts with parents as well. We have absolutely got to get parents involved in changing the culture.

I implore the Labor Party to support this legislation because it is the nation's most comprehensive legislation. From memory, over 13,000 Queenslanders had their say. It has been an incredibly exhaustive consultation process with the public and all the stakeholders. The criticism or

claim from the Labor Party that the liquor industry is dictating this policy to this government is absolutely ridiculous. Sitting on the implementation panel we have a representative from the Street Chaplains, a drug education expert, representatives from various government departments and a few MPs, including the current occupant of the chair, Mr Watts.

So there is a wide range of voices. It is interesting that, unlike the Labor Party, we have MPs who have owned and managed pubs, people who come from the private sector. We have to crack down on those few who do the wrong thing, absolutely, but we also have to remember that these are small business people who could be dramatically affected by Labor's knee-jerk policy.

With that, I commend the member for Brisbane Central and I commend the Attorney-General, the Premier and the cabinet for backing this really innovative and comprehensive package of measures. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KAYE** (Greenslopes—LNP) (9.10 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Through the Safe Night Out Strategy the government is committed to the most comprehensive plan in Australia to tackle alcohol and drug related violence. With over 80 components, from education programs to compulsory ID scanners, Queensland families and patrons can be assured that we are serious about not only changing Queensland's drinking culture but also ensuring that Queensland is a safe state. We have listened to all stakeholders and this legislation will prevent further deaths and violence while still preserving our vibrant night-life. I am impressed by the number of Queenslanders who responded to the Premier's survey earlier this year, with respondents overwhelmingly agreeing that the government must do something. Tougher penalties and sentences for law-breakers affected by drugs or alcohol also received the broadest and strongest support and that is reflected in the legislative initiatives contained within this bill. Furthermore, ongoing consultation in response to the draft Safe Night Out Strategy released in March conferred a high level of support with regards to the potential efficacy of the proposed responses in addressing alcohol and drug related violence.

With approximately 3,500 people aged 18 to 25 in the Greenslopes electorate, I felt it was important to hear the feedback of young people in my community and wrote to them for comment earlier this year. Of the respondents, an overwhelming 89 per cent supported tougher penalties and sentences for law-breakers affected by drugs or alcohol, while 94 per cent supported the expansion of ID-scanning technology to all licensed venues. More than 75 per cent of respondents agreed that measures needed to be taken that did not penalise the majority of law-abiding patrons. With regard to the reduced trading hours, the result was closer, with 51 per cent not supporting reduced hours and 41 per cent in favour, with the remainder undecided. I am pleased to report to them that this consensus is reflected in the legislative initiatives contained in this bill.

I would suggest with the greatest respect that, as a former police officer, who was operational in general duties for 23 years across the CBD, the suburbs and rural Queensland, I have witnessed and attended more alcohol related incidents and assaults than probably anyone in this chamber. I have dealt with those incidents before, during and after they have occurred. Identifying situations before they occur and defusing those situations is part of good police work. Actually dealing with intoxicated persons at the time of the offence gives one a far better understanding of that behaviour and, importantly, the pathetic excuses given by those involved. Many of the assaults that I attended happened well and truly before midnight. So in answer to the member for Rockhampton, yes, I have spent more time than I care to remember in licensed venues, emergency departments, watch-houses, morgues and every other situation where alcohol has been a factor. If the answer is to reduce trading hours as the opposition suggest, do they expect us to believe that the assaults that occur at 9 pm are acceptable?

With the greatest respect to the member for Stafford—and I certainly respect the career he has come from and the good work he has done in that career. He is also highly regarded in that career. His job was putting people back together once they had suffered horrendous injuries. However, one does not suggest that an aircraft mechanic who can build a plane can also fly a plane. A panelbeater who puts a car back together does not really know a great deal necessarily about road safety and how to drive a car on a racetrack.

Queensland families suffer from the devastating and tragic effects of violent and antisocial behaviour. I commend the decision to create a new offence of unlawful striking causing death with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. I also fully support those amendments which provide greater powers to police officers in issuing on-the-spot banning notices and strengthen the penalties for other offences including those involving steroids. I am also satisfied with the safeguards included in the bill with respect to banning powers.

I particularly commend those provisions which will enhance liquor compliance measures to create a more responsive and safe environment for patrons, including young people in our community. These enhanced measures will see increased action taken against licensees who serve alcohol to an intoxicated person and require that licensees meet certain CCTV and ID-scanning requirements. I believe these amendments are on point with responding to concerns about community safety and will ensure that those ongoing issues are addressed.

While some believe that this problem can be fixed by simply reducing drinking hours, they fail to understand that the majority of Queenslanders do the right thing. I do not accept that those who act responsibly should be punished because of the stupid, selfish and ignorant behaviour of some. In fact, I would go so far as to say that I am sure there are people in this chamber who at some point in their life probably went out and got highly intoxicated. I would also suggest that they probably did not end up seriously injuring or killing somebody. People are responsible for their actions. As a state it is our responsibility not only to protect our children but also to instil standards of responsible behaviour and respect. It is, therefore, the strong sense of this government to introduce a widespread approach which will action reform across the night-life scene in Queensland by collaborating with all stakeholders, not just those who want prohibition. People must start taking responsibility for their own actions. 'Do the crime, do the time' is a saying that many are familiar with. There is also another saying that police use. I cannot use the exact saying, but it is along the lines of 'what you do when you're drunk you pay for when you're sober'.

I have no sympathy for anyone who drinks too much and commits any offence. During my time in the service I watched the previous government erode many areas surrounding the consumption of alcohol. Prior to the Goss government being elected, there was zero tolerance in relation to good order offences in the entertainment precincts in Brisbane. This was coupled with proactive liquor licensing enforcement and inspections.

I congratulate both the Premier and the Attorney General on their leadership in developing this comprehensive plan. I support the bill.

 **Mr RUTHENBERG** (Kallangur—LNP) (9.16 pm): When I was a young fellow—a while ago—we enjoyed a drink or two every now and again. We would never ever have thought about taking to a cop or an ambo though. From time to time someone in our group would want to size up to someone else, but usually our mates would walk us away. Binge drinking was fairly rare. What happened? Why has the culture changed so much that it is okay to take on a cop or beat up an ambo or have such little regard for someone else?

I congratulate the Attorney-General and the Premier on taking the lead on this issue and spending time asking Queenslanders for their input. I spent time on the side of the road seeking input from the people I am responsible to in my electorate. We did an online survey with my good friend the member for Pine Rivers, who I know spent time in pubs, clubs and hotels in his electorate seeking feedback from patrons. The government conducted broad consultation across Queensland. The committee heard from many people on the issue and it is my sense that the bill addresses the issues in a balanced manner responding to that consultation. In her speech the Leader of the Opposition said that the core issue is trading hours. The core issue is not trading hours. It is one of the issues to be considered, but it is not the issue.

In my earlier life I was a maintenance engineer. One of the mechanisms I used to help improve machinery availability was to conduct root cause analysis. One thing I can bring from that experience is that there is never one cause to an event and there is always more than one consequence to an event. There is no one core issue; there are multiple issues. For example, the issue is the culture of binge drinking. The issue is that respect for police and ambos among young adults is significantly reduced from a decade ago. The issue is that so many young people tank up before they go out. The issue is how many jobs will be lost if operating hours are cut. The issue is access to public transport early in the morning. The issue is ensuring if someone chooses to have a night out they do not end up in hospital or in a morgue. The issue is a lack of personal accountability and responsibility.

We need to implement a solution that is considered and broadly addresses the issues, not just one issue. We need to consider, as we look for solutions, the jobs of those who work in the industry as well as the consequences of a series of events that result in someone being injured or killed. We need to reduce drug and alcohol related violence in Queensland night-life. We need to change attitudes to bad behaviour so it is not tolerated.

I do not pretend that the change implemented by this legislation will stop all of the violence; I do not think that is possible. There is always going to be violence when alcohol is consumed in excess. I do think this legislation is a balanced, considered approach; however, that will provide a powerful reason for people to stop and consider the consequences before they take the decision to get legless and hit someone.

I greatly respect the member for Stafford's professional ability, and his excellent reputation as a medical professional precedes him. His professional ability and experience qualifies him as an expert medical professional, not an expert in culture, law and order, control crowd or peer pressure. If I was seeking an opinion related to fixing an engine, I would talk to a mechanic; if I were trying to redesign the engine I would speak to a mechanical engineer—they are related, but different, skills. I respect the member for Stafford's professional skills and ability in the medical world. I respect his passion around the issue because of his life experience, but in regard to social policy and addressing this issue his opinion is not an expert opinion, albeit well considered—it is another opinion that is in the mix to be considered. His recommendations and Labor's proposals to address this complex issue with a single-tactic strategy is to water down this issue too simplistically. It is an opinion that was considered, but it is not the only answer to the question. This legislation also provides an answer, and it provides for a wider impact on the broader parameters than just cutting trading hours.

In the closing part of her speech the opposition leader inferred that more people will die by implementing this legislation than if we implemented Labor's policy and that that would be our fault. I reject that assertion. To suggest that my colleagues and I would deliberately implement legislation that would cause injury or death because someone in industry donated to our campaigns and to say that we would put money before life is absolutely absurd and ridiculous in the extreme. I have a 17-year-old boy. He is a good kid. I am very proud of him. He does well at school, is an excellent singer and has the world at his feet. I want to know that he will be safe when he goes out. I do not want to get a phone call like the one that has been received by so many parents in our community saying that their child is injured or dead. No-one wants that outcome, and to suggest that we are willing to put a price on a young person's life—like my son—is absurd and is not only irresponsible, but absolutely preposterous.

The core of the issue, Speaker, is personal accountability and responsibility. The core of the issue is that we are all responsible to tell someone who is acting in an antisocial or socially aggressive manner that that behaviour is unacceptable. The core of the issue is ensuring that our enforcement capacity is adequate and reflects our community's expectations. Putting people out of work will not address the core issues of personal accountability and responsibility. Making sure as a community we say, 'Antisocial behaviour is unacceptable, and we are willing to put you in prison if you hurt someone,' upholds that personal accountability and responsibility principle.

In changing personal behaviour we will address the core issues. We can change personal behaviour with well designed responses to bad behaviour, and this is what this bill will try to accomplish. My friend, the member for Ipswich, put it well in his speech when he said that it is a matter of balance. Again Labor had their blinkers on. They selectively choose evidence, narrow the issue down to one reason for the problem and speak in emotive language, condemning everyone who does not agree with them. This issue is complex. I appreciate that there are different ideas and thoughts on how we can accomplish the Safe Night Out objective.

I think this bill will have an effect on unacceptable behaviour just as radar guns had on speeding, and I thank the Premier and Attorney-General for carefully considering this issue and presenting a balanced response. I support this bill.

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (9.23 pm): I rise to speak to the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. I note that this bill includes amendments to numerous different acts of parliament including: the Criminal Code, the Penalties and Sentences Act, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, the Bail Act, the Drugs Misuse Act, the Liquor Act, the Summary Offences Act and the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Act. I also note that the bill is another of Premier Newman's signature bills, but the Premier has handed the conduct of the debate on this bill to someone else. I think that *Hansard* will show that that has been a common trend in many of the Premier's signature bills over the last two years.

As I listened to the Attorney-General's speech earlier this afternoon, I heard him make some comment about my opinions on this bill and I think he used words alleging that, as the deputy chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, I had been complaining about not having had sufficient time to consider the submissions, or words to that effect. Unfortunately, I have not had the chance to peruse *Hansard*, but I understand that is the thrust of what he was saying. I say quite

clearly that if I had been in the chamber I would have risen on a point of order to say that those comments were untrue and offensive and I would have asked for them to be withdrawn. Unfortunately, as I was not in the chamber I will take this opportunity to put on the record that the Attorney-General's comments about my alleged comments were not true and provide me with more evidence as to why I believe that this Attorney-General cannot be trusted with the truth.

I am disappointed that this bill, which has at its core a range of strategies to combat alcohol fuelled violence, does not consider the issue of reducing trading hours. When the issue of trading hours was raised during our committee hearings, the government's response was—if members choose to look to the committee's report—along the lines of 'the issue of trading hours is sensitive'. I believe that the reason why it is sensitive is because of the obligations or commitments that the Newman government may have provided to clubs and pubs. We will never know, because the government has increased the \$1,000 donation threshold. Now donations can be made up to \$12,400 and no-one in this chamber or in Queensland, apart from the people who made those donations, will ever know who made them. I say that that is wrong, and I hope the next government will overturn that decision.

I believe the evidence shows that the connection between trading hours and alcohol and drug related violence is very clear, and I am very disappointed that this government was not prepared to consider that issue amongst the range of other issues which are contained in the bill before us. There are some parts of this bill that I am prepared to support, because I agree we need to use a wide range of strategies to respond to the issue of alcohol and drug fuelled violence. In my statement of reservation which was tabled with the committee's report I said that I believe the bill should include winding back the hours of operation of some venues, including late night and early morning entertainment precincts. I support the proposal of doors being shut at 1 am where liquor is supplied, that alcohol is not served after 3 am and that if venues currently have a permit to trade until 5 am, that they are able to keep trading until 5 am with non-alcoholic drinks being served between 3 am and 5 am. I believe my proposal is not about shutting everything down, as some members would claim. It would not destroy our nightclubs and entertainment precincts in Queensland, but I believe it would provide some certainty.

I respect that other people have different views on the matter to mine, and I believe dealing responsibly with the issue of trading hours must be included in the range of strategies to be considered when dealing with this difficult issue. While this government has not been prepared to deal with the issue of trading hours, I hope that the next government will have the strength to do that, but who knows? That will be decided whenever the Premier chooses to call the election.

Members have spoken about the costs of the range of strategies contained in this bill. Some members have spoken about a \$44 million price tag and others a \$45 million price tag. We will not really know, but one thing I can share with members is where I believe the dollars are going. In our report reference is made to the Queensland Government Statistician's Office, which will be evaluating the trial of the sober-safe centres. This is a letter from the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and it says that the Queensland Statistician's Office will also be developing an evaluation framework. Yet members may not be aware that the government's statistician started the evaluation earlier this month, with responses required from the community by 23 August. I will share with members a letter which corroborates what I am saying dated 11 August from the Queensland Government Statistician's Office. It says—

The Queensland Government has designated the Safe Night Out Strategy to address alcohol and drug-related safety issues in Queensland, especially around night-time entertainment venues. In order to evaluate how successful the strategy is at improving safety, the Queensland Government Statistician's Office ... is conducting an evaluation. As part of the evaluation, we are interested in your feedback through an online survey.

Please enter the following unique web address into the address bar of your web browser ...

It goes on—

It would be appreciated if you could complete the survey by **Saturday, 23 August** ...

And this legislation has not even been passed by parliament yet! I wonder how many more surveys will be coming from our Queensland Government Statistician and how much money will be allocated to do the evaluation. How credible will the evaluation be?

Contained in this bill are a whole range of new powers for our police; new offences—the new offence of unlawfully striking causing death; increased penalties for serious assaults on public officers; the issue of providing banning orders in various venues; sober-safe centres; proposals to deal with identification scanning and the technologies related to that; and issues involving mandatory community service orders.

It is amazing how many former police are in this chamber tonight. As a former police officer and former solicitor, I can see the merit in many of these additional powers. I have been critical of some members of our Queensland Police Service but can I say that most police do the right thing. There will always be a rotten apple in every bunch—just like in every group of politicians or every group of councillors or whoever. There will always be someone who does not want to do the right thing, who wants to use the special powers they are entrusted with for ulterior purposes. There are certainly some police who abuse their powers, but most police I come in contact with want to do the right thing for the right reasons. All I hope is that after this legislation is passed our Queensland police will be forever vigilant to ensure that police officers who abuse their powers for whatever reason are identified and that action is taken to have them removed as soon as possible from the service.

We all want to make sure that when people leave home at night and go out to party or have a good time they return safe and well. No-one wants to receive a phone call or have a knock on the door from someone saying that a loved one is in hospital. No-one wants to see that happen.

I have circulated a minor amendment to the Summary Offences Act which I believe is necessary. When we finally get to the debate of the clauses, I look forward to speaking to that foreshadowed amendment. I hope that members will have a chance to peruse and consider the merits of that proposed amendment.

I believe that people must take responsibility for their actions. People should stop blaming everyone else for doing the wrong thing. We have all run amok at some stage and done things wrong, but I think the test is whether we learn from our mistakes.

Whilst I am not a great advocate of the Premier or the Attorney-General, I am prepared to support this bill because I am aware that some time next year there will be a state election. If perchance the government does change, I would hope that the next government will have the strength of character to consider the important issue which has been overlooked in the range of matters which are contained in this bill. That is the issue of trading hours. I am disappointed that the government was not prepared to proceed further on the issue of trading hours, but I will not repeat myself.

Many members have their own views. I respect other members' right to have an opinion different from mine, but Independents cannot sit here and hide behind a party. As an Independent you have to make a decision. I know that some will like the decision I make tonight and some will not, but at least I am prepared to stand up and make a decision. I look forward to proceeding to consideration of the clauses. More importantly, I look forward to, whenever the Premier chooses to call the election, seeing who will form the next government of Queensland.

 Hon. AP CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.34 pm): I rise to speak to the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill. I thank the Attorney-General for bringing the legislation to the parliament. The primary objective of the bill is to reduce alcohol and drug related violence in Queensland's night-life. The bill proposes amendments to the Criminal Code, the Penalties and Sentences Act, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, the Bail Act, the Drugs Misuse Act, the Drugs Misuse Regulation and the Liquor Act. The amendments cumulatively contribute to the rolling out of this government's Safe Night Out Strategy. As many members have already mentioned during the course of this debate, this is a comprehensive strategy to achieve the objectives of the bill to reduce alcohol and drug related violence in our pubs and clubs across the state of Queensland.

I must say that in my electorate of Hinchinbrook there are not a lot of nightclubs. There are quite a few licensed premises in the form of traditional pubs and community clubs, but we do not have a lot of nightclubs. It might be from the outset considered by the House that the electorate of Hinchinbrook is probably not a hot spot in terms of the requirement for the Safe Night Out Strategy. Notwithstanding that, the police do an outstanding job of supporting licensed premises and ensuring patrons of these various licensed premises are safe and observe the rules and obligations for patrons attending these licensed premises.

Without the Safe Night Out Strategy being deployed into various precincts in my electorate of Hinchinbrook, I will take one moment to give a plug to the work of the various liquor accords that have been in operation in my electorate for some time. Local communities have got together through these liquor accords and have tried to do something about the prevalence of alcohol related violence and antisocial behaviour on licensed premises. I genuinely endorse the work those liquor accords have done in addressing some of those issues in licensed premises in the Hinchinbrook electorate.

Truth be told, I did not intend to make a contribution to the debate of this particular bill for the reasons I outlined earlier, but I was compelled to do so after listening to the contributions of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Rockhampton and the member for Stafford. I was compelled to do so because of the diatribe that was forthcoming from the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Rockhampton and, later on, the member for Stafford.

On a couple of occasions already during the course of this parliament it has been necessary to get up to correct the record of the rank hypocrisy and glib rhetoric that comes from the members opposite so regularly when we enter into debates of substance. Unfortunately, the member for Rockhampton, who is protesting opposite, has been the victim on many occasions when I have been required to stand up and point out the utter inconsistent nonsense of the position he has put forward. Often he has done so innocently because he is a relative newcomer to the chamber and he does not have the corporate history of some of the members who have served for a longer period of time in this House.

The thrust of the contributions from the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Rockhampton and the member for Stafford was that the Labor Party somehow had adopted a commitment to undertake the development of policy through the consideration of science and data and a thorough and comprehensive consultation process. This is a totally new commitment from the Labor Party to undertake thorough and comprehensive consultation processes and make decisions based on data and science. It has never happened before. This is very much a new-found commitment from the Labor Party to have a robust policy development process. My mind was cast back to an example in relation to this particular issue that I want to draw to the attention of the member for Rockhampton and the member for Stafford, because they are largely just riding in on the coat-tails of the story that they have been told by the rest of their colleagues in the caucus. My mind goes back to the knee-jerk reaction undertaken by the former Premier and the former government when they brought in the temporary ban on glass in what they referred to as a number of high-risk venues across the state of Queensland in 2009 when, unfortunately, there was a spate of attacks and violent assaults in licensed premises involving glass.

We then had a situation where the then Premier and the then minister for tourism and fair trading commented in the media for a good fortnight telling the Queensland public what they were going to do to try to address the issue of this so-called spike in glassings in Queensland in licensed premises. They spent a fortnight telling everybody what they were going to do and then at the tail end they said, 'We're going to give this to a parliamentary committee to examine,' and I spoke to the motion in this parliament when the former Leader of the House got up and gave the referral to the parliamentary committee—as a matter of interest, the Law, Justice and Safety Committee at the time—because I was the deputy chairman of that committee. They set the terms of reference for us to investigate an issue when they had told the Queensland public they had already decided what they were going to do. They had already told us that they were going to ban glass in these premises, that they were going to do something about trading hours and that they were going to take a whole series of courses of actions when they had not even done any research. They had not done any research; they had not done anything! They had not done any research. They had not even allowed the parliamentary committee to investigate the situation, but the research had been done. Professor Paul Mazerolle and Dr Peter Cassematis did a report in 2009 which was subsequently tabled when the parliamentary committee did the research on this issue, and the now Attorney-General and the member for Mermaid Beach were also members of that committee. It was a very comprehensive report which the member for Mermaid Beach has already referred to—a report that the previous government adopted very few recommendations from.

It is ironic now that the Labor Party comes into this place and says, 'Well, you haven't done any consultation.' In contrast to what the former government did in relation to that situation, the member for Brisbane Central in particular supported by the cabinet and this government has undertaken a very comprehensive consultation process indeed. We have not undertaken the type of knee-jerk reactions that were typical of the policy decisions undertaken by the previous government—typical! Once again, the poor old member for Rockhampton has gone onto the parliamentary website, done a bit of googling and formed a whole series of unsubstantiated views and made assumptions about what happened previously, probably directed by his colleagues over there in the caucus, and comes in and makes these sanctimonious contributions to the debate about important issues when he has absolutely no idea about the history of what has gone on in public policy development in this state for the last couple of decades. It is absolutely disgraceful that the member for Rockhampton continuously comes in here and serves up this nonsense to the parliament. The only reason I have got up tonight

is to correct the record yet again from the poorly informed, useless member for Rockhampton led by the Leader of the Opposition and then backed up by the member for Stafford. They have got absolutely no idea what they are talking about. The member for Rockhampton really needs to take a cold shower about his contributions in this debate, because I have never seen someone so obviously led by the nose and so ignorant about the corporate history of public policy development in this state than the member for Rockhampton. Hopefully we can expect something better from the member for Stafford in the future.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (9.44 pm): I rise to support the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I reflect on some of the contributions that have been made particularly by members in the Labor Party suggesting that there are people who do not have any experience in this. I have worked in the industry on three continents for nearly 30 years. I have worked in venues that close early, I have worked in venues that close late and for many years I have dealt with lots of the problems that Queensland and Queensland youth are currently facing and have been involved heavily in many harm minimisation strategies for a long period of time. With that, I will just go back and reflect on history. I know the hour is getting late, but I will ask members to bear with me because I am particularly passionate about this legislation. The member for Brisbane Central is to be congratulated on the work that he has done and the consultation that has been done in terms of this legislation. The Premier and the Attorney-General have made a very strong choice and a very brave move not to just jump to some populist ‘let’s close everything early kind of decision’ in the vain hope that it will grab a few votes prior to an election and not solve anything.

Let me take members back to 1788. The First Fleet has just landed. There are no closing hours. There are no venues. There are no curfews. One of the first things that happened on the first day after they landed is that people were issued some rum. What do members reckon happened next after many days at sea if soldiers, criminals and various other people are issued with some rum after they have been on a boat for a long period of time? There was a fair amount of drunkenness, there were some assaults and there were some sexual assaults. Lots of things happened and the first piece of legislation that was passed by the Governor at the time was to regulate alcohol, and Australia has been facing problems with alcohol regulation since then. It is a cultural issue. We can try to slam the door closed as hard as we like, but unless we solve the cultural issues around alcohol we will not correct the problems. We will just shift the problem somewhere else.

We are all aware of legislation that has been passed in this House in terms of so-called Facebook parties and other things. That is an example of shifting the problem of alcohol to somewhere else. If we do not have venues where people can go and enjoy a safe night out, a good night out, in a controlled environment, in an environment that is policed and looked after, where there is support, where there are trained people and where the buildings are designed for it, they will party in other places. Those places may well have mixed aged groups. It may be someone’s house with a deck that cannot support everybody who is jumping around on it. It may be a house that does not have the right fire regulations and people cannot get out of the building when something goes wrong. As I said, there might be mixed ages. There are no standard drink measures. There are no CCTVs, there is no trained security and the police do not know it is there. There is no regulation and you are in a very dangerous environment. As a father of four teenagers, I do not want that environment to expand and grow because we have tried to grasp this problem and the quicksilver that is this problem just slips through our fingers. It is a cultural problem. This legislation will comprehensively address the cultural problems. It also gives the department teeth to be able to deal with licensees that are doing the wrong thing. Something needs to happen.

I am aware of a premises that in 2009 was proudly named on the front page of the *Courier-Mail* as a high-risk, superdangerous venue that must switch from glass to plastic for fear of someone getting injured by a glass—a knee-jerk reaction. Unfortunately, for the previous four years that that premises had been operating, that premises had already been using plastic. It had already done everything that was being suggested that would solve the problem and in fact there had never been a gassing event there.

It was a knee-jerk reaction based on some hearsay put forward by the previous government. It is really incompetent management of a really complex problem—something that this legislation begins to address, something that I think this government can be very proud of in making the first move. Nobody should think that this problem is going to go away in six months, or a year, or two years, or a parliamentary term; this problem is going to take a long time to be dealt with properly.

But let me take members back to when I first moved to Toowoomba. I had been working down in the Valley at venues that operated until 5 am while I was at university and I moved up to Toowoomba. In 1988-89, the Valley was maybe not quite as friendly as it is now. But let me assure members that, when I moved to Toowoomba and the venues closed at three o'clock, there was plenty of violence on the street. There were plenty of problems on the street. There were massive difficulties in controlling people's behaviour, but yet the venues closed early.

We have heard a lot about the Newcastle experiment and how wonderful it is. I will run through some of the facts that come from such a disreputable source as the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. It is important that people hear these numbers. When that state first introduced the 1.30 lockout, the 3.30 close, the drink restrictions, including no shots and no more than four drinks at once after 10, something did happen. For the first year there was a big drop—a 23.4 per cent drop in assaults in that first year. That is a really good outcome for the people of Newcastle. The number fell from 304 assaults to 233. Unfortunately, the following year when all of that legislation still existed, assaults increased by 21 per cent. To recap, the silver bullet that the opposition would have us load and fire at this problem has been fired in Newcastle. It had an effect for the first year and then the number of assaults jumped back up.

But the situation is worse than that. Over a five-year period, under this legislation Newcastle has had a reduction of 25.3 per cent of assaults. I think everybody would agree that that is a pretty fantastic outcome. Interestingly, the New South Wales average is 30 per cent. So in Newcastle, where the hours are restricted, the number of assaults has fallen less than it has in the rest of the state. Over that same period in a very similar town, Wollongong, which does not have the restrictions in place, assaults fell by 34.6 per cent. These are figures provided by the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. I understand that it might not have all the facts and figures, or that the researcher has, with one eye closed, proclaimed the Newcastle solution as the panacea for this problem. But across that five-year period assaults in Gosford went down 37.7 per cent; as I said, in Wollongong they went down by 34.6 per cent; and in Campbelltown they went down by 42.7 per cent. There is no restriction on opening hours in those places. So if opening hours is really the silver bullet that the members opposite wish to fire, how come Newcastle is performing worse than the rest of the state? Clearly, the problem is not going to be solved by closing early and locking out. Clearly, the solution is to address the culture.

I have had some experience with this issue in Toowoomba. Since 1994, I have chaired either a liquor industry action group or its predecessor, or been on the board. Those bodies have put in place many harm minimisation strategies. Many of them were very similar to what is proposed in this legislation and there have been some great outcomes. If we look at the assault rate in Toowoomba and the difficulties that might occur at night, we find that it is pretty good in comparison to the assault rate in some other areas. I just want to highlight a couple of assaults that occurred in Toowoomba in the proposed safe-night precinct. In 2012-13, between 8 am and 1 am, there were 31 assaults in the proposed safe-night precinct. I am not sure how the 1.30 lockout is going to stop those 31 assaults. After 1 am until 6 am, there were 38. A lockout may have some effect on that assault figure, but it is certainly not going to get it back to zero. If the suggestion is that restricting opening hours is the cure, then why are we not suggesting to close at eight o'clock, because in that time there were still 31 people being assaulted compared to the 38 people who were assaulted after that period? The number has fallen a little bit. In 2013-14 in Toowoomba, 31 assaults occurred between 8 am and 1 am and between 1 am and 6 am there were 28. So there were fewer assaults. So using the logic that has been espoused about opening hours, we suggest that, based on those numbers, we should close between 8 am and 1 am and open at one o'clock in the morning until 6 am because there will be fewer problems.

It is easy to cherry pick figures—and, clearly, I have heard the opposition members do that tonight—but the simple fact is that what is being proposed is not going to solve the problem. I believe that the opposition—I believe that everybody in this House—wants to see this problem solved. I do not think that there is anybody here who wants to be the father of a daughter or the father of a son who goes out and gets into trouble with alcohol, or is assaulted, or, God forbid, someone throws a coward punch and someone dies. I have worked on premises where people have been killed by a single hit—not when I was there, but the night before I did my shift—and let me tell members that there is nobody in the industry who wants that outcome. There is nobody in this House who wants that outcome.

This legislation is very strong legislation, because we need people to take personal responsibility for their behaviour. No government can enforce that behaviour on them. It is going to take education. It is going to take a multifaceted approach, which is exactly what this legislation does with simple little messages like the advertisements that are running now—‘Red card, your behaviour is unacceptable.’ Society is civilised when people are civilised. We need to educate people so that, when they go out at night, they behave in a civilised way. We need to make sure that if a venue is encouraging people to become uncivilised the operators are punished severely. We need to make sure that there is legislation in place so that people who misbehave cannot go out. The scanning regime that is being implemented here is a wonderful suggestion and, in my opinion, a tool that will make one of the single biggest differences.

One of the things that we implemented in Toowoomba for a long period was bans, which involved all the premises across town, including our golf clubs and our other sporting clubs. When someone misbehaved in one licensed premises, they were banned from all licensed premises. I have had someone who had been charged and found guilty of assaulting with a coward punch crying because they cannot go and play golf because the golf course is licensed and they cannot get in. Bans will change behaviour. The reason bans have struggled to be effective is that they have not been applied to all premises. People have been able to select where to go out. Having a comprehensive strategy across 15 areas that are open late at night with compulsory scanning means that if you misbehave you will not be able to go out, and I think appropriately so. I do not want to be out with someone who is misbehaving. I certainly do not want my children, as they are growing up, to go out and be exposed to someone who is a known troublemaker, someone who has caused problems repeatedly on licensed premises to the point at which the police have found cause to ban them. The scanning technology regime will solve this problem. It will encourage people to behave. People know that the venue knows who you are.

A venue that I had control of had 36 CCTV cameras. There were 15 people trained in security under the Security Providers Act as well as trained in first aid. They were all able to provide support. We were in direct communication with the police. The building was in direct communication with the fire brigade. All of the staff were RSA trained. Across five years, my average alcohol intake was 2.2 drinks per person. When people asked me, ‘What is the strategy for stopping people drinking too much?’ I would say ‘price’. People did not come to my venue to get drunk. My best customers were people who were out for a birthday party, or an anniversary, or a wedding. They were out to celebrate in what is part of Australia’s culture to be able to go out and enjoy the company of others in a public space, have a few drinks, and have a good time.

A person should be able to go out without someone coming up and punching them in the back of the head. A person should be able to go out without having someone’s behaviour cause their whole night to crash and burn. If I am honest, I would say that the behaviour of patrons in venues has actually got a lot better over a period of time. A lot of the difficulties we see are on the street because the venues are so much better run than they were back in the late eighties. I think the industry is to be commended for that. People have talked about the industry being after profits. Why shouldn’t someone in hospitality be entitled to make a profit from investing their capital, taking some risk and running a business? When a venue operator is paying \$40,000 a year for public liability insurance, they know that their business is a serious business. They want to look after and take care of people. We should encourage people who want to be in this industry to make a profit and enjoy it. I can tell members that they will make a profit far quicker by charging a cover charge than they will by charging for the alcohol. We know that if you go down to the liquor barn you can buy alcohol cheaply. We know that the people at most risk of drinking excessively are our teenagers and our youth. We know that they are going to be price motivated. Why are they going to walk into a nightclub and pay \$9 a drink when they can walk into a liquor barn and buy half a litre of spirit for much the same price? The reality is that the solutions are multifaceted. That is what this legislation does. It will take cooperation between venue owners, police, the fire brigade, taxis, the community, the various people who provide ministries at night and schools. At the point when this starts maybe we can move on from what happened in 1788 where a culture of drinking excessively when given the opportunity was first founded on these shores.

To the member for Stafford, who I have a great deal of respect for, for the profession he has been in and for the work he has done in putting people back together, many venue owners are no more responsible for the person who gets hit in their venue than he would be for having the person on his table. If someone mindlessly comes up and commits an act that is completely indefensible by anybody because nobody knows it is about to happen, all we can do as a civilised society is tell

people that that is completely unacceptable and create legislation that will punish them accordingly and then let people know that that legislation exists. People in Queensland, be aware that the coward punch is off the table. The penalties are severe. I do not want to see anybody charged under this legislation because I want people to stop the behaviour. I do not think anything else we do will achieve the same outcome as these severe penalties. The word will go out: this is not going to make you a man; it is not your rite of passage to go and hit some innocent person who is not looking; it is not going to make you tough; what it is going to make you is a criminal, very lonely and ruin the potential of your life. People need to stop and think before they do it.

There are many parts of this legislation that I support. I would say to my community of Toowoomba that it is very attractive to grab at the early closing hours and think that that will be a solution. In 1991 Toowoomba used to close early and there was plenty of trouble on the streets. During Expo Queensland venues were open 24 hours in some spots and there was less trouble. If opening hours are the panacea why do the statistics from New South Wales tell us otherwise? Why are we in a situation where people are saying this is the solution and it is not. Downstairs there is one of the biggest petitions put before this parliament suggesting that restricting opening hours would be a good solution. People have been grappling with this problem for a long time. It is time for us to deal with it. It needs comprehensive legislation. It needs bipartisan support. I would encourage the opposition to throw their support behind this. Give the legislation a chance to work. The people of Queensland deserve it. The children of Queensland deserve it. Your children and grandchildren deserve an opportunity for the culture to be changed permanently. I commend this legislation to those opposite and seriously consider that what they have on the table is no solution at all, it is just something that looks really attractive when in actual fact it will be an empty promise to the electorate of Queensland. I congratulate both the Premier and the Attorney-General for putting this legislation forward. They will have my full support in implementing it.

 **Mr CAVALLUCCI** (Brisbane Central—LNP) (10.04 pm): It is with the greatest of pleasures that I rise to contribute to the debate tonight. I thank my colleagues for covering off comprehensively much of the Safe Night Out Strategy. My contribution will focus more on why this government is doing what is right for Queenslanders. What a load of exculpatory, populist, knee-jerk nonsense has come from that side of the chamber today, in particular from the member for Stafford. It was his main election platform issue and he could not even give a 10-minute contribution to this House; he gave up and sat down after six minutes. I think he is truly confused about what he is doing in here. Every day he comes in with a look on his face like Bilbo Baggins on an unexpected journey.

Let us just park for one minute the member for Stafford's long-standing policy of raising the drinking age to 21—if it was not, as he claims, for those pesky little 21-year-olds who are still allowed to vote—and process the singular issue which has defined him and the opposition policy position today in its entirety and that is trading hours. Let us just consider for one moment where we would be if the government had taken this path. Firstly, Dr Lynham would not have had his dummy spit resulting in him nominating for Stafford in the first place. Secondly, we would have done nothing to set the state on a path of generational culture change around the consumption of alcohol and the culture of violence in our community. Let us take a look at the magic-bullet trading hour reduction theory being espoused by the opposition today by making reference to a body of research into restrictions on the sale and supply of alcohol. I quote—

Factors which influence alcohol consumption and the experience of related harms are complex, bound to history, culture, privation and prosperity, as well as more tangible and measurable factors such as physical and economic availability. There is no single approach to alcohol regulation which will ultimately lead to the most desirable outcomes for all involved, no one 'magic bullet' which will address alcohol related problems in all social settings.

I continue—

There is no one single answer to the question of 'what is the most effective mix of restrictions?' A combination of restrictions which work well in one area may not produce the same outcomes in another. Some restrictions appear to work under a range of different conditions while others appear to be situationally and/or circumstantially dependent. Ideally, combinations of restrictions should reflect the needs of the population to which they are to be applied and the number of possible combinations is large.

This is why the basis of the Safe Night Out Strategy is a comprehensive, multifaceted solution targeted at what is best for situational factors associated with Queensland and its people. I continue: several recent reviews have assessed the research evidence for the impact of opening hours on alcohol consumption and related harms. The research concluded 'that the effect of changes to trading hours for licensed premises was inconsistent but that nevertheless, when applied strategically, such restrictions have the potential to reduce drinking and alcohol related harms'. Despite this they also noted that in recent years there has been a tendency for many countries to move away from restricted

trading hours as a form of regulation. Research also concluded that changes to trading hours have some impact on the 'patterning of problems of alcohol intoxication across both time and place'. They added that, taken as a whole, the international evidence for small changes in trading hours is suggestive but not conclusive and that the effect of such changes is likely to be closely tied to local contextual factors.

I refer the House to moves in January this year by the Colorado government which, in order to combat alcohol related violence in entertainment areas in their state, passed laws to allow extension of drinking hours from 2 am out to 4 am. That is right, colleagues, they have gone in the exact opposite direction. I say to the opposition argument that the evidence is neither conclusive nor is the argument settled about the desired actions governments across the world should be taking. I will continue with this quote—

There's no quick fix.

...

It's a lack of respect from one human being for another. I think that we have to go back to some old-fashioned values. Education is the key.

...

It's got to start in preschool and it's got to work its way all the way through ... so that they come out the other end showing respect for other people, to look after other people, rather than this horrible interpersonal violence.

Who said this? Was it the Premier? Was it me? Was it the Attorney-General? It was Dr Lynham, the member for Stafford, on 23 July 2012. The opposition leader mentioned earlier that this parliament is now graced with the presence of Dr Lynham. We know why the Labor party needed a maxillofacial surgeon in parliament—because they are all so two faced he is the only one who can tell the difference. The member for Rockhampton announced a policy that the member for Stafford wrote before he was the member and before the member for Rockhampton had even visited Newcastle. During the by-election the ALP bosses gave the member for Stafford tongue surgery to prevent him from speaking, all the while not even consulting with the actual shadow minister for health who is not even on the speaking list for the bill tonight.

Let us move on and look at what happened in Newcastle, which is the basis for the opposition's entire policy position and debate here today. In 2008, an 80 per cent escalation of alcohol fuelled violence resulted in a significant number of conditions being imposed on Newcastle's entertainment precincts, just one of which included the reduction in trading hours to 3.30 am. Subsequently, a body of research was commissioned to assess the effectiveness of the measures. That body of work was based on circumstances surrounding 11 licensed premises, not hundreds of licensed premises across an entire state or a capital city, but only those specific to the small New South Wales town of Newcastle. Up until earlier this year, it was the only town in Australia where trading hours had been reduced. What did they find? I quote—

The night-time economy is an important part of any modern city, providing entertainment for many, and jobs for many others. It is a risk-laden environment. There are an immense number of variables at play which determine whether one individual suffers harm whereas another does not. Most do not; and most feel safe while visiting night-time entertainment districts.

On the other hand, most of the general public that have not been to a licensed venue in the past 12 months are often misinformed by sensationalist media painting scenes of gratuitous violence and hedonism. However, alcohol-related harm is a complex problem needing a primary prevention approach, which is both multifaceted and long-term.

In his contribution, the member for Stafford claimed that unless we copy Newcastle and reduce trading hours, measures to reduce violence will not work. I can reveal to the House what the opposition has completely ignored, which is that for the same period covered by the Newcastle research the New South Wales government revealed alcohol related harm decreased on average across the state by 28 to 35 per cent where none of the restrictions were applied, matching exactly what was achieved in Newcastle despite the severe restrictions imposed. In the same period in Penrith, alcohol related assaults were down by 56.16 per cent, in Wollongong they were down by 30.97 per cent, in the Sutherland Shire they were down by 47.7 per cent and in Gosford they were down by 28.8 per cent, all exceeding or on par with Newcastle.

The recommendations to come out of Newcastle that discussed restricted trading hours when rates of violence were unacceptably high and that outlined the case for trading hours restrictions were weak in the areas where violence rates were lower. If there was no alternative, why even canvass this as an idea? The reality is that the Newcastle solution is a solution for Newcastle, not for Queensland.

This government wants what is right for our state and that is why the Safe Night Out Strategy is based on what is best for Queenslanders and has been developed through consultation with over 12,000 Queenslanders.

Today I refer the House to the release of the 24-month report into the drink-safe precincts, which is the former Labor government's own policy and Queensland's own research that the opposition has completely abandoned tonight. Clearly it reveals reductions during the last two years of 24 per cent and highlights specifically that in Queensland the majority of offences occur between midnight and 3 am. A recent body of work completed by the same researchers who undertook the Newcastle research, in a report titled *Patron Offending and Intoxication in Night-Time Entertainment Districts*, found that physical incidents observed in Perth, Sydney, Melbourne, Geelong and Wollongong suggested that—

While the trading hours in Wollongong close at 2 am, the patterns of intoxication are very similar to those of other cities which close at 5 am.

The pattern of intoxication occurs earlier in the evening suggesting that earlier trading hours may shift drinking cultures to the evening rather than late-night/early morning economy.

What both bodies of Newcastle research did find, and it is supported by every other piece of research internationally on the subject, is that—

'Pre-loading' has been identified as the single biggest and most major predictor of alcohol related violence.

Closing hours do nothing to address this.

Earlier the opposition leader mentioned that each year over 500 alcohol related presentations occurred at emergency departments across Queensland. What she failed to mention is that a 10-year study across Queensland revealed that just 15 per cent of all alcohol related presentations to emergency departments occur from licensed premises, with over 40 per cent occurring from homes. Only the government's strategy of a strong focus on education and changing the culture of drinking, anti-social behaviour and violence in our community will address this reality.

Earlier the opposition leader gave some bland coverage and skimmed over the use of ID scanners. A recent federal government study into the technology found that—

ID scanners were considered to reduce antisocial behaviour in licensed venues by accurately identifying people with a recorded history of disorderly conduct and ensuring patron bans could be readily enforced. This served two important deterrence functions. First, licensees believed potential troublemakers avoided attempting to enter venues where scanners were deployed. Second, the increased probability of accurate and rapid identification was considered to attract more orderly patrons.

Both venue licensees and suppliers considered ID scanners removed anonymity and reduced the likelihood that people with a propensity to engage in violence would attend the precinct. A licensee was quoted as saying that—

By removing anonymity, those who are prone to bad behaviour, and not necessarily just because of alcohol ... but the fact that they know that they're not anonymous, it's pretty much a surety that they are going to be caught, be able to be identified and then caught, so they don't do it.

These measures and over 60 others form the most comprehensive and world's best practice measures in dealing with alcohol related harm, developed after two years of research and consultation with over 12,000 Queenslanders.

 Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.14 pm), in reply: I acknowledge the contributions of all honourable members to the debate on this important issue of solving the problems of alcohol and drug related violence. As I said in the second reading debate, there is no silver bullet to solving the problems of alcohol or drug related violence. What is required is a comprehensive strategy that is developed in consultation with Queenslanders, which is exactly what we have been doing over the past 18 months. We did not have a knee-jerk reaction to this issue. We listened to the likes of the member for Gregory. I note that the member for Gregory is giving me some hand gestures, so I will get straight to his contribution. He has a particular issue in his electorate involving a pub that has changed its licence category. I am pleased to say that the bill that we are debating tonight empowers local governments to enable them to say no in relation to adult entertainment permits. This is about empowering local governments. I know the member for Gregory will be very happy and satisfied with that particular provision. I thank him for his representations on behalf of his community.

This debate about alcohol fuelled and drug related violence started many years ago. As I indicated in my second reading speech, the former government started the debate with the drink-safe precincts. The honourable Minister for Natural Resources and Mines gave a very good review of what happened on the former law, justice and safety committee that the member for Mermaid Beach, the minister and I were on. That committee came up with many recommendations dealing with these issues. We travelled the state. I note that, while the member for Hinchinbrook said that there is not much nightclub night-life in Hinchinbrook, certainly when we travelled to the electorate of Townsville and went on a study tour, the member for Hinchinbrook was well known amongst the locals in the establishments that we visited.

Following the review in 2009 and onwards, we had the drink-safe precinct trial. It is no secret to the members of this House that the Auditor-General produced a report that said that the drink-safe precincts cost too much money, were hard to implement, that the implementation did not go according to the plan of the Labor Party and that there were issues with it. However, this government indicated that we liked aspects of the drink-safe precinct trial. We continued the trial and extended it on numerous occasions to ensure that we could get to where we are tonight, that is, debating the Safe Night Out Strategy.

While on the subject of the drink-safe precincts, for the benefit of members of the House I table the final evaluation of the drink-safe precinct trial. Let us remember that this was a DPC commissioned trial from the former Labor government and continued by this government. I have the final evaluation of that trial, which makes it quite clear that the start-up of the drink-safe precincts was a bit rushed, there was limited accountability and it cost too much money. However, it also states that rates of assault and so forth are certainly on the decrease. For the benefit of members, I table the *Drink safe Precincts, Evaluation summary report* and the *DrinkSafe Precincts, Final evaluation: 24 months of the trial*. The final evaluation was to ensure openness and transparency with that process.

Tabled paper: Department of the Premier and Cabinet report titled 'Drink Safe Precincts, evaluation summary report' [5744].

Tabled paper: Department of the Premier and Cabinet report titled 'Drink Safe Precincts, final evaluation: 24 months of the trial' [5745].

In terms of the drink-safe precincts, over the two years of the trial in the Valley all types of offences were down by 11.5 per cent, good order offences were down by 25.5 per cent and offences against police were down by 29.5 per cent; in Surfers Paradise all types of offences were down by 22.6 per cent and assaults were down by 23.7 per cent; in Townsville all offences per weekend drinking night were down by 1.5 per cent, including particular good order offences which were down by 18.4 per cent. There has been a decrease in the rate of assault offences by 25.3 per cent, driven in part by the decrease in the percentage of grievous serious injury occurring during the weekend drinking nights. As I said, non-government groups helped over 16,000 patrons and handed out more than 300,000 free water bottles. Guess what? There was no trading hours issue with respect to the drink-safe precincts and we managed to achieve quite a substantial reduction in those particular crimes.

The Safe Night Out Strategy is the most comprehensive strategy developed by any government in Australia. It was not a knee-jerk reaction. It was done over an extensive period of time. It was released as a draft strategy, then as an updated strategy and then finally introduced as legislation into the parliament. We took Queenslanders with us on this journey.

We did not go out like the Labor Party and announce a policy which they copied off Newcastle and then when I raised in the media 'Had the member for Rockhampton actually visited Newcastle where they are basing their policy on?', he quickly jumped in a jet and flew down to Newcastle over the weekend to have a look. That is not how we draft policy. That is not how we have debate about these important issues.

If we want to tackle this issue in good faith for the men and women who have lost their lives because of alcohol and drug related violence then we have to treat this issue seriously. Announcing a policy, then forgetting that you have not actually been down to see the place where you have copied the policy from is a disgrace and does not show good faith to the people who have lost their lives because of this issue.

Then those opposite brought forward the star candidate for Stafford to solve all the problems of alcohol related violence. I have to say that I think the member for Stafford underperformed tonight, particularly given the opposition leader put him on a pedestal and led us to believe that he was about

to give a sermon from the mount in terms of alcohol and drug related violence. He could not last the distance. He only lasted seven minutes. I am not sure what he is going to do for the next seven, nine or 10 months before the next election.

Mr Nicholls: I don't think he likes it. I think he's bored. I don't think he likes it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Treasurer. I agree; I think he is already bored and does not like it. This was his big issue—he campaigned on this sole issue—and he could not even speak for 10 minutes. We afforded him the opportunity of 10 minutes. He could not speak for 10 minutes. I went to a conference last year where he spoke for half an hour on the issue. That was when he was a doctor. As a member of parliament representing his electorate he can only speak for seven minutes on such an important issue.

We tackle these issues seriously. We tackle these issues with Queensland's support. Over 13,000 Queenslanders had input into this Safe Night Out Strategy. It is about changing the culture. Everyone is responsible for this issue. It is about saying bad behaviour will not be tolerated. That is why we have implemented the penalty and offence reforms and provided for safe and supportive environments.

In her contribution the member for Gladstone raised the issue of privacy. I thank the member for Gladstone for her support for the bill. We recognise the need for privacy considerations in relation to the ID scanners. That will be addressed in a practical framework for the implementation of the networked ID scanner system. In order to achieve this, the government's intention in the bill was that both regulated premises and approved operators will be subject to the obligations and responsibilities already provided for under the Commonwealth's Privacy Act 1988. It will be the responsibility of regulated licensees and approved operators to ensure that their respective internal controls and procedures, including staff training, are consistent with the objectives of the Commonwealth Privacy Act. Of course, there are penalties and offences in there if they do not do that.

The bill provides that the commissioner may approve an application to operate an approved ID-scanning system if the commissioner is satisfied that the applicant is a suitable person. A person's suitability is not limited to the person's criminal history but may include the person's ability to operate an approved ID-scanning system in accordance with the objectives and intentions of the bill.

The technical specifications of the ID-scanning system and ID scanner were released for industry and public comment from 8 August until 25 August. The member for Nicklin raised why we are having this discussion now. It is to get a baseline. In order for the Queensland government statisticians to do the future work they have to start somewhere. The letters that the member for Nicklin received or the one that he talked about relate to achieving a baseline. We have to start somewhere before we can achieve the end results with statistics.

Once an ID has been scanned and details confirmed as accurate or amended, it is intended that only authorised persons be able to access scanned ID information. ID scanners and systems must incorporate and use a fire wall and must have intrusion detection software installed and configured to detect, block and lock excessive failed log-in attempts or any other potentially malicious activities.

Under the draft technical requirements, for the benefit of the member for Gladstone, it is intended that all patrons' records will be transmitted to the central system at least every 24 hours. All data from scanned patron IDs and associated photographs must be automatically deleted from both the local venue host and central system after 30 days, unless the data relates to a banning order or a licensee ban currently in force. I hope that addresses the issues that the member for Gladstone raised.

As I said, the Safe Night Out Strategy has been developed over a comprehensive period of time. I am a father of three children. As I have said, my daughter Taylor is 11—time flies when you are having fun. She is heading into year 7 next year, which is middle school. I am pleased that this Safe Night Out Strategy will teach her, as much as the school can—as parents we have a responsibility too—as she grows up the implications of drug and alcohol fuelled violence. This will be before they get into a situation where peer pressure is too much for them to handle. We will do what we can as parents. I am sure all Queenslanders will do that. We have to also make sure that the curriculum is there. That is why education is such a key.

As I said, this is the only plan in Australia to comprehensively deal with the issue. There is no one silver bullet. Trading hours is not the silver bullet to all these issues. The solution to the problems of alcohol and drug related violence is a comprehensive strategy—one that is developed with the

support and help of Queenslanders. I thank the over 13,000 Queenslanders who contributed to the Safe Night Out Strategy when we went out and consulted to develop the most comprehensive plan in Australia tackling this issue.

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

AYES, 68:

LNP, 63—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Young.

KAP, 1—Katter.

PUP, 1—Judge.

INDEPENDENTS, 3—Cunningham, Douglas, Wellington.

NOES, 9:

ALP, 9—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! I note the Attorney-General's amendment No. 1 proposes to amend clause 2, which relates to proposed new clauses which are outside of the long title. Therefore, consideration of clause 2 is postponed until after the clauses and amendments have been considered.

Clause 2 postponed.

Clauses 3 to 124—

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (10.33 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc and outside of the long title.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 11 (Conditions on release on bail))

Page 15, line 7, 'the'—

omit, insert—

a

3 Clause 9 (Replacement of s 182A (Parole eligibility date for prisoner serving term of imprisonment for drug trafficking offence))

Page 18, line 29, '302A'—

omit, insert—

314A

4 Clause 9 (Replacement of s 182A (Parole eligibility date for prisoner serving term of imprisonment for drug trafficking offence))

Page 19, line 8, '302A'—

omit, insert—

314A

5 Clause 13 (Amendment of s 300 (Unlawful homicide))

Page 20, lines 13 to 17—

omit, insert—

13 Amendment of s 72 (Affray)

Section 72—

insert—

(3A) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B also states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against this section.

6 Clause 14 (Insertion of new s 302A)

Page 20, lines 18 to 24—

*omit, insert—***14 Insertion of new ch 28A**

After section 314—

*insert—***Chapter 28A Unlawful striking causing death****314A Unlawful striking causing death**

- (1) A person who unlawfully strikes another person to the head or neck and causes the death of the other person is guilty of a crime.

7 Clause 14 (Insertion of new s 302A)

Page 21, after line 5—

insert—

- (3A) For subsection (1), the striking of another person is unlawful unless it is authorised or justified or excused by law.

8 Clause 14 (Insertion of new s 302A)

Page 21, line 8, 'was'—

omit, insert—

is

9 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 303 (Definition of manslaughter))

Page 22, lines 17 to 20—

*omit, insert—***15 Amendment of s 320 (Grievous bodily harm)**

Section 320—

insert—

- (3A) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B also states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against this section.

15A Amendment of s 323 (Wounding)

Section 323—

insert—

- (3) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against this section.

15B Amendment of s 335 (Common assault)

Section 335—

insert—

- (2) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against this section.

15C Amendment of s 339 (Assaults occasioning bodily harm)

Section 339—

insert—

- (4) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B also states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against this section.

10 Clause 16 (Amendment of s 340 (Serious assaults))

Page 22, line 22—

omit, insert—

- (1) Section 340—

insert—

- (1C) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B also states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against subsection (1)(b).

- (2) Section 340(2AA), penalty—

11 Clause 16 (Amendment of s 340 (Serious assaults))

Page 23, after line 7—

insert—

- (3) Section 340—

insert—

- (2B) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B also states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against subsection (2AA).

12 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 35A)

Page 24, lines 4 to 9—

omit, insert—

- 2 The *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*, chapter 18A applies the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995*, section 80 to allow evidentiary certificates about breath, saliva, blood or urine specimens taken from the person to be used in proceedings for the offence.

13 After clause 26

Page 31, before line 3—

*insert—***Part 6A Amendment of Evidence Act 1977****26A Act amended**This part amends the *Evidence Act 1977*.**26B Amendment of s 21AC (Definitions for div 4A)**Section 21AC, definition *offence involving violence*, first dot point, after 'chapter 28'—*insert—*

or 28A

Part 6B Amendment of Introduction Agents Act 2001**26C Act amended**This part amends the *Introduction Agents Act 2001*.**26D Amendment of sch 1 (Disqualifying offence provisions under the Criminal Code)**

Schedule 1, part 1—

insert—

5A Chapter 28A (Unlawful striking causing death)

14 Clause 28 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))

Page 31, after line 12—

*insert—****abatement notice*** means a notice made under section 187.**15 Clause 28 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))**

Page 32, after line 2—

*insert—****compliance order*** means an order made under section 46.**16 Clause 28 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))**

Page 33, after line 4—

insert—(a) ***system failure***, for regulated premises, for part 6AA, see section 173EE.(b) ***unreasonable noise***, in relation to licensed premises, means noise that—

- (a) exceeds the limits (if any) prescribed by regulation; or
- (b) contravenes a compliance order that applies to the premises; or
- (c) contravenes a condition that applies to the licence or permit for the premises.

17 After clause 29

Page 33, after line 19—

*insert—***29A Amendment of s 9 (Ordinary trading hours)**

- (1) Section 9(1B) and (1C), 'and (3)'—
omit, insert—

to (3A)

- (2) Section 9(3)(a)(ii), after 'paragraph (b)'—
insert—

and subsection (3A)

- (3) Section 9—
insert—

- (3A) Subject to subsection (2), if a licence condition of a commercial special facility licence relating to an airport or casino specifies the trading hours for the licensed premises on Anzac Day, the ordinary trading hours on Anzac day are the hours specified in the condition.

- (4) Section 9(5), after 'relates'—
insert—
or an airport or casino to which subsection (5A) applies
- (5) Section 9—
insert—
- (5A) Subject to subsection (2), if a licence condition of a commercial special facility licence relating to an airport or casino specifies the trading hours for the licensed premises on Good Friday or Christmas Day, the ordinary trading hours on that day are the hours specified in the condition.

18 Clause 32 (Amendment of s 21 (Jurisdiction and powers of tribunal))

Page 34, line 27, '(a) to (t)'—

omit, insert—

- (a) to (x)

19 After clause 33

Page 35, after line 14—

insert—

33A Amendment of s 46 (Orders for licensed premises etc.)

- (1) Section 46, heading, 'Orders'—
omit, insert—

Compliance orders

- (2) Section 46(1)(c)—
omit, insert—
 - (c) stopping or preventing unreasonable noise coming from the premises; or
- (3) Section 46(2) and (3)—
omit, insert—
- (2) The order must state—
 - (a) the action that is required to be taken; and
 - (b) the grounds for requiring the action to be taken; and
 - (c) an outline of the facts and circumstances that form the basis for the grounds; and
 - (d) for each action that is required to be taken—the time, of up to 6 months, within which the person to whom the order is issued must take the action; and
 - (e) the time, of up to 6 months, that the order has effect for; and
 - (f) that, if the person to whom the order is issued fails to comply with the order, the commissioner may start proceedings in the Magistrates Court in relation to the failure, without further notice to the person.
- (3) The commissioner may, by written notice, extend a time under subsection (2)(d) or (e) for 1 or more periods of up to 6 months to enable the person to whom the order is issued to comply with the order.
- (4) The person to whom the order is issued must comply with the order.

Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.

- (5) The issuing of an order under this section does not stop any other action being taken under this Act in relation to the matter that is the subject of the order, including, for example—
 - (a) an abatement notice being issued; or
 - (b) the licence or permit for the premises being varied; or
 - (c) disciplinary action being taken in relation to the licence; or
 - (d) proceedings being started for an offence against this Act.
- (6) No compensation is payable by the State to any person because of an order made under this section, despite any other Act or law.
- (7) In this section—

premises includes an area containing plant or equipment that is not part of the premises, but is used for the benefit of the premises.

33B Insertion of new s 46A

After section 46—

insert—

46A Compliance orders for unreasonable noise

- (1) The commissioner may issue a compliance order, in accordance with section 46, in relation to unreasonable noise coming from premises if an abatement notice has been issued in the last 1 year in relation to the premises.

- (2) The commissioner must consider at least the following before making the order—
- (a) the order of occupancy between—
 - (i) the licensee or permittee; and
 - (ii) any person who has complained about the noise to the commissioner;
 - (b) any changes, including structural changes, made over time to—
 - (i) the premises; or
 - (ii) the premises occupied by any person who has complained about the noise to the commissioner;
 - (c) any changes made over time in the activities conducted on the premises;
 - (d) for each abatement notice issued for the premises—
 - (i) the reason for issuing the notice; and
 - (ii) whether the notice was complied with.
- (3) The commissioner, as part of the action required to be taken under the order, may require the person to stop all specified noise coming from the premises until the person demonstrates to the commissioner that the noise can be permanently limited to reasonable noise.
- Example of specified noise—*
- noise of a specified kind or level
 - noise at a certain time of the day
 - noise from a specified location
- (4) Also, the order may require the person to give the commissioner an acoustic report that complies with the commissioner's guideline (if any) about acoustic reports.
- (5) After considering the acoustic report, the commissioner may amend the order to require the person to take action to improve the acoustics of the premises in order to stop unreasonable noise coming from the premises.
- (6) Also, the commissioner may amend the order if—
- (a) the commissioner is satisfied the person has taken, or is in the process of taking, the action required under the order to stop unreasonable noise coming from the premises; or
 - (b) the licence or permit for the premises is varied in a way that the commissioner considers is reasonably likely to stop unreasonable noise coming from the premises.
- (7) In this section—
- acoustic report** means a current report from a qualified acoustic engineer that identifies—
- (a) how much noise can come from the premises before the noise is unreasonable; and
 - (b) ways to improve the acoustics of the premises to stop unreasonable noise coming from the premises.

20 After clause 40

Page 38, after line 28—

insert—

40A Amendment of s 58A (Licences subject to conditions imposed under regulation)

- (1) Section 58A(3), 'the condition applies to all licences'—
omit, insert—
or all licences in a particular area, the condition applies to all the licences or all the licences in the area
- (2) Section 58A(4), 'the condition applies to all licences of that class'—
omit, insert—
or a particular class of licence in a particular area, the condition applies to all the licences of that class or all the licences of that class in the area
- (3) Section 58A—
insert—
- (6) However, if the commissioner imposes a condition on a licence under section 107C or varies a licence under section 111 by amending or revoking a condition of the licence, the condition or variation prevails over any condition prescribed by regulation to the extent of any inconsistency.

40B Amendment of s 64 (Authority of commercial special facility licence)

Section 64(1)(a), 'the times stated in the licence'—

omit, insert—

ordinary trading hours or approved extended trading hours

21 After clause 42

Page 40, after line 9—

*insert—***42A Amendment of s 67D (Restriction on grant of subsidiary on-premises licence)**

Section 67D—

insert—

- (2) Also, the commissioner must not grant a subsidiary on-premises licence to a person if the commissioner is satisfied that the sale of liquor proposed to be carried on under the authority of the licence would more appropriately be carried on under the authority of a licence of another kind.

22 Clause 43 (Insertion of new pt 4, div 6A)

Page 41, line 2, after 'section 67A(3)'—

insert—

- (b) to (d)

23 Clause 43 (Insertion of new pt 4, div 6A)

Page 41, lines 30 to 32, and page 42, lines 1 and 2—

omit, insert—

- (1) A nightclub licence authorises the licensee to sell liquor on the licensed premises during ordinary trading hours or approved extended trading hours—
 (a) for consumption on the premises; and
 (b) if stated in the licence—for consumption off the licensed premises, subject to section 83D.

24 After clause 46

Page 43, after line 29—

*insert—***46A Amendment of s 97 (When all or part of licensed premises must be classified as high risk)**

Section 97(2), note, from 'or how the commissioner'—

omit, insert—

, how the commissioner administers this Act or matters that may help persons comply with this Act.

25 Clause 50 (Amendment of s 107C (Commissioner may impose conditions on licences and permits))

Page 45, lines 16 and 17—

omit, insert—

- (3) Without limiting subsection (1), a condition of a commercial special facility licence relating to an airport or casino may, and always could, specify the trading hours for the licensed premises on Anzac Day, Good Friday or Christmas Day.
 (4) A condition may provide for matters mentioned in section 173EG.

26 Clause 66 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1AA)

Page 56, lines 2 to 16—

omit, insert—

- (1) A licensee or permittee must, in the conduct of business on the relevant premises, engage in practices and promotions that encourage the responsible consumption of liquor—
 (a) generally; and
Examples—
 - having non-alcoholic and low alcohol beverages available
 - supplying liquor in standardised quantities that can be recognised by patrons
 - serving patrons half-measures of spirits on request
 (b) prescribed by regulation for this section.

27 Clause 66 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1AA)

Page 56, lines 32 and 33, and page 57, lines 1 to 4—

*omit.***28 Clause 66 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1AA)**

Page 59, lines 22 to 25—

omit, insert—

- (4) A licensee or permittee must not advertise or allow anyone to advertise anything that is, or would be if it were engaged in, an unacceptable practice or promotion under section 142ZZ.

29 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 65, lines 9 to 11—

*omit, insert—****approved evaluator*** means—

- (a) a licensed testing facility operator under the *Gaming Machine Act 1991*; or
- (b) an approved evaluator under a gaming Act within the meaning of the *Gaming Machine Act 1991*; or
- (c) an entity prescribed by regulation as an approved evaluator for this part.

30 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 66, lines 11 and 12, ‘optically scanning’—

omit, insert—

interpreting

31 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 67, after line 5—

*insert—****system failure***, for regulated premises, means—

- (a) a fault in, damage to, or discontinuation or ending of the approval of, the approved ID scanner ordinarily used at the regulated premises; or
- (b) a failure, or discontinuation or ending of the approval, of the approved ID scanning system to which the approved ID scanner at the regulated premises is linked.

32 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 67, after line 23—

insert—

- (3) This division does not apply to licensed premises if the licensee holds an extended hours permit mentioned in section 103I(1) for the premises.

33 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 67, line 27, after ‘part’—

insert—

4 or

34 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 68, after line 12—

insert—

- (6) To remove any doubt, it is declared that the reference in subsection (5) to regulated premises includes regulated premises to which this division applies under section 173EF(1).

35 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 68, line 28—

omit, insert—

- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply during regulated hours starting on a day if the licensee is not authorised to sell or supply liquor on the licensed premises after midnight of that day.
- (3) Despite subsection (2), a licence condition for regulated premises may require the licensee for the premises to ensure that, during the regulated hours for the premises, no person is allowed to enter the premises as a patron unless—
 - (a) the person produces a photo ID; and
 - (b) a staff member of the licensed premises scans the photo ID using an approved ID scanner linked to an approved ID scanning system; and
 - (c) the scan of the photo ID indicates the person is not subject to a banning order for the premises.
- (4) A reference in subsection (1)(b) or (3)(b) to scanning a

36 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 68, line 31, ‘information’—

omit, insert—

permitted information

37 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 69, lines 5 and 6—

omit, insert—

- (5) If, during the regulated hours for the premises, the licensee can not comply with subsection (1) or (3)

38 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 69, line 8, after 'subsection (1)'—

insert—

or (3)

39 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 69, lines 10 and 11, 'manually checking the photo ID against a list'—

omit, insert—

checking the photo ID against a current list

40 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 69, line 25—

omit, insert—

- (6) For subsection (5)(a), a current list of persons is a current list within the meaning of section 173EJB.
- (7) This section does not apply to any of the following persons entering the premises—
 - (a) a resident, whether temporary or permanent, of the regulated premises;
 - (b) an exempt minor;
 - (c) a person whose sole purpose for entering the premises is to attend a function held on the premises;
 - (d) for premises to which any of the following licences relates—a person whose sole purpose for entering the premises is to eat a meal in a part of the premises ordinarily set aside for dining, whether or not liquor is sold and supplied to the person for consumption by the person in association with the eating of the meal—
 - (i) a commercial hotel licence;
 - (ii) a subsidiary on-premises licence if the principal activity of a business conducted under the licence is the provision of accommodation;
 - (iii) a community club licence.
- (8) Also, this section does not apply to a person entering the premises—
 - (a) if the licence for the premises is subject to a condition declaring the premises not to be regulated premises for this division; or
 - (b) to access a part of the premises if the licence for the premises is subject to a condition declaring the part not to be regulated premises for this division.
- (9) In this section—
enter, premises, includes re-enter the premises.
permitted information does not include personal information about a person other than the information mentioned in section 173EJ(1)(a), (c) or (d) for the person.

41 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 69, line 34, '8p.m.'—

omit, insert—

10p.m.

42 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 70, lines 4 to 10—

omit, insert—**173EHA Delayed application of s 173EH to particular regulated premises**

- (1) This section applies to licensed premises if the licence for the premises becomes subject to a condition declaring the premises to be regulated premises for this part.
- (2) Section 173EH does not apply to the licensee of the regulated premises until—
 - (a) 3 months after the day the premises become subject to the condition; or
 - (b) if the commissioner gives written approval for a period longer than 3 months after the day the premises become subject to the condition—the end of the longer period.

43 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 71, after line 15—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

44 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 71, after line 18—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

45 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 71, line 21, after 'ban'—

insert—

in force for the person

46 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 71, line 24, 'immediately'—

omit, insert—

as soon as reasonably practicable

47 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 71, after line 32—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

48 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 72, line 1, 'immediately'—

omit, insert—

as soon as reasonably practicable

49 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 72, after line 9—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

50 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 72, line 10, 'immediately'—

omit, insert—

as soon as reasonably practicable

51 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 72, after line 16—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

52 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 72, after line 21—

insert—**173EJA Obligation to notify of system failure**

If an approved operator for an approved ID scanning system becomes aware that there is a system

failure for regulated premises, the approved operator must give written notice of the system failure to

the commissioner and the police commissioner within 48 hours after becoming aware of the system

failure.

Maximum penalty—10 penalty units.

173EJB Other obligation if system failure

(1) This section applies if an approved operator for an approved ID scanning system becomes aware that there is a system failure for regulated premises.

(2) The approved operator must ensure the licensee for the regulated premises has immediate access to a current list of persons who are subject to a banning order for the premises.

Maximum penalty—10 penalty units.

(3) For subsection (2), a list of persons remains current for 7 days after it is prepared.

53 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 72, after line 28—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

54 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 73, after line 22—

insert—

Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.

55 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 74, after line 3—

*insert—***173EMA Information sharing**

- (1) This section applies to an approved operator for an approved ID scanning system to which an approved ID scanner in regulated premises is linked.
- (2) To remove any doubt, it is declared that—
 - (a) the approved operator may give the following persons information about each person subject to a banning order for the regulated premises, or licensee ban imposed by the licensee for the premises—
 - (i) the police commissioner;
 - (ii) the commissioner;
 - (iii) the licensee for any regulated premises; and
 - (b) a court or the police commissioner may give an approved operator details of a banning order for regulated premises that is in force for a person.

56 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 76, after line 17—

*insert—***173EOA Direction about ID scanning system**

- (1) This section applies if the commissioner is satisfied an approved ID scanning system no longer meets the requirements under section 173EO(7).
- (2) The commissioner may, by written notice given to a responsible person for the ID scanning system, direct the responsible person to alter, adjust, maintain or repair the ID scanning system so that it meets the requirements under section 173EO(7).
- (3) The responsible person for the ID scanning system must comply with the direction.
Maximum penalty—25 penalty units.
- (4) The commissioner must give a copy of the notice to—
 - (a) if the responsible person is the person to whom the approval for the ID scanning system was given—the approved operator of the ID scanning system; and
 - (b) if the responsible person is the approved operator of the ID scanning system—the person to whom the approval for the ID scanning system was given; and
 - (c) the licensee for regulated premises who uses, in the premises, an approved ID scanner linked to the ID scanning system.
- (5) In this section—
responsible person, for an ID scanning system, means—
 - (a) the person to whom the approval for the ID scanning system was given; or
 - (b) the approved operator of the ID scanning system.

57 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 77, lines 20 and 21—

omit, insert—

day stated in the information notice.

- (6) The stated day must be at least 14 days after the information notice is given.

58 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 77, line 22, '(6)'—

omit, insert—

- (7)

59 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 77, line 26, '(7)'—

omit, insert—

- (8)

60 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 77, after line 28—

*insert—***173EPA Immediate suspension of approvals relating to ID scanners or ID scanning systems**

- (1) This section applies if the commissioner is satisfied—
 - (a) for an approval given under section 173EN or 173EO, a circumstance in section 173EP(1)(a) or (b) exists; and

- (b) harm may be caused to members of the public if urgent action to suspend the approval is not taken.
- (2) The commissioner may immediately suspend the approval by written notice to the person to whom the approval was given.
- (3) The commissioner must, when giving written notice under subsection (2), give the person a notice under section 173EP(2).
- (4) If the commissioner decides to suspend or revoke the approval, section 173EP(4) to (7) applies for the suspension or revocation.
- (5) If the commissioner decides not to revoke the approval, the commissioner must give the person notice of the decision.
- (6) The approval is suspended under this section until the earlier of the following happens—
 - (a) the commissioner gives the person a notice of the commissioner's decision under subsection (5) or section 173EP(4);
 - (b) the end of 60 days after the notice under subsection (2) was given to the person.

61 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 78, after line 31—

insert—

Examples of matters to which the commissioner may have regard—

- whether the applicant has the skill, knowledge and experience required for operating an approved ID scanning system
- whether the applicant demonstrates the ability to comply with the applicant's statutory obligations relating to privacy

62 Clause 74 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Pages 79, lines 21 to 34 and page 80, lines 1 to 26—

omit, insert—

173ER Suspension or revocation of approval to operate ID scanning system

- (1) The commissioner may suspend or revoke an approval to operate an ID scanning system if—
 - (a) the commissioner is satisfied the approved operator has contravened a provision of division 3 or a condition of the approval; or
 - (b) the commissioner is satisfied the approved operator has operated an ID scanning system to which an approved ID scanner in regulated premises is linked, and the ID scanning system has not been approved; or
 - (c) the commissioner is no longer satisfied about the matters stated in section 173EQ(4).
- (2) For deciding about a matter stated in section 173EQ(4), the commissioner may obtain a report from the police commissioner about the criminal history of the approved operator or, for an approved operator that is a corporation, an executive officer of the approved operator.
- (3) Before suspending or revoking an approval, the commissioner must give the approved operator a notice (**a show cause notice**) stating—
 - (a) that the commissioner proposes to suspend or revoke the approval; and
 - (b) for a proposed suspension—the proposed period of suspension; and
 - (c) the reasons for the proposed suspension or revocation; and
 - (d) that the approved operator may, within a stated time of at least 30 days, give the commissioner a written response stating why the approved operator considers the approval should not be suspended or revoked.
- (4) After considering any response from the approved operator within the time stated in the show cause notice, the commissioner may suspend or revoke the approval.
- (5) The commissioner must give the approved operator an information notice for the decision to suspend or revoke the approval.
- (6) The suspension or revocation takes effect on the day stated in the information notice.
- (7) The stated day must be at least 14 days after the information notice is given.
- (8) If the commissioner decides not to suspend or revoke the approval, the commissioner must give the approved operator notice of the decision.

173ES Immediate suspension of approval to operate ID scanning system

- (1) This section applies if, for an approval to operate an ID scanning system—
 - (a) any of the following apply—
 - (i) the commissioner is satisfied the approved operator has contravened a provision of division 3 or a condition of the approval;

- (ii) the commissioner is satisfied the approved operator has operated an ID scanning system to which an approved ID scanner in regulated premises is linked, and the ID scanning system has not been approved;
- (iii) the commissioner is no longer satisfied about the matters stated in section 173EQ(4); and
- (b) harm may be caused to members of the public if urgent action to suspend the approval is not taken.
- (2) Section 173ER(2) applies for deciding about a matter stated in section 173EQ(4).
- (3) The commissioner may immediately suspend the approval by written notice to the approved operator.
- (4) The commissioner must, when giving written notice under subsection (3), give the approved operator a notice under section 173ER(3).
- (5) If the commissioner decides to suspend or revoke the approval, section 173ER(5) to (7) applies for the suspension or revocation.
- (6) If the commissioner decides not to revoke the approval, the commissioner must give the approved operator notice of the decision.
- (7) The approval is suspended under this section until the earlier of the following happens—
 - (a) the commissioner gives the approved operator a notice of the commissioner's decision under subsection (6) or section 173ER(5);
 - (b) the end of 60 days after the notice under subsection (3) was given to the person.

173ET Commissioner takes over operation of approved ID scanning system in particular circumstances

- (1) This section applies if there is no longer an approved operator for an approved ID scanning system to which an approved ID scanner in regulated premises is linked because the approved operator's approval to operate an approved ID scanning system is suspended or revoked under section 173ER or 173ES.
- (2) The commissioner may take over the operation of the approved ID scanning system, or operate another approved ID scanning system to which an approved ID scanner in the regulated premises is linked, until another person holding an approval under section 173EQ becomes an approved operator for any approved ID scanning system to which an approved ID scanner in the regulated premises is linked.

63 After clause 79

Page 93, after line 9—

insert—

79A Amendment of s 187 (Abatement of nuisance or dangerous activity)

- (1) Section 187(1)(a)—
omit, insert—
 - (a) noise coming from licensed premises, or a utility area for licensed premises, is unreasonable noise; or
- (2) Section 187(2), after 'written notice'—
insert—
 - (an **abatement notice**)
- (3) Section 187(2)(a), 'the noise stop or'—
omit, insert—
 - if subsection (1)(a) applies—
- (3A) Section 187(2)(b), before 'the premises'—
insert—
 - if subsection (1)(b) applies—
- (4) Section 187(2A), 'a written notice under subsection (2)'—
omit, insert—
 - an abatement notice
- (5) Section 187—
insert—
 - (2B) An abatement notice may state specific action that must be taken by the person to whom the notice is given.
 - (2C) An abatement notice must state—
 - (a) for each action that is required to be taken—the time, of up to 3 months, within which the person to whom the notice is issued must take the action; and
 - (b) the time, of up to 3 months, that the notice has effect for.

- (2D) The commissioner may, by written notice, extend a time under subsection (2C)(a) or (b) for 1 or more periods of up to 3 months to enable the person to whom the notice is given to comply with the notice.
- (2E) The issuing of an abatement notice does not stop any other action being taken under this Act in relation to the matter that is the subject of the notice, including, for example—
 - (a) a compliance order being issued; or
 - (b) the licence or permit for the licensed premises being varied; or
 - (c) disciplinary action being taken in relation to the licence; or
 - (d) proceedings being started for an offence against this Act.
- (6) Section 187(3), after 'If the'—
insert—
abatement
- (7) Section 187(4)—
omit, insert—
(4) The person to whom the abatement notice is issued must comply with the notice.
Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.
- (8) Section 187(5), definition *unreasonable noise*—
omit.

64 Clause 81 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 16)

Page 94, after line 30—

insert—

321A Transitional provision for applications for subsidiary on-premises licence (entertainment)

- (1) This section applies to an application for a subsidiary on-premises licence made before the commencement if—
 - (a) the principal activity of a business to be conducted under the licence is the provision of entertainment; and
 - (b) on the commencement, the application had not been decided or withdrawn.
- (2) The commissioner must deal with and decide, or continue to deal with and decide, the application under the unamended Act.
- (3) However, if the commissioner decides to grant the licence, the commissioner must grant the licence as a nightclub licence.
- (4) In this section—
unamended Act means this Act as in force from time to time before the amending Act was enacted.

65 Clause 81 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 16)

Page 95, lines 7 to 14—

omit, insert—

- (2) From the commencement, the licence continues in force under this Act as a nightclub licence held by the licensee on the same terms as the licensee held the licence.
- (3) If, immediately before the commencement, the licence was subject to a condition, the nightclub licence is taken to be subject to the condition.

66 Clause 81 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 16)

Page 95, lines 22 to 25—

omit, insert—

- (2) Subject to this Act, the approval continues in force.
- (3) Subsection (4) applies if, while the approval is in force and before the commencement, the licensee applies for—
 - (a) an alternative extended trading licence; and
 - (b) an extended trading hours approval for the licence that would authorise the sale of liquor on the licensed premises after 1a.m.
- (4) From the earlier of the following days, the approval does not authorise trading for a period after 1a.m.—
 - (a) the day after the applicant is given notice of the decision made about the application;
 - (b) 1 January 2016.
- (5) Subsection (6) applies if, on the commencement, the approval is in force and the licensee has not applied for an alternative extended trading licence.

- (6) From the commencement, the approval does not authorise trading for a period after 1a.m.
- (7) In this section—
alternative extended trading licence means a licence of a type—
 - (a) other than a subsidiary on-premises licence (meals); and
 - (b) for which an extended trading hours approval may be granted under part 4, division 7 that would extend trading hours on a regular basis to include trading for a period after 1a.m.

67 Clause 81 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 16)

Page 96, after line 8—

insert—

325 Cancellation, suspension or variation of permits

- (1) This section applies if circumstances existed before the commencement that could have formed the basis for the commissioner to be satisfied that former section 134(1) applied.
- (2) Part 5, division 3, subdivision 2 applies as if the circumstances existed immediately after the commencement to enable the commissioner—
 - (a) to impose a new condition, amend a condition or revoke a condition because of circumstances mentioned in section 134(1)(a); or
 - (b) to cancel, suspend or vary a permit because of circumstances mentioned in former section 134(1)(b).
- (3) In this section—

former, in relation to a provision, means the provision as in force immediately before the repeal or amendment of the provision under the amending Act.

326 Grounds for disciplinary action

- (1) This section applies if circumstances existed before the commencement that could have formed the basis for the commissioner to consider that former section 136(1)(h) applied.
- (2) Part 5, division 3, subdivision 3 applies as if the circumstances existed immediately after the commencement to enable the commissioner to take disciplinary action because of the circumstances.
- (3) In this section—
former, in relation to a provision, means the provision as in force immediately before the repeal or amendment of the provision under the amending Act.

327 Authority for post-midnight trading for particular licences

- (1) This section applies to a commercial special facility licence that—
 - (a) is in force on the commencement; and
 - (b) is not endorsed with an extended trading hours approval granted under part 4, division 7; and
 - (c) purportedly authorises the sale of liquor on the licensed premises, on a day other than Anzac Day, Good Friday or Christmas Day, during a time starting at or after 12a.m. and ending at or before 5a.m. (the ***authorised post-midnight trading hours***).
- (2) The licence is taken to be endorsed with an extended trading hours approval (the ***deemed approval***) for trading during the authorised post-midnight trading hours.
- (3) To remove any doubt, it is declared that this Act, including a provision about the payment of licence fees, applies as if the deemed approval had been granted under part 4, division 7.
- (4) Despite subsection (2), an application for an extended trading hours approval, for trading during all or part of the authorised post-midnight trading hours, may be made and granted under part 4, division 7.
- (5) The deemed approval continues in force until—
 - (a) an extended trading hours approval for trading during all or part of the authorised post-midnight trading hours is granted under part 4, division 7; or
 - (b) the deemed approval is cancelled or otherwise ends under this Act.

328 Declaration and validation relating to particular licences

- (1) This section applies to a commercial special facility licence in relation to the period (the ***relevant period***)—
 - (a) starting on or after 1 January 2009 and ending on or before the commencement; and
 - (b) during which the licence—
 - (i) was not endorsed with an extended trading hours approval granted under part 4, division 7; and

- (ii) purportedly authorised the sale of liquor on the licensed premises, on a day other than Anzac Day, Good Friday or Christmas Day, during a time starting at or after 12a.m. and ending at or before 5a.m. (the **authorised post-midnight trading hours**).
- (2) During the relevant period—
 - (a) section 64, as amended by the amending Act, is taken to have applied to the licence; and
 - (b) the licence is taken to have been endorsed with an extended trading hours approval for trading during the authorised post-midnight trading hours for the licence.
- (3) Without limiting subsection (2)—
 - (a) licence fees for the licence relating to any part of the relevant period are payable, and are taken to have been payable during the relevant period, as if an extended trading hours approval granted under part 4, division 7 were in force for the authorised post-midnight trading hours; and
 - (b) anything done during or after the relevant period in relation to a licence fee is, and is taken to have been during the relevant period, as valid as it would have been if an extended trading hours approval granted under part 4, division 7 were in force for the authorised post-midnight trading hours.

Examples of things that may be done in relation to a licence fee—

 - assessment of a licence fee payable
 - demand for payment of a licence fee
 - payment of a licence fee
- (4) Subsections (2) and (3)—
 - (a) do not apply for the purpose of a legal proceeding decided before the commencement; but
 - (b) otherwise apply for all purposes, including—
 - (i) a legal proceeding started, but not decided, before the commencement; and
 - (ii) a legal proceeding started after the commencement.
- (5) Subsection (2)(a) does not apply in relation to trading on Anzac Day, Good Friday or Christmas Day during the relevant period.
- (6) No compensation is payable by the State to any person because of the operation of this section.

329 Eligible entity for sale of liquor at a fundraising event

- (1) This section applies—
 - (a) if an entity, or an executive officer of the entity, is a licensee or permittee; and
 - (b) for the purpose of determining, after the repeal of section 148A, whether the entity is an eligible entity for the sale of liquor at a fundraising event under section 13(3).
- (2) The entity is not an eligible entity for the sale of liquor at the event if the entity or executive officer has been convicted of an offence under repealed section 148A(2) or (4) within the 5 years immediately before the event.

68 After clause 91

Page 99, after line 22—

insert—

91A Amendment of s 108 (Termination of community service order)

Section 108(c), after 'section 120(1)'—

insert—

or 120A

69 Clause 92 (Insertion of new pt 5, div 2, sdiv 2)

Page 100, line 27 to page 101, line 5—

omit, insert—

- (1) It is a circumstance of aggravation for a prescribed offence that the offender committed the offence in a public place while the offender was adversely affected by an intoxicating substance.
- (2) If a court convicts an offender of a prescribed offence with the circumstance of aggravation mentioned in subsection (1), the court must make a community service order for the offender whether or not the court also makes another order under this or another Act.
- (2A) However, subsection (2) does not apply if the court is satisfied that, because of any physical, intellectual or psychiatric disability of the offender, the offender is not capable of complying with a community service order.

70 After clause 92

Page 102, after line 17—

*insert—***92A Amendment of s 110A (Making of an order)**

Section 110A(2) and (3)—

omit, insert—

- (2) The court must make a graffiti removal order for the offender whether or not it records a conviction and whether or not it also makes another order under this or another Act.
- (3) However, subsection (2) does not apply if the court is satisfied that, because of any physical, intellectual or psychiatric disability of the offender, the offender is not capable of complying with a graffiti removal order.

71 Clause 98 (Amendment of s 160A (Application of ss 160B–160D))

Page 104, lines 18 and 19—

omit, insert—

- Criminal Code, sections 305(2) and (4) and 314A(5) and (6)

72 Clause 99 (Amendment of s 171 (Review—periodic))

Page 104, line 26, '302A'—

omit, insert—

314A

73 Clause 101 (Amendment of sch 2 (Qualifying offences))

Page 106, text after line 1, '302A'—

omit, insert—

314A

74 Clause 107 (Amendment of s 46 (When power applies to behaviour))

Page 107, line 25, 'subsections'—

omit, insert—

subsection

75 Clause 108 (Amendment of s 47 (When power applies to a person's presence))

Page 108, line 13, 'subsections'—

omit, insert—

subsection

76 Clause 113 (Insertion of new ch 14, pt 5, div 2)

Page 117, line 17, 'or'—

*omit.***77 Clause 113 (Insertion of new ch 14, pt 5, div 2)**

Page 118, lines 1 to 3—

omit, insert—

- (3) However, the person is liable to pay the cost recovery charge only if the manager of the centre gives the person a notice for the charge, in the approved form, before the person is released from the centre.

78 Clause 113 (Insertion of new ch 14, pt 5, div 2)

Page 118, after line 8—

insert—

- (5) The manager of the centre may decide not to give the person a notice for the charge if the manager reasonably suspects the commissioner will not reasonably be able to recover the charge from the person.

Example—

A tourist from another country is admitted to a sober safe centre but proposes to leave Australia the next day.

79 Clause 113 (Insertion of new ch 14, pt 5, div 2)

Page 118, after line 8—

*insert—***390MA Waiver of charge**

- (1) A person who has been given a notice for a cost recovery charge under section 390M(3) may apply to the commissioner to waive the charge on the ground that payment of the charge would cause the person financial hardship.

- (2) The application must—
 - (a) be in the approved form; and
 - (b) attach sufficient information to enable the commissioner to decide the application; and
 - (c) be made within 14 days after the person receives the notice.
- (3) The commissioner must—
 - (a) decide whether or not to waive the cost recovery charge within 7 days after receiving the application; and
 - (b) as soon as practicable after making the decision, give the applicant a written notice about the commissioner's decision for the application.

80 Clause 113 (Insertion of new ch 14, pt 5, div 2)

Page 118, after line 27—

insert—

- (4) Despite subsections (2) and (3) and the *State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999*, section 119, the registrar must not issue an arrest and imprisonment warrant for a person for an unpaid amount of a cost recovery charge.

81 Clause 117 (Insertion of new ch 18A)

Page 121, lines 15 and 16, 'and'—

omit.

82 Clause 117 (Insertion of new ch 18A)

Page 122, line 20, 's'—

omit, insert—

section

83 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 130, line 22, 'for'—

omit, insert—

of

84 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 136, line 18, 'notice'—

omit, insert—

commissioner's decision

85 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 137, lines 1 to 3—

omit, insert—

Part 5B Photographing persons and distributing orders and images

86 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 137, lines 7 to 10—

omit, insert—

approved ID scanning system see the *Liquor Act 1992*, section 173EE.

approved operator see the *Liquor Act 1992*, section 173EE.

87 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 137, line 15, after '11(3);'—

insert—

or

88 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 138, lines 4 and 5—

omit, insert—

persons and distribute orders and images

89 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 138, line 13—

omit, insert—

section 11(3), if—

- (i) the person was granted bail by a police officer at a place mentioned in section 11(4AA)(a) of that Act; or
- (ii) a condition was imposed on the person by the court under section 11(4AA)(b) of that Act;

90 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 139, line 5, after 'made'—

insert—

under the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, part 3B

91 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 139, line 7, after 'order'—

insert—

or police banning notice

92 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 139, after line 33—

insert—

(3A) Also, a police officer may distribute a police banning notice that does not have an image attached to it in the same way as an imaged order may be distributed under this section.

Notes—

1 The *Bail Act 1980*, section 34F provides for the distribution of information about a special condition made under section 11(3) of that Act in circumstances where the condition does not have an image attached to it.

2 The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 43N provides for the distribution of a banning order made under that Act in circumstances where the order does not have an image attached to it.

93 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 141, line 2, after 'order'—

insert—

or police banning notice

94 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 141, line 5, '602T'—

omit, insert—

602U

95 Clause 118 (Insertion of new ch 19, pts 5A and 5B)

Page 141, after line 33—

insert—

(4) In this section—

imaged order includes a police banning notice that does not have an image attached to it.

96 Clause 120 (Amendment of s 790 (Offence to assault or obstruct police officer))

Page 142, line 7—

omit, insert—

(1) Section 790(1), penalty—

97 Clause 120 (Amendment of s 790 (Offence to assault or obstruct police officer))

Page 142, after line 15—

insert—

(2) Section 790—

insert—

(2A) The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 108B also states a circumstance of aggravation for an offence against this section.

98 Clause 122 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))

Page 143, lines 11 to 14—

omit, insert—

approved ID scanning system, for chapter 19, part 5B, see section 602R.

approved operator, for chapter 19, part 5B, see section 602R.

99 After clause 122

Page 145, after line 19—

insert—

Part 9A Amendment of Security Providers Act 1993

122A Act amended

This part amends the *Security Providers Act 1993*.

122B Amendment of sch 1 (Disqualifying offence provisions under the Criminal Code)

Schedule 1, part 1—

insert—

5A chapter 28A (Unlawful striking causing death)

Part 9B Amendment of State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014**122C Regulation amended**This part amends the *State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014*.**122D Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws)**(1) Schedule 1, entry for the *Liquor Act 1992*, entries for sections 165(2), 165(4) and 165A(2), column 3, '4'—*omit, insert—*

5

(2) Schedule 1, entry for the *Liquor Act 1992*—*insert—*

s 165A(4)	(other than an offence that constitutes an assault on an authorised person)	5
-----------	---	---

(3)	Schedule 1, entry for the <i>Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000</i> , entries for sections 790(1) and 791(2)—
-----	--

omit, insert—

s 790(1)	in the circumstances in paragraph (a) of the penalty (other than an offence that constitutes an assault on a police officer)	6
----------	--	---

s 790(1)	in the circumstances in paragraph (b) of the penalty (other than an offence that constitutes an assault on a police officer)	3
----------	--	---

s 791(2)	in the circumstances in paragraph (a) of the penalty	6
----------	--	---

s 791(2)	for contravention of a requirement under section 40(1) to state the alleged offender's name or address as required. .	1
----------	---	---

s 791(2)	for contravention of a requirement under section 58(2) to produce a driver licence for inspection.	2
----------	---	---

s 791(2)	in other circumstances in paragraph (b) of the penalty.	4
----------	--	---

s 791(2)	in the circumstances in paragraph (c) of the penalty.	4
----------	--	---

(4)	Schedule 1, entry for the <i>Summary Offences Act 2005</i> , entries for sections 6(1) and 7(1)—
-----	--

omit, insert—

s 6(1)	for abusive, indecent, obscene or offensive language—
--------	---

(a)	within licensed premises, or in the vicinity of licensed premises	3
-----	--	---

(b)	in other circumstances	1
-----	------------------------------	---

s 6(1)	for disorderly, offensive, threatening or violent behaviour (other than an offence that constitutes an assault)—
--------	--

(a)	within licensed premises, or in the vicinity of licensed premises	6
-----	--	---

(b)	in other circumstances	3
-----	------------------------------	---

s 7(1)	for urinating in a public place—	
(a)	within licensed premises, or in the vicinity of licensed premises	2
(b)	in other circumstances	1

I table the explanatory notes, a copy of which I have already provided.

Tabled paper: Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [5746].

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 124, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 125—

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (10.35 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 **Clause 125 (Amendment of s 7 (Urinating in a public place))**

Page 146, lines 8 to 14—

omit, insert—

Section 7(1), from 'in a public place'—

omit, insert—

in an offensive or indecent way in a public place unless the person has a reasonable excuse.

Maximum penalty—

- (a) if the person urinates in an offensive or indecent way within licensed premises, or in the vicinity of licensed premises—4 penalty units; or
- (b) otherwise—2 penalty units.

I table the explanatory notes to the amendment.

Tabled paper: Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Mr Wellington's amendments [5747].

My submission is that amendments need to be made to clause 125 of the bill to provide that, before the increase in penalty proposed for section 7 of the Summary Offences Act 2005 occurs, which deals with urinating in a public place, an offence of urinating in a public place is not committed unless the urination occurs in an indiscreet or offensive manner. Section 7(1) of the Summary Offences Act 2005 currently reads—

A person must not urinate in a public place. Maximum penalty—2 penalty units.

This subsection makes no reference—

Government members interjected.

Mr WELLINGTON: Listen to the laughter from members of the government. Perhaps if they were quiet and listened they would understand what it is about. The current section makes no reference to the urinating occurring in an indiscreet or offensive manner. It does not even require the urinating to occur in the view of another. As the section is currently worded, a person who urinates in a range of circumstances, which I have set out in the explanatory notes, is automatically deemed to have committed an offence. One example that I have referred to is of a young fellow who stopped at a service station to get fuel. When he asked the operator if he could use the toilet he was told that they were no longer available to the public. Because he was busting to go to the toilet, he went around the back of the service station and relieved himself discreetly in some bushes. On returning to his car, he was asked by the police who had driven into the service station what he had been doing around the back of the service station. The young fellow told the police what he had been doing and was charged with an offence of public urination. Prior to the charge, the young fellow had a completely unblemished criminal record. It is my submission that it is a proper function of this parliament to insist that the consequences of the government's proposed legislation are addressed before we look at simply increasing penalties.

Another case which was put to me was of a young fellow in an amusement centre. He wanted to use the toilet but they said, 'Sorry, you can't use it.' He had to go outside. He went to a discreet place, relieved himself and next minute he was also arrested, charged and now has a record. I believe it is reasonable to require that we do not simply leave it up to the discretion of the police officers to decide whether or not someone is going to be charged with an offence. It is proper that it is this parliament that decides what are the relevant elements of the offence rather than leaving it to the police to use ad hoc discretion as to whether they will charge someone or not.

(Time expired)

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I referred to this function in my speech during the second reading debate. I have since had a discussion with the member for Nicklin about his amendment and the reasoning behind the amendment. I think it is objectionable action to take unnecessarily. Where public facilities or facilities within a building are available, that is exactly and appropriately the facility that people should use. What I understand the member for Nicklin is trying to achieve is that, where somebody does use their discretion because they have no other option but does so sensitively and with propriety, they should have that attitude, action and consideration taken into account. I think the amendment is common sense and would be welcomed by most thinking people.

Dr DOUGLAS: This issue has come up a number of times over many years. In fact, I wrote to the former minister in the Labor government about this issue of discretion and the lack of discretion with regard to the fining of people in these circumstances. What tends to happen is people do not have the money or the capacity to defend themselves when they come up on charges. Overwhelmingly, the vast majority of the offenders who are charged are doing it because there is no other facility around.

There certainly are cases where people go out and urinate in public places and quite deservedly are given fines, but to use disproportionate methods and reckless types of penalties as prescribed under this proposed legislation is grossly disproportionate and unnecessary. It will lead to unintended consequences and it is a poor step. The amendment moved by the member for Nicklin is appropriate, and in fact in the cautious words of the member for Gladstone, who is a highly experienced person who has been on the council for many years, these things do occur where toilets are locked. I gave the example of bus drivers on the Gold Coast who are not given key access to the various toilets around the Gold Coast, and both the women and the men had to go to the toilet in the gardens. In fact one of the bus drivers had been told by the police officer that they could not go there, but these people only had a limited time for toilet breaks in the bushes and that is where they were told to go. This totally ridiculous situation does routinely occur, and to use this type of reckless and overly officious penalty is ridiculous. People urinating in public is a very important issue, and I think that it should be supported.

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

AYES, 5:

KAP, 1—Katter

PUP, 1—Judge.

INDEPENDENTS, 3—Cunningham, Douglas, Wellington.

NOES, 72:

LNP, 63—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Young.

ALP, 9—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Wellington) negated.

Clause 125, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 126 to 133—

Mr BLEIJIE (10.47 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendments—

100 After clause 126

Page 146, after line 25—

insert—

Part 10A Amendment of Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994

126A Act amended

This part amends the *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994*.

126B Amendment of sch 1 (Disqualifying offences—provisions of the Criminal Code)

Schedule 1, part 1—

insert—

7A chapter 28A (Unlawful striking causing death)

126C Amendment of sch 1A (Driver disqualification offences)

Schedule 1A, part 3, division 1—

insert—

7A chapter 28A (Unlawful striking causing death)

101 Clause 128 (Amendment of sch 1 (Declared offences))

Page 147, line 10, '302A'—

omit, insert—

314A

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 126 to 133, as amended, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): The House will now consider the postponed clause.

Clause 2—

Mr BLEIJIE (10.48 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 14, lines 8 to 13—

omit, insert—

(2) The following provisions commence on assent—

- part 3
- part 4, heading
- section 12
- section 14
- section 16, other than section 16(1) and (3)
- part 5
- part 6
- part 6A
- part 6B
- part 7, heading
- section 27
- section 28, other than to the extent it omits the definitions *drink safe precinct* and *entertainment* and inserts the definitions *irresponsible* and *system failure*
- section 29A
- section 30
- section 32(1) to the extent it inserts new section 21(1)(eaa)
- section 33, other than to the extent it inserts new section 42A(1), example 4
- sections 33A to 39
- sections 40A and 40B
- section 46A
- sections 50 to 52
- section 54
- sections 56 and 57
- section 61
- section 63
- section 69
- sections 72 and 73
- section 75
- section 76, other than to the extent it omits part 6B
- sections 77 to 80

- section 81 to the extent it inserts sections 324, 327 and 328
 - part 8, heading
 - section 82
 - section 84
 - section 86
 - sections 98 and 99
 - section 100, other than to the extent it inserts new section 238
 - section 101
 - part 9, heading
 - sections 102 and 103
 - section 109
 - section 110, other than section 110(2)
 - section 114
 - section 120, other than section 120(2)
 - section 121
 - section 122, heading
 - section 122(1), other than to the extent it omits the definition *photograph*
 - section 122(2) to the extent it inserts the definitions *intoxicated* and *licensed premises*
 - part 9A
 - part 9B
 - part 10
 - part 10A
 - part 11
 - part 12
 - part 13.
- (3) The following provisions commence, or are taken to have commenced, on 1 September 2014—
- section 46
 - section 81, to the extent it inserts new part 12, division 16, heading and sections 319 to 321.
- (4) The following provisions commence on 1 October 2014—
- part 2, other than sections 4(3), 5 and 7
 - sections 85, 87 and 88
 - sections 104 to 108
 - section 110(2)
 - sections 111 to 113
 - section 116, other than to the extent it inserts new section 442(cb)
 - section 118
 - section 122(1) to the extent it omits the definition *photograph*
 - section 122(2), other than to the extent it inserts the definitions *intoxicated*, *licensed premises* and *relevant assault offence*.
- (5) The following provisions commence on 1 December 2014—
- section 4(3)
 - section 5
 - section 7
 - section 13
 - sections 15 to 15C
 - section 16(1) and (3)
 - section 17
 - section 83
 - sections 89 to 97
 - section 100 to the extent it inserts new section 238
 - section 115
 - section 116 to the extent it inserts new section 442(cb)
 - section 117
 - section 119
 - section 120(2)
 - section 122(2) to the extent it inserts the definition *relevant assault offence*.

- (6) The following provisions commence on 1 July 2015—
 - section 28, to the extent it omits the definition *entertainment*
 - section 29
 - sections 40
 - sections 41 to 45
 - sections 47 and 48
 - section 53
 - section 55
 - sections 70 and 71
 - section 81, to the extent it inserts new sections 321A, 322 and 323.
- (7) The following provisions commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation—
 - section 28, to the extent it omits the definition *drink safe precinct* and inserts the definitions *irresponsible* and *system failure*
 - section 31
 - section 32, other than to the extent it inserts new section 21(1)(eaa)
 - section 33(2) to the extent it inserts new section 42A(1), example 4
 - sections 58 to 60
 - section 62
 - sections 64 to 68
 - section 74
 - section 76 to the extent it omits part 6B
 - section 81, to the extent it inserts new sections 325, 326 and 329.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.50 pm): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.50 pm): I move the following amendment—

102 Long title

Long title, from 'the *Liquor Act 1992*' to 'the *Summary Offences Act 2005*',—

omit, insert—

the *Evidence Act 1977*, the *Introduction Agents Act 2001*, the *Liquor Act 1992*, the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*, the *Security Providers Act 1993*, the *State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014*, the *Summary Offences Act 2005*, the *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994*,

Amendment agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.50 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Hendra State School, Sesquicentenary

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (10.50 pm): I rise to inform the House of a celebration in my electorate: the 150th anniversary of the Hendra State School which took place on Sunday, 3 August 2014. I was pleased to represent the Minister for Education,

Training and Employment, the Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, whose office was kind enough to provide me with a written speech, in case I did not know enough about the Hendra State School in order to say a few short words about that esteemed place of education and learning.

I was joined by the Principal, Mr Trevor Carr; Lord Mayor Graham Quirk, who is an alumnus of the district of Hendra but not of Hendra State School itself; Councillor David McLachlan, who used to train greyhounds in the area—he one day thought he could be a jockey but as soon as his legs touched the ground he realised that was not going to work; Councillor Kim Flesser, who is a past student of Hendra State School; and Mrs Lori Floden, who is president of the P&C.

It is tremendous to think that Hendra State School opened on 1 August 1864, just 4½ years after the state of Queensland was proclaimed. In fact the first enrolled pupil at Hendra State School was a Charles Gerler, a descendent of German missionaries who founded the German mission station up Nundah way in about 1837. In fact, Gerler Road at Hendra is named after the Gerler family, as Franz Road and quite a number of other roads in the district are based on those early German settlers. In fact, none of the first students spoke English; they all spoke German, having that German background. I do not think any of them would imagine that their small timber hall with 47 pupils would grow and prosper over many years into the beloved community school it is in 2014.

Hendra State School has become an integral part of the local community. Those in the racing industry certainly, with the stables area to the eastern side of Nudgee Road, have sent generations of students to Hendra State School. In fact, even today the school maintains a strong link with the racing fraternity. That history weaves its way into the present with the parents and citizens association organising the Riding to Success program, which provides all students with five weeks of horse lessons as part of the physical education program.

There have been many great occasions, perhaps none more so than on 17 September 1957, when a young student named Bob McCulloch was presented with the Lilley Medal, the Corporal French VC Prize and the EM Hanlon Bursary all on the same day after winning the awards at the state scholarship exams.

(Time expired)

Somerset Hills State School, Groundskeeper

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (10.53 pm): It is a great pleasure to rise and give my first adjournment debate speech in this House about a subject that is very important to me personally. Education and work are the staples of members on this side of the House. We believe that workers deserve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work and that everybody has the right to a decent and fulfilling education. Fair working conditions also include knowing that you have a job to return to and that you are respected and valued by your employer. During the Stafford by-election campaign I was made aware of an instance where this was not happening due to an education minister who was simply not listening to our community.

In the wisdom of policies overseen by the Newman government the student numbers at Somerset Hills State School have declined, which apparently meant that the groundskeeper, Peter, needed to pack his bags and leave. Let us look at the logic here. There is the same amount of grass. It grows at the same rate and needs to be cut just as often. The same number of paths still need to be swept so that students can learn in an appropriate setting. I ask the minister: why in the world would anyone sack a groundskeeper under these circumstances? Does he want teachers and principals mowing the lawns of this school?

It was a short-sighted decision by the minister, and I am sad to say that it took considerable media pressure for Peter to have his job reinstated. Despite the spin that the LNP tried to apply, I have again spoken with the school's P&C president, Ian Carmody, who has confirmed that Peter's job was only reinstated after the minister's office became aware of this media pressure. Even after this mid-campaign about-turn, the terms of Peter's employment leave a lot to be desired. He has received only an 18-month contract when what he needs is a full-time, permanent contract for the security of his own employment and for the good of this school.

It is time for this charade to end. As the demographics in my electorate change and more young families continue to move into this area, the school's numbers will continue to rise. It is just not believable that the school will not need a groundskeeper in the future. That is why I am asking for Peter to be appointed as a permanent employee, so that he can continue to care for the grounds of Somerset Hills State School. It is time for this callous attitude of this government to stop and for common sense to prevail.

Lees, Mr D

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (10.56 pm): On Friday, 15 August 2014 I had the melancholy responsibility of attending the funeral of Detective Sergeant Darren ‘Beefa’ Lees in Toowoomba. Beefa passed on 8 August after fighting lymphoma. He was only 45. Detective Sergeant Lees was very well known in Rockhampton and in the broader Central Queensland region. He was particularly well known for his role as the lead investigator in the case involving serial killer Leonard John Fraser. Beefa’s leadership, professionalism and compassion were amply demonstrated to my community during his involvement in this dreadful case.

I can say without doubt that Darren was well known to me long before any thoughts of politics entered my mind. He was an extroverted character. He liked a beer, loved his football and could always be relied on for a laugh. He was a straight shooter by any definition. Without doubt, he was great company. For most of the time in Rockhampton that was the basis of our friendship.

One of my grandfathers said to me that a man’s achievements in life are not measured by his accumulated wealth, by his visible material things or by the perceived power he accrues. No, the real measure of a man’s contribution is how many people bother to gather at his passing. On that basis, Darren achieved an extraordinary amount. It was certainly one of the biggest funerals I have ever attended and bears witness to the type of fellow Darren was. He was a fantastic man in many respects. There were many funny stories about him during the service. None of them surprised me, and they reinforced my personal knowledge and demonstrated what a likeable, fun-loving bloke he really was. He was a bit of a rogue but in a very good way. He was a staunch unionist, having been heavily involved in the Queensland Police Union for many years. He was also a staunch Labor man, through thick and thin. It is a funny thing that during our numerous social interludes in Rockhampton we never discussed politics, probably because we were too busy talking about football or the punt. It was only in recent years that I discovered his political inclinations. It is enough to say that Darren ‘Beefa’ Lees was a passionate and compassionate man in all things. He leaves behind Kath and two school-age children.

The Toowoomba service was a particularly moving one. Beefa may have passed at a young age, but I can assure you that he crammed a lot into the time he had. He was a champion bloke who cared about his community, his profession, his colleagues and his workmates, and he loved his family absolutely. They say that only the good die young. Nothing could be more true in Beefa’s case. Our community will be poorer for his passing. I place on the record my condolences to his family on behalf of my community, the people of Rockhampton. We will remember him. Hasten the dawn.

Aspley Electorate, Seniors Week

 **Hon. TE DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (10.59 pm): Tonight it gives me great pleasure to rise to update the House about the wonderful events that took place in Aspley to celebrate Seniors Week last week. Last week’s annual celebration was, as always, a terrific opportunity to acknowledge and highlight the valuable role that seniors play in our families and in our communities. This year a record 180 organisations across the state secured Seniors Week grants from my department and a total of 360 events were registered online to take place across Queensland—a record number of events for Seniors Week. With all of these events there was certainly no shortage of ways in which our communities could say thank you for the tireless efforts of our seniors. In my own electorate of Aspley the role that seniors play cannot be overstated, with many quietly going about their business helping through their volunteering efforts. Whether it is through established community groups or just ad hoc assistance, their work is absolutely inspiring and they deserve to be recognised.

That is why this year I was absolutely delighted to host the Aspley Achiever Seniors Week awards for 2014. The awards were a great success and more than 300 seniors from across the electorate participated from four of our local retirement villages—Aveo Aspley, Aveo Bridgeman Downs, Compton Gardens and Holy Spirit at Carseldine. It is fair to say that the anticipation of who had won an award was equally matched by the anticipation of who would be the lucky person to cut the very large Seniors Week cake. As the local member and the minister for seniors, it was particularly special for me to award 35 very impressive seniors in our local community. True to form, as seniors often are in their volunteering efforts, they were extremely gracious and humble in receiving their awards. Many did not know that they had been nominated and part of the excitement of the day was seeing their faces when their names were called out to receive an award. Again, the value to our community of seniors cannot be overestimated not only in my electorate of Aspley but

right across our state. Finally, I put on record my thanks to the federal member for Petrie, Luke Howarth, who joined me in celebrating Aspley seniors. Next year I look forward to hosting some seniors events to recognise our wonderful seniors.

Banking Industry

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (11.02 pm): The banks in this country have much to answer for when it comes to the issue of low-document loans. I remember back in my days as a financial planner in probably the early 2000s of hearing about these very strange low-document loans that were being pushed around the place by various lenders and I started to make inquiries. I have to say that I was very concerned to realise exactly what was going on, and that was that loans were being provided to people without a great deal of proof of their capacity to repay. I could see that the potential was there for that type of loan to be abused by lenders, by brokers and so forth. We know now that those loans are being scrutinised in the various realms around Australia because of the pain and suffering that is being meted out to people who now find themselves in impossible situations.

I need to tell members a story, and it is a deadly serious story. In fact, my folder in relation to this family is very thick but is just a fraction of the size of the folder that is in the hands of their legal professionals. This is about a man and his wife and his two children. It is also about two banks—the Commonwealth Bank and Westpac. It is about a mortgage broker and indeed it is about the Gold Coast City Council. These matters need to be spoken about from the perspective that these people are a broken family. This couple have lost their two daughters, who moved away because of the stress and strain of things. I have to say that there have certainly been times when there has been a lot of pain and suffering in the house. I note that I have about half a minute to go and I probably need about 15 minutes to tell the story. It is a travesty of justice that these banks and these mortgage brokers have abused the system to such a degree that these people are on the brink of suicide and on the brink of losing everything. It is simply because of the abuse of the banking system in this country.

Charlton Wellcamp Industrial Estate

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (11.05 pm): I rise to respond to the statements made by the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry to my MPI this morning. The minister fails to address the substance of my speech because he cannot. I table all of the references to the articles from which I quoted.

Tabled paper: Statements about Charlton Wellcamp industrial estate [5748].

I also table all of the company investigations relating to businesses associated with his brother Tom and other close colleagues.

Tabled paper: Australian Securities and Investments Commission and Department of Natural Resources documents regarding Charlton Industrial Pty Ltd [5749].

I will continue to list those and other activities in the near future. If the minister has anything that proves that any of this information is incorrect, then he must now put up. If the minister had read *Hansard* he would have clearly seen that I have referred only to his actions and the actions that have benefited his brother Tom and not any other distant McVeigh relative or any other cousin. He did so as an elected Toowoomba Regional Council councillor and later as the member for Toowoomba South and minister in the Campbell Newman government in the Queensland parliament. In response to his claim that he takes an interest ‘as the development around Charlton Wellcamp promises so much to agriculture’, was he referring to the Boral asphalt plant or the Vinidex plant that is making pipes for the CSG plant or the transporters that continue to consume all of those farms immediately abutting the magnificent former wheat farm and horse stud that is no longer Wellcamp? The real truth is that the minister knows that this has nothing to do with agriculture, and its progression to an airport to carry 747 planes readily confirms this.

It is not any reflection on any part of the extended McVeigh clan. What I am saying is that his own community in Toowoomba and those outside in those communities around Toowoomba have noted his misuse of his position to gain advantage for his brother without declaring that apparent conflict of interest. This is occurring at a time of great personal hardship to all Queenslanders due to the high cost of living, particularly with utilities, and particularly those in agriculture—remember, he is the Minister for Agriculture—with the worst drought in 100 years and the very delayed drought assistance payments to farmers, and there are many members here who are representing those people. I say to the minister: if he cannot see the apparent conflict of interest and the imbalance here, then he is a very poor reader of community sentiment.

Minister, the ownership of the former Charlton primary school has been transferred to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service with plans to convert it to the city's third fire station—Charlton primary school was the first of six schools to change ownership—and anyone will tell you that in an industrial estate with a nearby big jet cargo airport the first thing you need is a fire station. To make things really happen, that is what you need and it is certainly wonderful if you get the water supply paid for by the state government. This industrial estate of Charlton is in Condamine. It got \$10 million in Royalties for the Regions. Ministers come and go, but a primary school was closed and a fire station has been announced. If the cap fits, wear it.

(Time expired)

Mansfield Electorate, Queensland Day

 **Hon. IB WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts) (11.08 pm): During the House's most recent recess I had the pleasure of hosting a morning tea in honour of Queensland Day at which our local community achievers on the south side were recognised. It was a perfect opportunity to recognise those in my electorate, as I am sure each member has in their own electorate, who are active in the community in supporting so many great community outcomes. Alongside me in the hosting chair was local councillor Krista Adams and we had the opportunity to recognise our local achievers with the very generous financial support of the Southside Sport and Community Club. We received many worthy nominations and it was quite difficult to actually declare who the winners were, but it did reinforce how lucky we were to have so many activists in our community who are working so much for the good of others.

We really wanted to find those people in the community who do great work but who might not always get the recognition that they deserve. All who received awards display great pride in their community and in the organisations in which they are involved. They have worked for a long time in our community to give something back.

We gave out six awards altogether. Each recipient received a framed certificate and a bursary, which was generously donated by the southside sports club. The joint winners of the Southside Community Spirit Award were Helen Aronis from the local Greek Orthodox Church. Helen works there with the women's group, known locally as the 'haloumi handbags'. They are tireless workers for the good of the community, particularly the Greek Orthodox community within my electorate. Terry Forster, the Principal of Mackenzie State Special School, is an outstanding worker in the area of working with students with special needs. Terry was a great winner of that award, as was Pastor Steve Dixon from the Hillsong Church, which is a very active and influential Christian organisation within my electorate. Debbie Williams was the final joint winner for her work at Blue Care at Mount Gravatt. Debbie has been working there for many years and has done a sterling job building up that Blue Care resource.

The Dennis Webb Neighbourhood Watch Award was won by Jill McGregor for her work in the Upper Mount Gravatt Neighbourhood Watch group. Bruce Wilson from the Mount Gravatt Youth and Recreation Club won the Southside Sports Award. The Southside Environment Award was won by Robert Dickinson for his work in the Burbank community. Robert previously worked at the CSIRO. He is a great observer and watcher of environmental issues within Burbank, which is an important acreage part of my electorate.

The Mansfield State School won the Community Project Award for its Stephanie Alexander kitchen garden, which is a great garden where the kids grow their own food and then cook it. Much community pride is engendered by that event. Tony South won the Southside Queenslander of the Year Award for his work as chairman of the Rotary Mount Gravatt Challenge. All recipients were worthy winners and I congratulate them all.

(Time expired)

Mudgeeraba Electorate, School Captains

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.11 pm): I rise to update the House on the good work of the outstanding student leaders in my electorate of Mudgeeraba who I have had the continuing privilege of hosting at Parliament House. In recent months, I have invited the school captains and vice-captains of various schools in the Mudgeeraba electorate to visit Parliament House to learn about the history of our state's legislature. This is a tradition that, as members may know, I established shortly after my election in 2009. It remains an important opportunity for me to engage with the young leaders in my electorate.

During the past several months I have had the opportunity to host the student leaders of Robina State High School, Bethany Curtis, Ryan Lim, Chloe Marshall, Ashleigh Ross, Luke Sinclair, Luke Stegman, Campbell Trevethan and April Wilson, who were accompanied by Mr Benjamin Weeks, who is the head of the Department of Junior Secondary at Robina State High School. I would also like to mention Arianna Clarke, who was unable to attend.

I hosted the student leaders of Gold Coast Christian College, Indiana Lawson, Amelia Maki-Nestie, Lucas Brzeski and Emily Clauss, who were accompanied by Mr Guy Lawson, the Principal of Gold Coast Christian College. I would also like to mention Justin Renfrew, who was unable to attend owing to athletic commitments.

I hosted the student leaders of Merrimac State School, Selma Zlatic, Caitlin Haines, Jamieson Schmitzer, Nikiah Campbell, Byron Hamilton and Kyle Relph, who were accompanied by Ms Lindy Murray, Deputy Principal of Merrimac State School. I would also like to mention Shannon Hattin and Bailey McDonald, who were unable to attend due to illness.

It is always fantastic to spend time with the remarkable student leaders of my electorate as their local member and to give them the opportunity to experience a guided tour of the parliament, lunch with me in the cafeteria and question time. I was also able to welcome these students to the floor of the chamber after lunch where a number of my parliamentary colleagues were able to make time in their busy schedules to meet and to have photos taken with the visiting students, which was no doubt a consistent highlight for these future young leaders.

I would like to thank the Treasurer and Minister for Trade, the Minister for Energy and Water Supply and the Minister for Health for taking the time to chat with the students. Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank you, too, for making yourself available on numerous occasions over the past two years to meet with the students from my electorate.

I very much look forward to hosting more student leaders from the Mudgeeraba electorate in the near future. Once again, I congratulate them on their hard work and dedication to the Robina State High School, Gold Coast Christian College and Merrimac State School communities. I wish them all the best in their future endeavours and look forward to hearing about their achievements in the years ahead.

Australian Reconstruction and Development Board

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.14 pm): I rise to speak about the inadequacies of the assistance that is currently provided to cattle producers and farmers. The real answer is that they urgently need the support of the federal parliament through the Australian Reconstruction and Development Board. The recent data that is available shows that, given that a large portion of the industry is in trouble, the take-up of the loans package has been poor. Recently, one western mayor indicated to me that the number of ratepayers who had not paid their rates in two years had risen alarmingly. That was just one shire. Once those people get three years in arrears, the council needs to sell up their properties. A lot of these places have destocked because there is no feed there. When the rain comes later in the year, cattle prices are expected to skyrocket. But none of these people are going to be able to afford to restock, so their ability to pay their rates in the near future does not look good at all.

It is a dark hour for the industry. You can see that this situation has not happened overnight. It has not happened just as a result of the live export ban. Over the past 20 years, rural debt has incrementally departed from the associated farm income. National rural debt is estimated at \$66 billion. Average farm debt levels rose from \$700,000 three years ago to \$1.2 million in 2012 and in the middle of 2013 were at \$1.4 million and increasing. These are very concerning figures. A common misconception is that this debt has been incurred through property expansions and acquisitions. That is not the case at all.

The good news is that there is a very effective solution to this crippling rural debt problem that is in federal parliament at the moment, and that is the Australian Reconstruction and Development Board. This board will ensure the sustainability of Australian agriculture by taking over eligible bad debt from commercial banks at a discounted value and offering farmers refinancing at interest rates that are lower than those offered by commercial lenders.

Upon being elected, the new government saw fit to expand the federal budget by \$8 billion to allow some desk jockeys to play around with pesos and rupiah. The previous government was happy to bail out the failures of the banking industry post the GFC with the backing of some \$14 billion. Some \$4 billion to \$6 billion for the ARDB could cage the entire rural debt for agriculture in Australia. Surely it deserves support.

Historically, these types of facilities have proven to be successful business models. They are prevalent throughout the world. In Queensland, the QIDC was sold by the Borbridge government for \$1 billion, which is a demonstration of its success. The ARDB urgently needs the support of this state government. It is desperately needed by farmers. It is a real solution that can provide for the sustainability of the land.

(Time expired)

Sandgate Electorate, All About Living

 **Ms MILLARD** (Sandgate—LNP) (11.17 pm): I rise to commend to the House the work of one of the Sandgate electorate's most well respected organisations, All About Living. I have heard it said many times that a community is only as strong as its capacity and willingness to look after its most vulnerable. If that is so, then All About Living sets a high standard for the Sandgate electorate and, indeed, the state. All About Living provides respite care and home services to people with disabilities and those over 60, who comprise approximately 20 per cent of my electorate, and has done so for over 20 years. The staff of All About Living are popular among their approximately 600 local clients, providing services such as domestic assistance, social support, personal care, home maintenance, meals, transport, assessment and case management. I have never heard anything but praise for the team as they are welcomed into people's homes, being part of a community, a contributor to a community that places a high premium on social inclusion.

During this term I have had the privilege of being part of negotiations for new premises for All About Living, which was needed so that it could expand its capacity to service the growing demand on the north side of Brisbane. The new premises in Lagoon Street, Sandgate, were opened in May and I was proud to attend as a special guest along with our guest of honour, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Andrew Cripps MP, who played a key role in facilitating this process. I want to thank the minister and his staff for guiding a somewhat complex lease transfer negotiation over a six-month period through to a successful result.

Of course, land is not the only form of support that this government offers groups such as All About Living. Since 2012, All About Living has received grants and HACC funding to expand its services and is eligible to apply for a range of community based grants, which I am always ready to support. On the issue of future program funding, I realise that details on what the NDIS will look like are still unfolding. Nonetheless, I hope and expect negotiations will only impact positively on the operations of All About Living as disability funding moves into a more client centred model.

It is groups such as All About Living that are well placed to organise resources, expertise and services in a way that can rapidly and effectively respond to their clients' needs. It is governments such as ours that are best placed to revitalise front-line services in a way that reflects sound economic management as well as community aspirations.

In conclusion, I again acknowledge and thank the team at All About Living for the valuable support services they provide to the elderly and vulnerable in the electorate that I proudly represent. I look forward to a future of partnership with All About Living as its member of parliament.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.19 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, D'Ath, Davies, 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, Lynham, 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