

TUESDAY, 30 OCTOBER 2001

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. R. K. Hollis, Redcliffe) read prayers and took the chair at 9.30 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Government House
Queensland

26 October 2001

The Honourable R. K. Hollis, MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Mr Speaker

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on 25 October 2001:

"A Bill for an Act to amend legislation about primary industries"

"A Bill for an Act to amend the Valuers Registration Act 1992"

"A Bill for an Act to amend the Commonwealth Powers (Family Law—Children) Act 1990"

"A Bill for an Act to amend the WorkCover Queensland Act 1996"

"A Bill for an Act to promote the responsible care and use of animals and to protect animals from cruelty, and for other purposes"

"A Bill for an Act to amend the Law Reform Act 1995"

"A Bill for an Act to provide for regulating activities involving gene technology, and for other purposes".

The Bills are hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

(sgd) Peter Arnison

Governor

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Annual Report

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that today I have received the annual report of the Queensland Information Commissioner for 2000-01 and I table the said report.

INCORPORATION OF MATERIAL INTO *HANSARD*

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Today I wish to make a few short remarks about the incorporation of material into *Hansard*. I am aware that the amount of material that has been incorporated in this parliament has increased significantly as compared to previous parliaments. Furthermore, I am aware that leave has been sought for the incorporation of material when the material has not, contrary to the established practice of the House, been viewed by me as Speaker and consent given prior to leave being sought. I have reviewed all rulings on the incorporation of material into *Hansard* in recent years. I have determined that the following rules apply and have advised all Deputy Speakers that these are to be applied.

Firstly, members should be cognisant of the fact that the parliament is a forum for debate and *Hansard* is first and foremost a record of the debate that takes place in the House. There should be good reason for incorporating material into *Hansard*. Secondly, prior to seeking leave to incorporate material into *Hansard* a member should provide the material sought to be incorporated to the Speaker for consideration and the Speaker's consent obtained. Unseen documents being incorporated have the potential to embarrass the House. Thirdly, in considering whether to permit the incorporation of material into *Hansard*, the primary factors that will be taken into account by me will be whether the material contains anything that is offensive or likely to breach the general rules of debate in the House, such as anything that is sub judice; whether the

material significantly enhances the arguments to be made in the debate; the length of the material; and the legibility and form of the material and resources likely to be expended in incorporating the material. Fourthly, generally the incorporation of material will not be permitted where the material is simply a member's speech that is likely to be too long for the allotted time.

There appear to be exemptions to the general rules above that will continue to be recognised. For example, a minister, when introducing a bill, is permitted by standing orders to incorporate explanatory material into *Hansard*. I take this to also include portions of second reading speeches that are routinely published and circulated as part of the introduction process. I will provide the same courtesy to members introducing private members' bills so long as they provide the speech to me in advance. A minister can incorporate an answer to a question into the record. Finally, in order to preserve time in the morning session and allow time for private members' statements, I will, in limited circumstances, permit ministers to incorporate important and lengthy ministerial statements. For the benefit of members, I intend to circulate this ruling and the references to previous rulings to which I have had regard. There will be a number of rulings on the document I will circulate.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Annual General Meeting

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that the annual general meeting of the Queensland branch of the CPA will be held in the chamber at 1 p.m. today.

PETITION

Mr W. Van Oostveen

Mrs Nita Cunningham from six petitioners, requesting the House to take note of the grievance of Mr William Van Oostveen not being able to obtain satisfaction to requests to obtain personal records about himself and take whatever action is necessary to ensure he receives the proper and just treatment within the process of the administration of Queensland government.

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—

19 October 2001—

- Gold Coast Hospital Foundation—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Sunshine Coast Health Services Foundation—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Chiropractors and Osteopaths Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Dental Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Optometrists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Pharmacy Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Psychologists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Speech Pathologists Board—Annual Report 2000-2001

22 October 2001—

- Report by the Minister for Innovation and Information Economy under section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992
- Two reports by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice under section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992

23 October 2001—

- Queensland Building Tribunal—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Report by the Minister for Tourism and Racing and Minister for Fair Trading under section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992

24 October 2001—

- Health Rights Commission—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Dental Technicians and Dental Prosthetists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Occupational Therapists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Podiatrists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2000-2001
- Office of Health Practitioner Registration Boards—Annual Report 2000-2001

25 October 2001—

Legal, Constitutional and Administrative Review Committee Report No. 31—Review of the members' oath or affirmation of allegiance

26 October 2001—

Queensland Law Society—Annual Report 2000-2001

Supreme Court—Annual Report 2000-2001

29 October 2001—

Three reports by the Minister for Natural Resources and Minister for Mines under section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments, received during the recess, were tabled by The Clerk—

Health Services Act 1991—

Health Services Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2001, No. 192

Transport Infrastructure Act 1994—

Transport Infrastructure (State-Controlled Roads) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2001, No. 193

Valuation of Land Act 1944—

Valuation of Land Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2001, No. 194

Water Act 2000—

Water Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2001, No. 195

Dental Act 1971—

Dental Amendment By-law (No. 1) 2001, No. 196

WorkCover Queensland Act 1996—

WorkCover Queensland Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2001, No. 197

MINISTERIAL PAPERS

The following ministerial papers were tabled—

(a) Premier and Minister for Trade (Mr Beattie)—

Final government response to Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee Report No. 55—

Three Yearly Review of the Criminal Justice Commission

(b) Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport (Mr Mackenroth)—

Statement of unforeseen expenditure 2000-2001

(c) Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Welford)—

Electoral Commission of Queensland—Annual Report for 2000-01.

PARLIAMENTARY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Criminal Justice Commission Review

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.35 a.m.): I lay upon the table of the House the final government response to the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee report No. 55, the three-yearly review of the Criminal Justice Commission, and note in passing that, with the amalgamation legislation for the CJC and Crime Commission, there have been significant developments since that time.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Comalco Alumina Refinery, Gladstone

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 a.m.), by leave: For years now—even decades—people have been promising to win the huge Comalco alumina refinery for Gladstone. My government promised, and we delivered. We have delivered a new era in the industrial development of this great state. On Friday I signed an agreement on behalf of the state government with Sam Walsh, the CEO of Comalco, which commits that company to building the \$1.5 billion stage 1 of the refinery and to immediately begin investigations for stage 2. The State Development Minister, Tom Barton, has been working closely with me on this project, and Senator Nick Minchin, representing the federal government, witnessed those signatures.

In December the first of 1,500 construction jobs will be created as earthworks get under way, with building due to commence early next year. Local Queensland firms will have the chance of winning up to 80 per cent of the supply contracts on offer. By the time first shipments of alumina go out in early 2005, more than 400 direct permanent jobs will have been created, and that is just

the first stage. Comalco's plans for Gladstone include a further two stages of the alumina refinery totalling four million tonnes of annual production involving a total \$4 billion investment with well over 1,000 permanent jobs in place.

This is a massive development, and it required a significant level of support to capture this project for Queensland and Australia. Queensland has committed \$150 million over the next few years as a contribution to common-user infrastructure which will remain in the ownership of the state. I stress that it is common-user infrastructure. That will be spent on building wharf and jetty facilities, dredging the harbour, the development of transport corridors and connections to utilities. The Commonwealth is providing \$137 million in funding for a multi-user energy facility and a research program to improve energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse emissions from mineral processing activity.

The Smart State vision places a high priority on value adding to our natural resources. We do not want to send jobs overseas in bulk mineral carriers; we want to see more jobs created right here by value adding in Queensland. Instead of simply putting our minerals on ships and sending them overseas to be processed or value added by some other country, we are seeking to value add in Queensland for the benefit of Queenslanders. Light metals such as aluminium and magnesium are the metals of the future, and Queensland is perfectly placed to be a part of that light metals future. This is about smart technology for smart jobs in the industries of the future, particularly light metals. We have a plan to boost the development of regional Queensland through major mineral processing investment projects, and Comalco is a key part of that strategy.

Our plan is not a glossy document with pretty pictures. It is an action plan aimed at doing the things necessary to deliver more jobs and more investment right across the state. It is about positioning Queensland as a major competitor in the market for global industrial development. We have a deliberate strategy towards value adding of our natural resources, which includes concessional mineral royalties if further processing is conducted in Queensland, as well as investment incentive packages. We are getting the runs on the board. We now have Comalco. The future of the AMC project, a project we are right behind, will be known in a few short weeks. Sun Metals is looking at stage 2 of its Townsville zinc refinery. Both Aldoga and Comalco are looking at boosting aluminium smelter capacity in Gladstone. By securing major projects such as these we can encourage new energy supplies, such as gas from PNG or the Timor Sea or coal seam methane. With a full, diversified range of cheap energy alternatives Queensland will attract even more companies to invest.

Friday was an important milestone in Queensland's history—an important milestone in delivery of that strategic vision. I thank Comalco for having the vision to commit a major investment project to Queensland. I thank the Commonwealth for providing investment incentives and supporting Queensland in its bid for this project. I thank Tom Barton, Ross Rolfe and his staff in the Department of State Development for delivering this vital project to Queensland. I particularly acknowledge the late Terry Palmer, former CEO of Comalco, who was instrumental in choosing Gladstone as the preferred site for the refinery. Sadly, Terry passed away early this year. I had many discussions with Terry Palmer about this project. I know that he was as passionate about it as is my government. Terry was convinced, as I think we all are, that Queensland is going to play a leading role in the industrial development of this nation—indeed, of the Asia-Pacific region. Friday's announcement was a major step along the path towards achieving that role of industrial leadership and making Queensland the Smart State.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Goodwill Bridge

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.42 a.m.), by leave: On Sunday, 21 October the Minister for State Development, Tom Barton, and I joined thousands of other Queenslanders—on foot, bicycles and rollerblades and in wheelchairs and prams—for the official opening of and first walk across the Goodwill Bridge. I always believed, as did my government, that people would enjoy the bridge once it was opened, but even I was pleasantly surprised by the feeling and the turnout on the day. Organisers estimate that between 15,000 and 20,000 people crossed the bridge on that first day. As members can imagine, my government and I are delighted.

Since its opening the bridge has proven very popular. I am able to see it from the window of my office in the Executive Building. I see a very steady, consistent stream of people who love the Goodwill Bridge. I am confident that more and more people will use this bridge each day. I am

pleased to say that that confidence is shared by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. On the John Miller program on 4BC last Tuesday, 23 October, the honourable member said—

The bridge is completed now. It looks damn good and a lot of people will certainly use it.

I could not agree more. The very first people to walk across the bridge were a lovely family from Banyo who won a competition to join Tom and me for the first journey. Ten-year-old Travis Cole actually put in the competition entry on behalf of his family—his mother, Hayley Cole, his stepfather, Rob Pennycuick, and his sisters Amy, 15, and Ruby, 1. That family lives in the electorate of the honourable member for Nudgee. I know that he would appreciate that.

At the opening were people from Bicycle Queensland, rollerbladers Blade Sensations, the Playgroup Association of Queensland Inc., youth groups, the Queensland Council of Carers and John Holland Group construction workers and their families, amongst others. The celebrations that Sunday were a fantastic way to welcome Brisbane's first bridge dedicated to pedestrians and cyclists, which has enhanced Brisbane's reputation as one of the most livable cities in the world.

The bridge really is a magnificent structure—fitting for our capital city and the beautiful Brisbane River. The bridge is 450 metres long and 6.5 metres wide. During construction, 900 tonnes of structural steel and 3,300 cubic metres of structural concrete were used. The foundation is 30 metres below river level, the top mast is 30 metres above river level and there is a 13-metre clearance for river traffic. The bridge design has three distinct parts: the pier, the arch and the rampart. Seating is provided along the bridge, and the deck incorporates a lightweight canopy structure at intervals to provide weather protection. Security features include lights and cameras. I table a Goodwill Bridge fact sheet for the benefit of all members of the House. That sheet contains all of this information and more.

Later in the afternoon of 21 October Grant Hackett won the bridge to bridge swim, between Victoria Bridge and the Goodwill Bridge. He was competing against people such as world No. 1 triathlete Loretta Harrop and 73-year-old masters swimmer Stan Jacobs. Hopefully this will become an annual event. I will speak to the South Bank Corporation about it.

Tom Barton and I began the day by opening the latest exhibition of the Maritime Museum. *Cross Currents* reveals the colourful history of the crossing of the Brisbane River—from the first Aboriginal canoes to City Cats, construction of bridges and the toll of floods. It is fantastic to see the museum with a new lease of life and I urge members to take the time to visit the newly renovated premises.

The cost of the bridge project did increase when we made necessary design modifications early in the process. Firstly, the pier from QUT was substantially redesigned to allow an easier gradient to improve disabled access, beyond national standards. The angle between the pier and the main arch path is more acute as a result of these changes. Secondly, there was a delay as final bridge engineering techniques were agreed upon. A lot of work was done between the designers, the construction engineers and the supervising engineer on the point at which the arch meets the pathway. We wanted to ensure that it could be erected effectively and that the joints were adequate to manage the stress. There were minor alterations which involved some additional costs. This delay created an additional cost burden, as construction contractors were kept in place to be ready when design had been finalised. This is an innovative design. When you deal with something a little different, you have to be prepared to be a bit flexible. We wanted an imaginative and attractive bridge that would become an icon in our capital city—and that is exactly what we have. We are delighted with the outcome.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Numberplates

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.46 a.m.), by leave: Queensland will be driving home its message that it is on the move as Australia's Smart State by introducing new registration plates for vehicles by the end of the year. The plates will spread the message 'Queensland—The Smart State' in maroon numbers and letters on a white reflective background. The idea for the change came from a member of the public, but it embraces this state's commitment to the Smart State.

It would be only fair to describe broader public reaction as mixed. Many support the new slogan, but some have argued to retain the old words 'Queensland—Sunshine State'. In a spirit of compromise, this morning I announce that the 'Queensland—Sunshine State' slogan will be available to any Queensland Transport customer on request. This means that Queenslanders will

have a choice of slogan for their numberplates. Maroon, the Queensland state colour, will be standard on new numberplates. As planned, these changes will take effect from later this year. The numberplates will initially be available for new vehicle registrations and as replacements for plates that have deteriorated.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: We will make Queensland the Smart State. Notwithstanding the rabble opposite, Queensland will become the Smart State. I believe that Queenslanders will strongly identify with the new maroon colour and the message. It is about Queensland—about our strengths, our triumphs and our future. The change is about looking into the future. Queensland has much more to offer than sunshine. Being a Smart State is about doing things smarter. There are new possibilities in information technology and biotechnology and in working smarter in all other industries. There are possibilities to do things smarter in every endeavour we undertake—whether it be smarter management of our farms or our environment, smarter workplaces, smarter manufacturing processes or smarter ways to run a taxi or any other business, including construction, tourism and so on.

By working to do everything smarter, we maximise our chances of creating long-term jobs for our kids. We need to value our innovation and education. This is about jobs for our children and our grandchildren.

The move from the Sunshine State will not change how Queensland is perceived. We have an international and national reputation as the state of sunshine and that will not change. This is still the place to get the warmest welcome and to have fun in the sun. That reputation is established; our challenge now is to cement our growing reputation as the Smart State, to attract investment here from New South Wales and Victoria. My Government set out in 1998 to turn Queensland into the Smart State and we have come a long way down that road. We now have an international reputation as being Australia's Smart State, especially in terms of biotechnology and information technology. We want to extend that to all industries.

Queensland is innovative and energetic, with exciting employment opportunities and sound economic initiatives. Many Queensland businesses have taken up the Smart State challenge and are ensuring that they are adopting the latest technologies to improve their competitiveness. We have been looking at ways to reinforce our Smart State theme and these new plates provide the perfect opportunity to drive home our message that Queensland is the Smart State. Queenslanders in time will be just as proud of our Smart State reputation as they are of our magnificent maroon-clad Brisbane Lions, Rugby League Maroons and the Broncos, the Rugby Reds and Queensland Bulls cricket champions.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Honda Indy 300

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (9.52 a.m.), by leave: The 2001 Honda Indy 300 has been successfully run and won and I am pleased to inform the House that this year's event is the most successful ever. It will be a little while before all the figures can be tallied but CART chief executive, Joe Heitzler, has already confirmed that the crowd of 286,610 who attended over the four days of this year's event is the largest ever for a CART event anywhere in the world. The race day crowd of 110,187 easily eclipsed last year's figure of 107,785. In fact the numbers were higher for every day: 48,014 on Thursday, compared to 41,447 last year; 53,551 on Friday, compared to 50,778 last year; and 74,858 on Saturday, compared to 69,880 last year. That is a total increase of 16,720 on the 2000 event. These are amazing figures, especially given the inclement weather conditions which may have kept some spectators away from the practice rounds on Friday. However, we were blessed with brilliant weather for the rest of the carnival and both the Premier and I were lucky enough to join thousands of spectators trackside for all the action and atmosphere over the weekend.

As per usual there were plenty of thrills and spills to keep the record crowds entertained. In fact, it was almost impossible to keep up with all the action. Up in the sky there was the aerial aerobatics and precision of the roulettes, F-111s and F-18s. Trackside there were stalls and entertainers scattered everywhere around the site keeping the crowds amused with musical and artistic performances. And then of course there was all the action on the track. It truly is an amazing sight to see these cars racing at speeds of up to 300 kilometres an hour less than 10 metres from where you stand. My congratulations to Brazilian Cristiano da Matta and the

Newman-Haas racing team for their success in this year's Honda Indy 300. The race has now been run 11 times and there have been 11 different winners. Congratulations also to fellow Brazilian, Gil de Ferran who clinched his second successive Fedex series championship with his fourth placing. And of course I cannot forget Garth Tander who took the chequered flag in the V8 Supercar challenge.

Everyone involved, including all the teams, drivers and CART officials deserve a huge pat on the back for making this event such a stunning success. Particular credit must be given to Geoff Jones and his entire team who organise and run this event and also the 1,400 volunteers without whom the race could not be held. The Gold Coast race is the Indy calendar stand-out. Race drivers and officials love coming here. They acknowledge that the track is the best street circuit in the world, and they love the laid-back Queensland lifestyle. Joe Heitzler was so impressed that he wants a new five-year deal for the Gold Coast to host the race. Those negotiations have now started. After Sunday's exciting finale he said, 'I think every race promoter ought to come here and get tutored on how to run a race and how to run an event. What impresses me most is how the state government, private enterprise and everyone involved works together to make this event the absolute best.' Last year, the four days triggered economic benefits for Queensland estimated at \$46 million. This year, it will be over \$50 million.

However the exposure for the Gold Coast and Queensland really is invaluable. How can we put a dollar value on the images of the Gold Coast being beamed to an audience of more than 700 million people worldwide? There is absolutely no doubt that the Indy carnival brings an undeniable energy and excitement to Queensland. It has grown to become one of the most popular and spectacular events in the country and the Beattie government is proud to play a part in its success.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Jinibara State School; Mr J. Dale

Hon. A. M. BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Minister for Education) (9.55 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker, as members will be aware, an unfortunate incident occurred at Jinibara State School at Narangba last Thursday involving a student and the Deputy Principal of the school. Deputy Principal John Dale is now in a critical condition in hospital. Our thoughts and the thoughts of Queensland's entire education community are with John Dale and his family at this very difficult time. Education Queensland has given an undertaking to the deputy principal's family to protect his privacy and will do everything possible to respect their wishes at this time.

Education Queensland is investigating the matter and is cooperating with Queensland police, who are also investigating the incident. It is therefore not appropriate to comment further on the deputy principal's medical condition, to speculate on circumstances surrounding the incident, or reach any conclusions about the matter.

Guidance officers and counsellors worked closely with the school last week and will continue to be available as they are needed. Professional counselling and support have also been offered to the student and his family. The student is currently on suspension pending the outcome of Education Queensland's investigation and the police investigation.

Every teacher and every student in every school is entitled to a safe and supportive environment. I am determined to ensure that the investigations into this matter will not only shed light on the circumstances surrounding this tragic incident but will also help us to improve the safety of our schools in the future.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

TAFE Queensland

Hon. M. J. FOLEY (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Employment, Training and Youth and Minister for the Arts) (9.57 a.m.), by leave: TAFE Queensland is a leader in the development of the Smart State. Providing high quality training for Queenslanders has been and will remain a top priority for the Beattie Labor government. It is vital for jobs and a lifeline for industry. Unlike coalition governments, we are listening to the needs of working people and the communities they serve. A significant element in this has been the revitalisation of TAFE Queensland, which has remained a high priority of the Beattie government since we came to office in July 1998. We are totally committed to TAFE Queensland as the primary provider of quality training and skills for Queenslanders.

Unlike our predecessors, we believe that TAFE Queensland, through the 16 institutes across the state, has a special role to play in the development of skills for Queenslanders and local communities. That is why we broadened the community base of institute councils. We recognised that there must be a close relationship between institutes and the communities they serve. The institute councils have played a major role in shaping TAFE Queensland's interaction with industry and communities. That success prompted a review of the structure of the board of TAFE Queensland itself. The board presently consists of the directors of the 16 institutes.

I am pleased to announce today a new structure for the board of TAFE Queensland which I believe will deliver better results for the people of Queensland. The new board will consist of four chairs of institute boards, two institute directors and the Director-General of the Department of Employment and Training. I am delighted to inform the House that the new chair of the board of TAFE Queensland is Donna-Maree O'Connor, Chair of the Tropical North Queensland Institute of TAFE in Cairns. Ms O'Connor has considerable experience in public and local administration. She is joined on the new board by Brisbane businessman, Darrell Butcher, Chair of the Northpoint Institute; former mayor of Emerald Counsellor Paul Bell, Chair of Central Queensland Institute; and Bill Yarrow, retired entomologist, former President of the Queensland Professional Officers' Association and Chair of the Yeronga Institute. In addition, two institute directors and Ken Smith, Director-General of the Department of Employment and Training, will make up the board.

The new board is representative of both regional and metropolitan Queensland, of institutes of all sizes and of communities that they serve. I have every confidence that the new board will make a significant contribution to the strategic direction of TAFE Queensland. They will ensure that this great institution, which has touched the lives of hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders, will play an even more important role in the future skilling of Queensland and in the transition of young Queenslanders from school to work.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Violence Against Nurses

Hon. W. M. EDMOND (Mount Coot-tha-ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister Assisting the Premier on Women's Policy) (10.00 a.m.), by leave: Aggressive behaviour towards nursing staff is increasingly reported as a problem, and violence against nurses in the workplace has become a significant issue. In fact, it is estimated that occupational violence will occur at least once during the working life of a nurse. Most commonly in the form of verbal abuse and threats, it is rarely exposed as physical violence. Obviously in some cases aggressive behaviour may be a manifestation of an underlying clinical condition.

Queensland Health has undertaken a range of initiatives, including the development of guidelines for the management of violence in the workplace. Those guidelines are currently being finalised. The Professional Assault Response Training program is already in place in many Queensland Health facilities. This involves training packages to ensure that staff know how to respond when violence occurs or is threatened, and assists staff to identify risky situations and, where possible, how to diffuse them. We are also improving security around hospital buildings, for example, by installing duress alarms along with closed circuit television and monitoring in areas of high need like acute mental health facilities.

In addition, I was pleased recently to have the opportunity to take part in the launch of what I regard as a very important campaign. The QNU's 'Zero Tolerance to Violence' is enthusiastically supported by Queensland Health because it recognises the importance of providing a safe workplace for our nurses and maintaining the highest quality of care for our patients. It raises awareness, firstly, in the community, that violence towards nurses and other health care staff is not and will not be considered acceptable behaviour, and secondly, among our staff, that accepting violence should not be tolerated as part of the nurses' role. We place great value on our nurses and, indeed, on all our health care staff, and Queensland Health is committed to maintaining a safe environment for them to work in.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Comalco Alumina Refinery, Gladstone

Hon. T. A. BARTON (Waterford-ALP) (Minister for State Development) (10.03 a.m.), by leave: Queensland businesses will now have the opportunity to bid for hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contracts following Comalco Ltd's decision to proceed with its first stage \$1.5 billion

alumina refinery in central Queensland. Comalco's decision to proceed with this significant project will open the way for industry, not just in central Queensland but throughout the state, to bid for work. The job opportunities that will flow on from this project, which will include opportunities for both medium and small businesses, are substantial. In a direct sense, Comalco has said up to 1500 people will be employed directly on site during the construction phase of the refinery, with more than 400 jobs directly associated with the refinery operations expected to be created.

Earlier this year Comalco decided it would switch from importing modular components for the plant to a construction plan using up to 80 per cent local content, which will also ensure job spin-offs for Queensland engineering and supply firms. Comalco had been working with the Queensland Government funded ISO on the sourcing of materials for the project. The ISO is a government-funded group designed to assist projects to identify competitive local supply capabilities. Following discussions between the ISO and Comalco, the company has committed to ensure that appropriate opportunities for local industry participation, job creation, skill development and local infrastructure development are provided. After working with the ISO, Comalco had identified requirements for components that must be imported, where components can be sourced either locally or offshore and where local suppliers can be used for sourcing materials.

Comalco has said work will commence later this year, with large-scale construction starting next year, with initial shipments from the new refinery expected in the first quarter of 2005. Comalco and its project contractor, Bechtel, will hold regional briefings on business opportunities later this year. As I have previously said, the go-ahead by Comalco is significant not only for central Queensland but for businesses throughout the state. After working at Queensland Alumina Ltd—in which Comalco has a substantial holding—as an instrument fitter back in 1969 and 1970, I know how important Rio Tinto's decision is to the future of this state. Further, I believe the Comalco decision will be a catalyst for further development of the region and will promote Gladstone's position as one of Australia's leading industrial port hubs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Queensland Rail, Apprenticeships and Traineeships

Hon. S. D. BREDHAUER (Cook-ALP) (Minister for Transport and Minister for Main Roads) (10.06 a.m.), by leave: In October 1998, not long after coming into office, the Beattie Labor government launched the Breaking the Unemployment Cycle initiative as a major element of its commitment to reducing unemployment in Queensland. Through this initiative, Queensland Rail has an active apprenticeship and traineeship program. The intake of apprentices in QR over the past three years totals nearly 270. The majority of these apprentices have been in the engineering and building environments.

For the 2002 year there is an identified need for 35 new apprenticeships throughout the QR organisation. Importantly, about 60 per cent of those will be in regional Queensland. Additionally, QR has employed approximately 280 trainees to date, with a further 80 expected to commence during the current financial year. Funding for those traineeships is made possible by the Breaking the Unemployment Cycle initiative, which statewide has helped 28,000 Queenslanders find apprenticeships, traineeships and job placements. QR offers traineeships in areas such as office administration, horticulture, information technology, warehousing, cleaning operations, water management and engineering.

Regional development is an important priority of this government. That development is supported by QR's traineeships program, ensuring that positions are available throughout the state. This year placements are expected to be made in Brisbane, Redbank, Maryborough, Rockhampton, Gladstone, Mackay, Townsville, Cairns, Emerald and Toowoomba. As well as the apprenticeship and traineeship programs, it is important to understand that there are many other initiatives being conducted within QR which are designed to further 'unlock the potential of its people'. These include leadership and management development programs, driver simulation training, literacy and numeracy training, and training to enhance QR's skills in customer service and hospitality. The latter is very relevant to Queensland's tourism industry.

The future wellbeing of Queensland will rely heavily on a committed, flexible and skilled work force within all sectors of the economy. One of the best ways to develop such a work force and to get the best response from people is to give them the training they need to do their job well. This

government has a number of key priorities for this state. They include providing more jobs for Queenslanders—particularly our young people—skilling Queensland, building Queensland's regions, a better quality of life, and providing strong government leadership.

These commitments are clearly supported by QR's activities associated with providing apprenticeships and traineeships. All the initiatives that I have just described are paying dividends, not just to QR's employees and QR but to the public at large. As a result of QR's and the government's efforts, QR is able to provide a very professional and efficient service to all its customers, whether they be passengers on Citytrain or Traveltrain, or whether they are shipping a small parcel or millions of tonnes of coal. Customers are responding and, as a result, QR's business is growing.

One very clear example of QR's success is provided by its Citytrain activities where, despite worldwide trends against public transport usage, QR has been successful in growing patronage by 5.4 per cent in 2000-01 over the previous year. This represents an extra 2.3 million commuters on public transport and, importantly, commensurate reductions in congestion and pollution and an increase in transport safety. In addition, the on-time performance of the Citytrain services in the last quarter of the 2000-01 year reached 96.4 per cent.

In QR's Traveltrain business group during the same period, growth of 3.8 per cent over the previous year has been achieved. This represents an additional 39,922 passengers being carried on QR's long distance train services. These outcomes can only improve the high quality of life we Queenslanders already enjoy.

This government will continue to focus on developing a skilled and enthusiastic work force to support the economic growth and development of Queensland. It will do so by providing strong leadership of, and meaningful employment and training programs within, its instrumentalities. This will be done in the context of enhancing economic efficiency, an acute awareness by government of maintaining a sound social fabric, and focusing on a better quality of life for the people of Queensland.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Alternative Dispute Resolution

Hon. R. J. WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.09 a.m.), by leave: I am pleased to inform the House of an important development in the delivery of justice, which is allowing more and more Queenslanders to maintain ownership of their dispute and to save time and money. Our government's support for the alternative dispute resolution—or mediation process—is helping people settle disputes without going to court.

I am pleased to advise members that the number of mediations conducted in the past financial year almost doubled, with an exceptionally high success rate. More than 2,300 mediations were an increase of over 70 per cent over the 1,278 mediations conducted in the year 1999-2000. Between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of non-court mediations reach agreement and because the parties work out the settlement themselves, their commitment to that solution is usually strong.

An important factor in this growth and success has been the introduction of an innovative process called abbreviated mediation to the Small Claims Tribunal and minor debts court. Magistrates and court staff have strongly supported this initiative and report positive outcomes, such as client satisfaction and workload reduction for the courts.

Mediation services for Queensland are provided through six dispute resolution centres located in Brisbane, Wide Bay, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville, and Cairns. A wide range of disputes are suitable for mediation, including neighbourhood disputes, workplace disputes, commercial matters, family conflict, large public interest disputes and facilitations for management committees and social clubs. The mediation process provides an invaluable preventive measure for disputing parties. Mediators act as a neutral third party and guide parties through a structured mediation process. The people in dispute discuss their differences and sort out a solution that suits them both—a win-win outcome. Whatever the criteria used—the number of mediation sessions, the percentage of agreements reached or compliance with those agreements—there is no question that this process is making a strong contribution to the delivery of justice throughout our state. The mediation process is undoubtedly successful in resolving a wide range of disputes speedily and inexpensively.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Disability Services Budget

Hon. J. C. SPENCE (Mount Gravatt—ALP) (Minister for Families and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy and Minister for Disability Services) (10.12 a.m.), by leave: Support for people with disabilities in Queensland is an area which has seen dramatic funding boosts and policy reforms over the past three years. Recurrent funding for new initiatives has increased by more than \$50 million and we have made capital allocations of \$10.2 million, including spending on new respite services. In just a decade, the non-government disability sector has moved from receiving just a few million dollars from the state to receiving more than 60 per cent of the \$304 million budget of Disability Services Queensland. We have pledged to increase the budget by \$60.8 million in this term and made a commitment to revisit this at every budget.

Queenslanders with disabilities have their own department and agencies across the Government have demonstrated commitments to inclusion. But we know we have a good way to go with the level of need well in excess of the service delivery capacity. I am pleased to announce that Disability Services Queensland is embarking on a funding reform strategy that will help map the way forward in meeting this need and ensure that the Disability Services budget is spent in a way that better supports people with disabilities.

One of the most pressing issues it will place under the microscope is the viability, or sustainability, of non-government service providers. As I have said, NGOs receive more than 60 per cent of the Disability Services budget. About half the NGO grants go to six big organisations: the Endeavour Foundation, the Cerebral Palsy League, Uniting Care, Centacare, Multicap and the Cootharinga Society of North Queensland. For some services, government funding supplements income raised from elsewhere and volunteers are the human resources backbone.

As we saw with the crisis in Endeavour last year, factors including a shrinking fundraising base can put even the state's biggest disability service provider in jeopardy. In line with an election commitment, a key element of the funding reform strategy will be working with services to gain a clear picture of their financial affairs so that we can better plan for the future of the non-government sector. A better response to sector viability issues requires a close partnership between government and the sector. I have been very impressed by the professionalism of sector members, many of whom have already shown enthusiasm for this project. While these organisations are the substrate of an effective disability sector, the consumers of government and non-government services are the people for whom the strategy is being implemented. The main aim is more and better support for people with disabilities and their families.

I have recently signed off on three major individualised funding program rounds: family support for the families of children with disabilities; Moving Ahead for school leavers; and Adult Lifestyle Support, tailored support packages helping people with disabilities to live in the community. Following this funding round, we will have more than 400 families, 340 young adult school leavers and about 1,000 adults receiving individualised funding. A focus of this strategy will be refining the links between the different programs so that people with disabilities have a smoother pathway through life.

While funded services deliver vital support for many Queenslanders, we cannot forget that the primary source of support for many people with disabilities remains families and friends. Parents, be their children school aged or in their fifties, frequently ask me about the future of their sons and daughters. It is my hope that the results of the funding reform strategy will give these tireless carers some peace of mind. Many of the challenges to be tackled under this strategy involve approaches from across government and I thank ministers whose departments have agreed to cooperate with Disability Services Queensland. These departments include the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Queensland Treasury and Queensland Health and will form a coordinating committee with Disability Services Queensland. To formally engage the sector, Disability Services Queensland will also form a steering committee with members of the non-government sector. The department will keep the community informed of progress through consultation and regular communication.

It would be remiss of me not to report back to the House on a matter I raised here some months ago. On 29 May 2001, I raised the alarm over the federal government's failure to include in its forward estimates funding for a promise it made last year. The result of this failure would be a \$248.9 million reduction in federal funding for Australians with disabilities over three years. Five months have passed since I wrote to Senator Amanda Vanstone, the responsible minister, seeking an assurance that the funding would be provided. I have not yet received a response.

Hopefully, with 12 days to go in the federal campaign, Senator Vanstone has not forgotten about people with a disability.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mr R. G. Reynolds

Hon. H. PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Minister for Primary Industries and Rural Communities) (10.17 a.m.), by leave: Last week, the Department of Primary Industries family mourned the sudden and tragic loss of one of its most distinguished members. Russell Gordon Reynolds was general manager in the department's Policy Analysis and Industry Development Division. Mr Reynolds, fondly and universally known as Russ, died on Monday afternoon. He was aged 49 years. I was honoured to be invited to speak at his funeral service on Friday.

As minister, I had the opportunity to work closely with Russ Reynolds. He was dedicated to his family, his friends, his colleagues, and to our state. Our thoughts are with Russ's wife, Marie, and his daughter, Siobhain. We are richer for his time with us and we are now poorer for his untimely passing. Vale Russ Reynolds.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Regional Centres Program

Hon. J. I. CUNNINGHAM (Bundaberg—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Planning) (10.17 a.m.), by leave: As a former Mayor of Bundaberg, I know how important it is for regional towns and cities to have an attractive city heart, not just for the sake of visitors but also for the sake of civic pride. I also know how difficult it can be for councils to find the money to create and maintain an attractive CBD when they are faced with the competing demands for ratepayers' dollars. So it always gives me great pleasure to see the real difference that funding from the state government can make when it comes to helping councils pump new life into their town heart.

The Regional Centres Program is an initiative of the Beattie Labor government that is having a significant impact on towns and cities around the state. This government has allocated \$50 million over three years to the program, which subsidises local councils with populations of more than 15,000 people to help them improve social and economic infrastructure in regional centres. Coupled with matching amounts from councils and community groups, the Regional Centres Program will create a \$100 million boost to Queensland's regions with the flow-on effects of creating jobs during the construction of these projects. The Regional Centres Program provides support for a wide range of infrastructure and community facilities, including the revitalisation of central business areas, tourism infrastructure, foreshore development in coastal areas, social and community facilities, and streetscaping.

Recently, I had the pleasure of inspecting progress on a number of these projects currently under way in regional centres throughout Queensland. Caboolture Shire Council is undertaking a project to provide physical infrastructure and streetscape improvements to rejuvenate Caboolture's central business district. That council has received final approval for a subsidy under the Regional Centres Program of more than \$1.56 million for stage 1 of the project, which is expected to cost \$5.13 million in total. Last month I officially opened stage 2 of Maroochy Shire Council's Urban Improvement Strategy. This is a \$2.4 million project, to which this government provided half of the funding.

I have also inspected works in progress or had the pleasure of officially opening projects from north Queensland to the Gold Coast. I have seen first-hand projects at Innisfail, on the Gold Coast, Kingaroy, Hervey Bay, Redcliffe, Beaudesert, Townsville, Thuringowa, Burnett and Bundaberg. The feedback I receive about this program, wherever I am in the State, is the same. This is a program that is making a real difference to communities right around Queensland. The Regional Centres Program is not only helping councils provide improved infrastructure and facilities for their residents but it is also helping to give Queenslanders a greater sense of pride in their local community.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Code of Ethical Practice in Biotechnology

Hon. P. T. LUCAS (Lytton—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Information Economy) (10.20 a.m.), by leave: The Smart State is about safe, ethical science. I would like to inform the

House about the steps the Beattie government is taking to ensure the Queensland public can have the maximum confidence in the integrity and soundness of Biotechnology Innovation in the Smart State.

Yesterday, I visited Toowoomba company Pacific Seeds. This company is the first private sector company to voluntarily subscribe to the Code of Ethical Practice in Biotechnology in Queensland. This code took effect in September, and it is the first of its kind in Australia. The code will enable this government to protect the interests of all Queenslanders by imposing strict guidelines for biotechnology and development.

Eighty-nine biotechnology organisations are legally bound by the code. These include all Queensland agencies, research centres, laboratories and public hospitals. If those companies breach the code they will have their funding cut. Private sector organisations in Queensland are being invited to voluntarily subscribe to the code, to demonstrate their commitment to ethical research. Pacific Seeds is the first of these companies to sign. At its Toowoomba site, the company is using GMO research to investigate herbicide tolerance in canola. The company has a licensing deal to increase tolerance in this crop, in order to improve yield for farmers and producers.

The government is in the process of establishing a public register to identify other private sector organisations that may voluntarily subscribe to the code, which will be published on my department's web site. Once they subscribe, those organisations will report annually to my department on biotechnology activities undertaken at an organisational level. They will also have to provide advice on instances where compliance with the code or any related regulatory instrument has not been achieved, and the measures taken to address the matter.

The code is in addition to the Gene Technology Act, which becomes law on 1 November. Queensland will be the first mainland state to legislate to ensure risks associated with gene technology are managed through regulation in the Smart State. The legislation will impose strict controls on genetically modified organisms, and failure to comply with the legislation may attract prison terms of up to five years, and fines of more than \$1 million. This government is about action, not words, and it is taking initiatives to balance the economic benefits of biotechnology, with our social and ethical responsibilities to the people of Queensland and the world.

QUEENSLAND PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE

Annual Report

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I lay upon the table of the House the annual report of the Queensland Parliamentary Service 2000-01.

SCRUTINY OF LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Report

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (10.23 a.m.): I lay upon the table of the House the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's *Alert Digest No. 7, 2001* and move that it be printed.

Ordered to be printed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Numberplates

Mr HORAN (Toowoomba South—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.23 a.m.): Today we saw a monumental backflip of Beazley-like proportions when the Premier came in here, obviously distressed about the numberplate issue. He said that now people can have a Smart State numberplate or a Sunshine State numberplate. It is a real flip-flop and a total backflip. As soon as he received the mixed reaction, he went to jelly. However, I have never seen a mixed reaction that was so one sided. Everybody in this state is proud to be a Queenslanders and is proud to be a part of the Sunshine State. We are proud that our lifestyle and climate attract people to the state; we are proud that our lifestyle and climate attract tourism to the state and that they give jobs to people.

The big issue is that people are sick of the arrogance of this government and they are sick of a premier who wants to impose his Labor government's slogan on people's numberplates. That is

what it is all about. It is the subtle use of taxpayers' money to put across the slogan that the government is running this year.

He should have put '5 per cent unemployment' on the numberplates. How would that be? That is another issue on which the government is only half smart. Now we will have a half smart numberplate system, where some people will have 'The Smart State' and some will have 'The Sunshine State' on their numberplates, because the Premier has gone to jelly after he received a mixed reaction on the issue.

We have the worst unemployment figures in Australia and it has been like that for 16 months. How smart is that? It costs us \$24 million to build a \$12 million bridge. How smart was that? The computers do not work properly in Parliament House. How smart is that? In the last financial year, we had an operating loss of \$820 million. How smart is that? Why would you turn your back on the greatest marketing slogan ever invented: the Sunshine State? That slogan has brought so much credit to Queensland and so much opportunity to our great tourism industry. To turn your back on the Sunshine State is not smart; it is stupid.

Time expired.

Daylight Saving

Mrs SMITH (Burleigh—ALP) (10.25 a.m.): I would like to address the issue of daylight saving. Every since being elected, I and the other Gold Coast Labor members have been hounded by the local media on this issue. My seat of Burleigh is the second most southern electorate in Queensland. Only my esteemed colleague Merri Rose has an electorate more affected by this issue. Recently, the *Gold Coast Bulletin* ran a phone poll on daylight saving and claimed that 82 per cent of Gold Coasters were in favour of it. The president of the Robina Chamber of Commerce also claimed that the chamber's poll proved that 80 per cent of people wanted daylight saving. Neither of those parties has seen fit to publish the actual number of respondents to their surveys nor, in the case of the Chamber of Commerce, how the information was obtained.

Not wishing to rely on either of those sources for information, I decided to ask the people myself. I wanted to know if, as I have been led to believe, it really is such a burning issue on the Gold Coast. Recently I sent out 17,000 surveys in my electorate to find out what people really thought was important to them and their families. I also provided a reply-paid address so that it would cost the respondent nothing to reply.

One of the questions was, 'Are you in favour of daylight saving?' Less than one per cent of householders responded. Of the 131 who did respond to the survey, 74 people were in favour and 57 were against daylight saving. Perhaps a lot more telling than the fact that only 56 per cent of respondents were in favour is that 16,869 did not feel strongly enough to respond. While I agree that being on a different time zone from New South Wales can make things difficult for some businesses, I would suggest that daylight saving is an issue of concern to fewer Gold Coast residents than the *Gold Coast Bulletin* would have us believe. I have the surveys or lack of them—

Time expired.

Scrutiny of Legislation Committee Annual Report

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (10.27 a.m.): I rise to speak to the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's annual report, which was tabled during the last sitting of parliament. In particular, I draw members' attention to page 1 of the report where it sets out quite clearly that, as there is no second house of review of legislation in this state, it is the committee's responsibility to examine draft legislation and ensure that it has sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals and the institution of parliament.

I take members to page 3 of the report where it refers to 79 bills that the committee reported on. However, the content of the 79 bills that were reported on in parliament was limited to the substance of the bills as existed at the time that the ministers made their second reading speeches. The committee did not have the opportunity to report on the possible implications of the hundreds of amendments that ministers introduced during later stages of the debates. I believe that if this parliament wants to be fair dinkum about having the committee genuinely consider the implications of draft legislation, the parliament must be prepared to give the committee powers to investigate the implications of ministers' amendments and not just a minister's first draft of a proposed bill.

I am proud to be a member of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee and believe that, over successive governments, this committee has built a solid reputation as an effective and independent non-political watchdog. Often during debate on draft legislation, members from both sides of the political fence make reference to committee recommendations in support of their respective arguments. I believe that this parliament can do better in relation to the independent scrutiny of minister's amendments to draft legislation, and this is why I again place my motion in relation to the committee's consideration of ministers' amendments back on the *Notice Paper*.

I initially put this motion on the *Notice Paper* early so that members had the time to form an opinion on this important matter before its debate. Unfortunately, the sessional orders in their present form do not encourage or support the early notification of motions. Accordingly, I urge the government to commence the review of the sessional orders, as I believe that the current sessional orders can be improved.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The time for private members' statements has expired.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Royal Brisbane Hospital, Bone Marrow Transplant Unit

Mr HORAN (10.30 a.m.): I refer the Premier to the fact that some leukaemia sufferers in Queensland are being told that they will have to wait up to six months for potentially lifesaving bone marrow transplant surgery because of underused bed capacity and a lack of resources at the state's only public transplant unit at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, and I ask: has his Health Minister informed him of this situation and is he prepared to intervene so that this unit can operate to its full lifesaving capacity?

Mr BEATTIE: The answer is yes, she has. All bone marrow transplant patients are constantly monitored and treatment is scheduled according to clinical need. Unfortunately, there is difficulty obtaining the highly specialised nursing staff required to provide the necessary care in this area. Royal Brisbane Hospital identified the nursing shortage and recruitment problems in early July, and in response a number of strategies are being implemented to address this shortage. These include skills enhancement of local staff, sponsorship of expert nursing staff from overseas, and extensive recruitment strategies, including Internet advertising. While some new graduates have been recruited to work in this area, this has to be carefully planned to ensure that the staff receive the appropriate education and support and that the quality of service is maintained.

Clearly, this is a very sensitive and important issue. The minister and I will continue to monitor it. As many honourable members would know, my wife lectures in nurse education at the Australian Catholic University. The whole issue of nursing recruitment and the skilling of the work force is an ongoing issue and challenge both for Queensland and the rest of Australia—indeed, not just here but also overseas. I know that efforts are being made by all involved in Queensland Health not only to enhance those skills but also to do everything possible to ensure that quality staff are available. This is a serious issue. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that we will be doing everything we can to assist those who are in need of these services.

Royal Brisbane Hospital, Bone Marrow Transplant Unit

Mr HORAN: I refer the Minister for Health to the fact that a group of leukaemia sufferers were told that they would have to wait up to six months for potentially lifesaving bone marrow transplant surgery at Queensland's only public transplant facility at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. These people—some of whom are in the gallery today—have approached the opposition because their pleas for assistance have fallen on deaf ears in the department. I ask: will the minister give these Queensland leukaemia sufferers and this parliament an assurance that she will take immediate steps to have all beds at this Royal Brisbane Hospital lifesaving facility opened to capacity and provide urgent reassessment of these individual cases?

Mrs EDMOND: Once again, we see the Leader of the Opposition trying to trifle with people's lives and engage in political point scoring out of what is a serious illness. The people who are having treatment at the Royal Brisbane Hospital are being carefully monitored. Their treatment programs are determined by their clinical conditions. The priority that they get in those treatment programs is determined by their clinical conditions and they are assessed by the doctors involved, not by politicians—not by you, mate, and not by me. It is not appropriate for the Leader of the Opposition to intervene and direct where services should go. It is not as a result of a funding

issue, as he keeps saying, but there is a shortfall of nurses. This is not only a Queensland issue; this is an issue right around the world, and not just for nursing but also for other related areas, such as radiation therapy services.

In New South Wales, I understand they have seven linear accelerators that are not being used to treat cancer patients because they cannot get radiation therapists. In Queensland, luckily because of the strategies I have put in place and the programs I have set up, we do not have a vacancy for radiation therapists as of now. That has been a significant achievement.

We are working on the nursing shortage. My understanding is that we have had positive responses from overseas and from graduate nurses. The instant it is safe and we are able to open extra beds at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, that will happen. But in the meantime, patients need to be assured and patients need to have confidence in the clinical decisions of their doctors and the fact that they are being monitored carefully. If there is a need for them to have their bone marrow transplant before other people, that will happen. But it will not happen because the Leader of the Opposition has scored cheap political points. It will not happen because the Leader of the Opposition is trying to intervene in the clinical process.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the member for Bulimba, I welcome to the public gallery students and teachers from the Ballandean State School in the electorate of Southern Downs.

Queensland Ballet

Mr PURCELL: I note that this government is an active supporter of the arts, with funding and wider support for a range of activities. I am particularly interested in the Queensland Ballet's plans for the coming season, and I ask the Premier: could he advise the House of the ballet's contribution to our cultural infrastructure and the role it plays in developing our young talent, and the level of government support for the company?

Mr BEATTIE: As we all know, the member for Bulimba is a very keen supporter of the ballet. I could not think of someone more appropriate in tights!

Later today, the Minister for the Arts, Matt Foley, and I will launch the Queensland Ballet's 2002 season of activities. As all honourable members would know, the Queensland government has been a long-term and longstanding major sponsor of the Queensland Ballet. That the Queensland Ballet employs more than 150 people and presented 84 performances of 20 separate dance works to an audience of 28,864 last year is a remarkable achievement. I congratulate the company on its astounding contribution to Queensland's expanding and increasingly sophisticated and mature cultural infrastructure.

The Queensland Ballet develops, promotes and performs dance, including classical ballet, of the highest international standard, both technically and artistically, in state, national and international arenas. In fact, I was interested to see that its program will be enhanced mid-year when performers from Germany, Canada and Western Australia converge on Brisbane as part of the Queensland Ballet 2001 international gala.

The Queensland Ballet 2002 season aims to include mainstream productions, an international gala, youth and education programs, festival events, an experimental program and state-wide touring. In 2001 the Queensland government will provide in excess of \$1.3 million to support the Queensland Ballet. I commend the company on its foresight and deep commitment to young people. It is encouraging to see such a prolific organisation thinking ahead to the future by nurturing dance excellence from a very early age. The Queensland Ballet is impressively proactive in giving young people a chance to pursue a career in ballet through its professional year program, the junior extension program, on-tour workshops and its association with the Queensland Dance School of Excellence. In 2001 the company has already staged 62 performances in Brisbane as well as touring throughout regional Queensland. It is a group of which we can all be justly proud, and I look forward to launching its season.

Mr Speaker, before I conclude, I also wish to join with you in welcoming students from the Ballandean State School. I saw them last week when I was at Wallangarra for a re-enactment, along with the local member, the member for Southern Downs. Ballandean was there and its choir performed, and there were also a number of other local schools there. There was also a re-enactment of Sir Henry Parkes' major Federation speech. All of the schools were there. They were magnificent. I am delighted to see those students here at Parliament House. They will find the performance here just as educational as that given last week.

Numberplates

Mr JOHNSON: I refer the Honourable Premier to his announcement on Sunday that he is turning Queensland numberplates into billboards for Labor Party slogans. He stated in his press release on Sunday that he had been looking at ways to reinforce his government's theme. Given his obsession with secrecy, I would like to present the Premier with this 'Queensland—The Secret State' personalised plate. In view of the negative public response to the numberplate change, I ask: will he now be perfectly clear about this and tell parliament what public consultation process he undertook before making this change?

Mr BEATTIE: If the member opposite does not think he is smart enough he can have his own personalised numberplate. I am relaxed about it. Let me tell honourable members about the Smart State and why it is so important. One of the things that my government has done is to attract Virgin Airlines here—another Smart State achievement. What are Virgin Airlines doing today? They are announcing additional services. They are announcing a new service from the Gold Coast to Melbourne and a second daily service from the Gold Coast to Sydney. We are delivering smart things to this state and we are going to continue to do it.

The Smart State is about jobs for tomorrow. It is not just about IT or biotechnology; it is about smarter ways to farm, it is about smarter ways to do things in the tourism industry, it is about smarter ways to hold events such as the Goodwill Games, it is about record crowds for major events, it is about smarter ways to do Indy and it is about smarter ways for this state to deliver the jobs of tomorrow.

Yes, we have made a decision to convert Queensland numberplates to 'The Smart State' and, more importantly, instead of being in National Party green they will be in Queensland maroon. I am delighted that we will be having Queensland maroon on numberplates. I am happy to be a supporter of the Maroons.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Let the National Party bleat and carry on over there. What a lot of rot. They can carry on all they like. Good heavens, they need someone smart over there. Bring Rob Borbidge back; he was smarter than this dribble.

Today I have said that from December, yes, there will be 'Smart State' numberplates for those who want them. If people choose, they can keep 'The Sunshine State'. Let me make it clear: this government wants the best for Queensland. I am determined—and so is my government—to do everything we can to get the jobs of tomorrow. I am prepared to do everything we can to persuade Queenslanders to my point of view. When we embarked on the Smart State I knew there would be troglodytes on the other side of the House who would resist because they are not interested in the smart jobs; they are not interested in the future—

Mr JOHNSON: I rise to a point of order. I asked the Premier about—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JOHNSON: I want the answer to the question. I have not had my question answered. I am asking about the consultation factor.

Mr BEATTIE: Let me make it clear: my government is determined to do everything that it can to make Queensland the Smart State. There is a role for dinosaurs in museums and other places, but we are determined to make—

Mr Foley interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Go Elliot! In terms of consultation, yes, the idea was suggested by a member of the public.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I always get bright suggestions. I listen to people. It was a very, very good idea.

Residential Services Accommodation Accreditation

Ms STRUTHERS: I refer the Premier to the fact that the standards in the private sector hostel and boarding house industry have been an ongoing concern for community groups and the Queensland government, and I ask: can he advise of plans to raise standards in the residential services sector?

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the honourable member for this question. This is a very important question. The honourable member is right; we are concerned about those standards. While there are many good operators, some others have delivered substandard accommodation and less than satisfactory service. The government has been working since 1998 to improve the standards and care in the sector and the quality of life of residents. We are currently drafting legislation to set standards and provide protection for residents. It will cover supported accommodation, boarding houses and aged persons' rental complexes. Our proposal to require them to be registered and accredited to operate has been welcomed by industry and also by community groups.

Legislation will consist of two bills, the residential services (accreditation) bill and the residential services (tenancy) bill. The accreditation bill, to be administered by the Department of Tourism, Racing and Fair Trading, proposes initial registration and accreditation requirements based on a continuous improvement framework, compliance and enforcement requirements and processes and processes for consumer complaints, as well as a provision for review and appeal of accreditation decisions and provisions for staged implementation. To be registered, operators will have to comply with minimum fire, physical building and management standards. Following registration they will seek accreditation.

Accreditation will consist of a cyclical process of self-assessment by a service provider; external assessment by an audit team comprising a departmental auditor, a peer assessor and a community/resident representative; assessment decision and quality improvement planning by the service provider; and continued monitoring by the accreditation body. Accreditation will be granted for a maximum of three years. The legislation will contain sanctions ranging from agreed corrective action and improvement orders through to the capacity to remove or refuse accreditation and close a premises. Decisions to cancel or refuse registration or accreditation will be appealable to the Queensland Building Tribunal.

The residential services (tenancy) bill, to be administered by the Residential Tenancies Authority, will provide for written contracts, mutual rights and responsibilities of residents and operators, model house rules, rent and other changes, entry to residents' rooms, termination procedures and notice periods, procedures for dealing with abandoned goods and dispute resolution on tenancy matters. A joint advisory committee comprising industry, government and community organisation representatives will assist in finetuning the detail.

Legislation will be phased in over four years to allow for changes or improvements to be made by industry and the accreditation body. Using a risk management approach to protect the most vulnerable, supported accommodation providers will be the first required to be registered and accredited. Aged persons' rental complexes and rooming houses will follow. This is a necessary and balanced approach to an issue that we are determined to resolve.

Daylight Saving

Mr FLYNN: I direct a question to the Premier. In view of the fact that we have had a referendum on the issue of daylight saving and this House recently voted not to review the issue and also that he has given his stamp of approval to voluntary time zones, I ask the Premier: given the difficulties that are said to have existed for businesses in southern Queensland, does he not think that the problem has now been shifted to include the whole of that region, which will be out of sync with those voluntary time zones, and has his government considered the difficulties that will undoubtedly arise with certain statutory hours of business in Queensland?

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the honourable member for Lockyer for his question. It is, indeed, a very important question. In fact, I brought a piece of paper in here which may be of assistance to him. In relation to the issue of timing I have asked for advice on the controls on current operating hours. There are restrictions under the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act of 1990; the Liquor Act, which covers hotels and restaurants; and the Fair Trading Act, which covers door-to-door salesmen. There are no legal impediments to other types of businesses varying their daily operating hours. I started with that to simply indicate to the member that we have no plans to amend any one of those three pieces of legislation. In other words, in terms of the voluntary proposals being pursued on the Gold Coast, which after all were suggested by the local business community, only those groups not covered by those three pieces of legislation will be able to vary their hours beyond what is currently provided; any change to operating hours will have to be done within the current regime.

Let me make it clear: I gave a commitment prior to the last election that there would not be daylight saving in this state, and there will not be daylight saving in this state. In terms of the issue of what is happening on the Gold Coast, the member was quite correct, I have indicated my support for a voluntary arrangement supported by the business community. I have indicated that I understand how they feel. Taking the border position, for example, involving Merri Rose's electorate, which borders New South Wales, yes, there are differences. Because that area borders New South Wales, which has a different time zone, businesses in that electorate have difficulties that no-one else in this state experiences. Let me be really clear about this. All I have said is that if they want to do it voluntarily—and this was a suggestion from the business community, it was not our idea—they can do so. However, we will not legislate and nor will we change the fact that there will not be daylight saving in this state. I have made it clear and we will not change.

Just to recap, there are three pieces of legislation that impose restrictions on trading hours. They relate to retail traders under the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990, hotels and restaurants under the Liquor Act and door-to-door sales under the Fair Trading Act. They will not be changed. The argument to me from the business community was that those businesses that wanted to deal interstate, particularly in tourism, felt disadvantaged. None of them are included in that group. If tourism operators want to make that voluntary change, they can do so. Let me make it very clear: we are not changing to daylight saving. All we have simply done is support a voluntary arrangement on the Gold Coast in the interests of those affected businesses. The same proposal has been indicated to the Sunshine Coast, but there does not seem to be the same pressure from that region. That is the bottom line. It is a compromise that is sensible and workable. This can work forever to end the daylight saving argument and debate. I ask people to give it a go. I think it is the final solution.

Schoolies Week

Mrs CROFT: I refer the Minister for the Arts to the annual Schoolies Week activities soon to take place on the Gold Coast and I ask: are there any plans to provide young people with creative alternative activities during Schoolies Week?

Mr FOLEY: I thank the honourable member for the question, and I understand she is to be a volunteer during Schoolies Week, much to her credit. Isn't it great to see members from the Gold Coast such as the honourable member taking such an active interest in the youth of the Gold Coast? The Queensland government is very mindful of the need to address the issues that arise when a large number of young people with a lot of time and energy to spend gather on the Gold Coast for Schoolies Week. A great deal of work has been done to put in place alternative, creative activities. Today I am able to announce a funding allocation of \$4,950 for the Gold Coast Schoolies festival project Who R U. The Who R U project is a series of arts based activities to take place in the chill-out zone, a centrally located supervised space for young people to take time out from the frenetic Schoolies festival. I am sure that it is something that the parents of young people going to Schoolies Week will also appreciate.

For many young people, Schoolies Week has become a rite of passage from a long period of schooling into a future full of uncertainties. It is especially important for young people involved in Schoolies Week to know that there are positive recreational alternatives available to them other than drinking alcohol while at the Schoolies festival. This funding will cover the costs of artists' fees, materials and equipment associated with the workshops and celebration events. I note that the Minister for Tourism is particularly keen on this exercise.

There is another significant aspect of the government's support for these alternative activities. The project will contribute to the achievement of the aims of Queensland's cultural policy for young people by supporting arts and cultural activities that also contribute to young people's personal and social development. In fact, this project could be quite handy for the opposition. Who R U activities could include banner making, writing, music, mask making and photography workshops. The sky is the limit when it comes to what can be done. I am also informed that activities could embrace day sports like beach volleyball and surf carnivals, a youth market with buskers and stalls, or even perhaps the creation of a mural. Schoolies Week should be fun, with activities undertaken in a relaxed, happy and safe environment. The Who R U festival will be held during the first week of the annual Schoolies festivities on the Gold Coast. Each workshop included in the festival will explore the theme Who R U through different mediums to celebrate the changes in the lives of the school leavers.

Numberplates

Miss SIMPSON: I ask the Minister for Tourism: given the importance of the tourism industry to the Queensland economy, can she tell us what input she had into the Premier's decision earlier this week to dump the tourism marketing icon of 'The Sunshine State' slogan from the state's numberplates? Did she support the move?

Mrs ROSE: I thank the member for the question. She may not be aware, but the Department of Transport actually provides a number of destination-specific numberplates. They include a Sunshine Coast numberplate and a Gold Coast numberplate. I see heaps of Gold Coast numberplates. There are outback numberplates and tropical north Queensland numberplates. I think it would be great if the member got a Sunshine Coast numberplate. One of the points about tourism that I have continually pushed over the last two years is the importance of tourism as an industry to Queensland. It is our largest employer. It employs around 150,000 Queenslanders. It is the second largest industry in this state. It generates some \$14.2 billion for the Queensland economy. I know that we do it very, very smart in the tourism industry. I also recognise that we can do it smarter in the tourism industry. Having the 'Smart State' logo on numberplates is not going to take the sunshine out of Queensland. There will be numberplates around with 'The Sunshine State' logo on them for a long, long time.

As I said, we are continually working to make sure that we make the tourism industry smarter in Queensland. Our marketing and promotion strategies have a very strong focus on Queensland as the Sunshine State. At Indy on Sunday we had absolutely perfect weather on the Gold Coast. We had perfect sunshine. That vision was being telecast into some 700 million homes around the world. The state sells itself very much as 'The Sunshine State'. We use the 'Queensland, the Sunshine State' logo. All of our promotion and marketing strategies, both domestically and internationally, promote Queensland's reputation as the Sunshine State. We will continue to do that. There will still be numberplates with 'The Sunshine State' on them in circulation in Queensland for a long time to come.

Industrial Development, Sunshine Coast

Mr CUMMINS: I ask the multitalented Minister for State Development: what is the Labor state government doing to boost smart and clean industrial development and jobs growth in the beautiful and smart Sunshine Coast region?

Mr BARTON: I thank the member for the question and acknowledge that he is a member of my ministerial policy and legislation committee and takes a very keen interest in these matters. Earlier this month I was very proud to have been at Kawana in the member's electorate to officially open a new industrial park at Kawana Waters, the Kawana Junction Industrial Estate, which is the next phase of industrial development on the Sunshine Coast. The member has taken a very keen interest in this with the developer and with the local council. It is part of my role, of course, to move around this great decentralised state to promote business development in Queensland's regions. The member for Kawana and I take this very seriously, as do all members on this side of the House.

The new Kawana Junction Industrial Estate is one of three tiers of development that that company is undertaking in the Kawana region, the others being the business village and the town centre. It is very important to note that this development alone is expected to generate nearly 10,000 jobs for Queenslanders over the next 10 to 15 years. That is not to be scoffed at, because it is a key part of the role of my Department of State Development to get out there and create real jobs. Statistics such as that put the Sunshine Coast at the forefront of job creation and at the forefront of population growth in Queensland.

My department's Investment Attraction Division is out there promoting Kawana and many other smart industrial estates not just around Queensland and Australia but around the world. The new estate was designed to have the latest infrastructure. It has fibre optic cabling, as well as the normal services that go into industrial estates. The types of industries that would be best suited to this estate are clean manufacturing, distribution and packaging, IT related manufacturing, health manufacturing, biotechnology and entertainment.

Kawana sets the tone for substantial industrial development on the Sunshine Coast, similar to what we are doing in the regions all over Queensland. It is also very important that estates such as this one are there as part of different companies' activities, that housing is provided where people want to live in the sunshine in this great state and, most importantly, that there are job opportunities for the people who are buying those houses and job opportunities for their

children as they grow up so that they can stay in Queensland and have a great, high technology job. I thank the member for his support for this project.

Unemployment

Mr QUINN: I refer the Treasurer to this year's state budget, which estimated that Queensland would have an average unemployment rate in 2001-02 of eight per cent. Given that since the budget was brought down all monthly unemployment figures have been above that figure, now putting the eight per cent average farther from reach, can the Treasurer advise whether Treasury has revised its unemployment projections for this year? If so, what is the new figure?

Mr MACKENROTH: As the member would be aware, when the budget was released there was considerable criticism from the opposition and the Liberal Party that we had projected an average unemployment rate of eight per cent. If he actually looked at the figures he would see that in each successive month since the budget was delivered the actual figures have decreased, and last month unemployment was at 8.1 per cent. We have to actually come down and go below that point to get an average figure of eight per cent for the year. At this stage we have four months—that is one-third of a year—of figures in which to reach that target, so it would be too early to start to change that. The projection is still the same. In either late December or early January we will release the mid-year forecasts. At that time the figure will be reviewed. If it needs to be adjusted, it will be. I can tell the member that the numbers are coming down at the rate Treasury had predicted.

Roads, Southern Brisbane

Mr REEVES: My question is directed to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Main Roads. I understand that the federal member for Moreton, Gary Hardgrave, claims that he has 1,200 pro forma letters addressed to the minister regarding road improvements in southern Brisbane. He also claims that he has successfully lobbied the state government to include the removal of tolls in the upcoming Brisbane urban corridor study. Could the minister respond to these claims? The minister may also wish to comment on who is funding this dishonest and misleading campaign.

Mr BREDHAUER: I will, because the member for Moreton has been totally dishonest to the people of the Moreton area in his portrayal of this campaign. He began a campaign in June this year of form letters addressed to me about issues concerning roads in the area. The letters are addressed to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, care of Gary Hardgrave. The other day in the media Mr Hardgrave claimed that he has 1,200 of those letters. Not one single copy of those letters has been forwarded to me by the member for Moreton. He has been out there telling the people in his electorate that he will forward those letters to me so that they can express their concern to me about those road issues. Not one single copy of those letters has been forwarded to me.

I went to the electorate office of the member for Moreton last week to collect those letters—not once, but twice. On the first occasion I was told that Mr Hardgrave would ring me back later that day and that if I made an appointment I could come and collect them. He did not contact my ministerial office. We rang him. We sought to make an appointment. Although I was unable to make an appointment, I told him that I would go out at 11.30 on Thursday to collect those letters so that his constituents would know that he had delivered on his commitment. That offer was rejected, and in a bizarre claim in one of the local southern newspapers he said that he refused to give the letters to me because he feared I would destroy them. What a joke! If he was really worried about that, he could have photocopied them and kept copies.

Not only that, the member for Moreton has been telling people in his electorate that the terms of reference for the study on the southern corridor have been changed. I ask members to bear in mind that Granard, Riawena, Kessels and Mount Gravatt-Capalaba roads are national highway. It is the responsibility of him and his government to fix the traffic problems there. It is not a state government road, but the state members in the area have been trying to work through the issues. The federal member has been telling his constituents that the terms of reference have been changed. It is not true. In fact, I wrote to John Anderson about the matter and the department has replied saying that the Deputy Prime Minister did not get to that issue before the election was called on 5 October.

What is worse is that all of this is funded by the taxpayers of Queensland. Liberal Party members all over this state are peddling this propaganda around their electorates, the member for Moreton included. I have copies of letters and leaflets he is distributing in his electorate during the election campaign, all of which is funded by the taxpayer. It is a scandal that the taxpayers of Moreton, Leichhardt, Herbert and all other coalition seats in Queensland and around Australia are actually funding the Liberal Party's campaign by helping to promote dishonest and untrue propaganda. I table the correspondence for the information of the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the member for Callide, I welcome to the public gallery students and teachers of Glen Aplin State School in the electorate of Southern Downs.

Police Resources

Mr SEENEY: I refer the Minister for Police and Corrective Services to the report released yesterday by the CJC, which found that the Queensland Police Service's growing demand for information technology has not been matched by levels of funding needed to achieve it. I also refer to the report's finding that the effectiveness of some of the key IT systems it does have is being hampered by technical shortcomings, creating more paperwork for police and making their job more cumbersome. How smart is it that the government continues to underfund the Police Service to this degree?

Mr McGRADY: I thank the member for Callide for the question. Once again, I remind him, the opposition and all members of this House that this year the Queensland Police Service has a record budget—an 8.6 per cent increase. During the last sittings I produced a chart which proved that the Queensland Police Service has fared far better under the Labor government than under any coalition government. People can do anything they want with reports or statements. Had the member for Callide read the next paragraph, he would have seen that it states—

A fair number of those surveyed occupied supervisory roles, which, by their nature require them to devote more time to administrative and less operational police work.

The report is saying that those who were surveyed were basically in supervisory or indeed management roles. Therefore, they tend to use more paper. If the member is going to come into this chamber and start quoting excerpts from the CJC report, he should quote a bit more. On the issue of technology in the Police Service, the member knows as well as anybody else that this year we are spending \$21 million on computers for the service.

This question gives me the opportunity to say a few words about the vision I and the commissioner have for the Queensland Police Service. We do not want to see fully trained police officers sitting behind a desk doing paperwork. We want to see highly trained police officers out there on the beat, doing the work they have been trained for. I want to see more and more civilians being employed in the Queensland Police Service.

The member for Callide is so keen to quote what the CJC has recommended. I am more than happy to accept this recommendation from the CJC. I ask him and the opposition to give us some support when we start implementing one or two other recommendations of the CJC. I will be doing that in the not too distant future and I will be looking forward to support from him and other members of the opposition.

Remembrance Day

Ms MALE: I direct a question to the Premier. With Remembrance Day approaching, I refer to the RSL's concern that the significance of this day is being lost, and I ask: how can we encourage Queenslanders to take the time to remember those who gave their lives for their country?

Mr BEATTIE: The RSL is very concerned that the significance of Remembrance Day is being lost and that there is a risk that the day will be forgotten. The state secretary of the Queensland branch of the RSL has written to me asking me to appeal to people to abide by a proclamation signed by the Governor-General in 1997 for one minute's silence to be observed. I am happy to do this. Obviously, all members can join me, and I urge them to do so.

Observing one minute's silence wherever we are is a simple and very respectful way to pay tribute to people who made the ultimate sacrifice. It is worth reflecting on the origins of this custom. World War I involved the mobilisation of more than 70 million people and left between nine million and 13 million dead. At 11 a.m. on Armistice Day, 11 November 1918, the guns of the western front fell silent after more than four years continuous warfare.

Edward Honey, an Australian journalist working in Fleet Street, proposed that there should be two minutes silence on the first anniversary of Armistice Day. The 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month became universally associated with the remembrance of those who had died in the war. The two minutes silence was popularly adopted, and it became a central feature of commemorations on Armistice Day.

After the end of World War II, the Australian and British governments changed the name to Remembrance Day. Following the attack on America recently, it is even more appropriate to remember the dreadful loss and the toll of warfare and reflect on the need to deal with the hatreds that fuel terrorism and warfare. I urge everybody to give that day the respect it deserves.

As some members would remember from my report to parliament, I had an opportunity to visit Gallipoli, where I laid a wreath at Lone Pine on behalf of all Queenslanders—indeed, all members of this parliament. Anyone who has seen Gallipoli or been to France or any parts of the western front and seen the conditions under which allied troops and, indeed, enemy troops fought would understand the difficulties and the hardships of the time and, of course, the sacrifice that they made.

I am quite happy—if that is the term; it is probably not—I am willing, on behalf of the RSL, to urge all members of this parliament and, through them, their constituents to give Remembrance Day the due respect that it deserves and that particularly at this time we use it as an opportunity to reflect on the freedoms that we have in this country and remember that we do live in the greatest place on earth; and that while we have our argy-bargy in this chamber, we have a respect for the democracy and that, when oppositions become governments, we do it in a peaceful way without bloodshed.

Water Allocations, Darling Downs

Mr HOPPER: I direct a question to the Minister for Natural Resources. Recently, after much debate with the minister over his timing on the completion of ring tank infrastructure, a reasonable scenario was established, and I thank him for that. Can the minister give the irrigators on the Darling Downs any idea when their water allocations will be finalised?

Mr ROBERTSON: I appreciate the comments that the member has made over some time regarding representing his constituents' interests in the Condamine/Balonne and Border Rivers areas. I can inform the House that we are on track to release the draft water resource plan for those two areas—the Condamine/Balonne and the Border Rivers catchments—towards the end of this year.

In the meantime, and I do not want to refer to them in detail, we have amendments currently before the House to the Water Act which I believe will provide some practical assistance in what is a very difficult issue in determining whether works out in these catchments have been started or not. Basically, without going into detail on a bill before the House, I am establishing a referral panel which will provide some form of peer review for irrigators who have started works and which can then review decisions made by the department.

This question provides me with an opportunity to place on record some debate that has been going on in these catchments for some time now. It is claimed that the moratoriums that we put in place are in some way discriminating against irrigators out in these stressed catchments. In particular, I have been concerned about the campaign being run by the opposition about current levels of extraction. I thought I would refer to *Hansard* to see what opposition members were saying when they were in government. I came across a statement that I think is worth while restating. It was stated in *Hansard* on 16 May 1996 that—

In terms of water allocation, Queensland has been far more conservative than in other parts of the basin, and as the flow management plans are finalised, there should be an opportunity for some further development of water use in Queensland. However, when a reasonable upper limit to the use of water is set, it will be important for all parties to operate within the limits so that users' rights are fulfilled all the way down the basin and the rivers are healthy.

Who said that? The member for Warrego! What were the extractions from the river system back then? About 550 gigalitres were extracted in 1996. What is the extraction rate now? Nearly 1,000 gigalitres are now being extracted from that system. So when the former minister said that there was some ability to increase extraction levels, one assumes he was not talking about a 60 per cent increase, and that is something that we need to understand as we go about this very difficult water resource planning process in the Condamine/Balonne and Border Rivers areas.

Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement

Ms NOLAN: I refer the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Housing to the national housing conference held in Brisbane last week. I refer also to the call by state and territory Housing Ministers for a continuation of the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement backed by adequate funds, and I ask: can the minister inform the House of any commitment made at the conference by the current federal minister responsible for housing?

Mr SCHWARTEN: I note the honourable member's greater interest in the subject of housing than the federal minister has. The short answer to her question is that there was no commitment. The 850 delegates who gathered for the conference last week were treated to a sort of Sybil Fawcett 10-minute diatribe by video from the honourable minister. But that was not what they were looking for. What the 850 delegates from all around Australia were looking for was a commitment that the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement would continue. As I said, there was no such commitment. Unlike the commitment that has been made by the Labor Party—which I might add takes housing seriously and actually has a dedicated position in its cabinet for a Housing Minister—there is no commitment whatsoever from the federal Howard government.

Every state minister in Australia would agree with me when I say that the future of housing provision in Australia depends on the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. All we ever hear from federal members and federal ministers, and all we ever hear from the opposition is that this money is supposed to come out of the magic pudding of the GST.

The reality is that if the CSHA comes to an end next year, Queensland will be \$180 million a year poorer—\$180 million less to spend on housing. What does that mean? That means, for one, 750 fewer jobs in the building industry. It means that the one in three people in Queensland who are pushed below the waterline—far be it below the breadline—as a result of the GST and the 30 per cent of people who are living in poverty in this state after they pay their rent have no chance whatsoever of getting a decent housing outcome. That figure of 20,000 people in this state whom we turn away from crisis accommodation will double in the next 12 months if that is the case.

While we hear from the federal government that the GST is the answer to education, it is now the answer to housing, as well; and it is the answer to every single problem in this community. I am telling this House that if the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement is not funded by the next generation of politicians in Canberra, then the number of homeless in the next generation of Queenslanders will be increasing. It is as simple as that. We have to have a Labor government federally to correct this, because it is clear to me that Ms Vanstone and all her cronies in Canberra are gearing up to walk away from the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, and only a Beazley-led government—a Labor government federally—will ensure that we have a proper housing arrangement in this state.

Director of Public Prosecutions

Mr SPRINGBORG: In directing a question to the Attorney-General, I refer to ongoing problems within the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and I ask: is the minister prepared to concede that, with last week's departure from that office of the 24th prosecutor in just two years, there are real and ongoing problems with resourcing and morale? Further, will the minister address remuneration issues and allocate sufficient resources to guarantee that set files are designated to, and managed from the outset by, senior and assistant prosecutors to ensure better prepared and more effective prosecution outcomes for the people of Queensland?

Mr WELFORD: The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions has for some years had to deal with an increasing workload, which has placed considerable pressure on all staff in the office of the DPP, including both senior prosecutors and junior legal officers. Those officers perform an outstanding job on behalf of all Queenslanders. They are the front line of our prosecution service and deal with some of the most complex criminal cases heard in our courts.

It is true that over the last few years a number of senior prosecutors have chosen to further their careers in other fields, including at the private bar. It is also true that the genesis of some of the pressures occurring at the office of the DPP occurred under the National Party government, which set up a so-called workplace reform strategy to reform that office. The office of the DPP that this government inherited, with all its strengths and weaknesses, is the office that resulted from the reform strategy put in place by the honourable member's party when it was in government.

Recently I met with a number of senior prosecutors and with the Director of Public Prosecutions. We are putting a program in place to rebuild that office, to attract senior prosecutors and to enable junior legal officers to develop a career path. People of the highest calibre are needed to prosecute criminal cases before the courts in our state. I intend to ensure that Queensland has the best Office of Director of Public Prosecutions of any jurisdiction in the country.

That will be achieved not by phoney reviews of the kind conducted by the opposition when it was in government, but by ensuring that senior prosecutors design a work flow system that ensures that the most important cases are handled by senior prosecutors and that support staff perform jobs that are appropriate to their skills. I will ensure, by working closely with senior prosecutors, that a first rate office of the DPP is brought to fruition in due course.

Graffiti

Mr WILSON: I ask the Minister for Families: is she aware of the impact graffiti has on our community and can she inform the House what measures are being taken to combat this?

Ms SPENCE: I thank the member for Ferny Grove for that question. I acknowledge his interest in this problem over a long period of time and the hard work he actively engages in with his local community in tackling the problem of graffiti. Most members would agree that the community of Queensland expresses zero tolerance to the problem of graffiti in our society. We hear constantly about the financial cost that graffiti imposes on property owners, businesses, schools and local and state governments. Indeed, beside those economic costs, there is evidence of other problems associated with graffiti. Research has shown that graffiti is associated with the presence of lawlessness, disorder and heightened criminal activity. The presence of graffiti, even in small amounts, heightens the fear of crime amongst our suburban residents and our businesses in Queensland.

The Beattie government is concerned about tackling crime, but we are also concerned about tackling the causes of crime. This government has allocated \$100,000 per year for the next three years to help the Queensland community tackle the problem of graffiti. Community organisations or local councils can apply for small grants from this graffiti fund. Those funds might be used, for example, to purchase equipment and supplies for the rapid removal of graffiti, for community arts programs or for community awareness and education programs and sponsored clean-up programs.

As the shadow Attorney-General said, members may be unaware of how much work already goes into cleaning up graffiti by young people who are on court orders. They are out there already, actively working in the community to tackle the problem. However, those grants are an enhancement of the process and will allow community groups—for example, the local bowls club—to undertake their own graffiti prevention activities.

Many councils in Queensland are already undertaking a number of strategies in the graffiti plan. The Brisbane City Council provides local aerosol art programs to tackle graffiti. The Townsville City Council has a Graffiti Action Plan and a Positive Action Against Graffiti Vandalism Plan that assist the community in removing and preventing graffiti. The Townsville Youth Justice Service has the Graffiti Busters program, which enables young people on court orders to participate in community graffiti clean-up programs. I urge all honourable members to encourage their communities to apply for this grant funding.

Australia Tradecoast

Dr WATSON: In directing a question to the Minister for State Development, I refer to the state government estate at Queensport Road, Murarrie, which was originally marketed by the government as a Smart State biotech estate, and I ask: how many of the eight blocks have been sold and how many of those blocks have been sold to companies in biotechnology-related Smart State industries?

Mr BARTON: I take the specifics on notice and I will give the member for Moggill an answer. However, in speaking about the Smart State activities and the Australia Tradecoast area, I make the point that that is one of the best innovations in this state. To place the member's question into context, he asks how many blocks have been sold to biotechnology-related Smart State industries. If I am expected to know such specific pieces of information, I would need to carry a computer around with me.

The Australia Tradecoast development, which is part of our entire activities at the port, is one of the most successful industrial developments seen not only by this state but by this country. It is a partnership between the Port of Brisbane Authority, the Brisbane Airports Corporation, the Brisbane City Council through the Office of Economic Development and my Department of State Development. In the past fortnight I have been down there three times to open new factories. The Premier has been down there as well because we are seeing things like Crazy Clarks' major new warehouse development, SEPR's new major activity in treating mineral sands and a large range of factories opening down in the Australia Tradecoast. It is consistent with what we are doing right across this State of Queensland.

I have answered a question from the member for Kawana. I have also been involved with the Premier today with what is happening with Comalco at Gladstone and with AMC, and I am absolutely amazed that members on the other side of the House are not applauding this government for what they are doing to create industrial development in this state and a large number of substantial jobs.

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

PRIVILEGE **Numberplates**

Miss SIMPSON (Maroochydore—NPA) (11.29 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. I believe that the Minister for Tourism has misled the parliament in regard to the availability of theme numberplates in areas, including the Sunshine Coast. According to today's listing of the personalised plates web site linked to the Queensland Transport web site, for the privilege of departing with \$275 you can get a range of theme plates, but that does not include one for the Sunshine Coast. I table these theme numberplate names.

Mrs ROSE: I rise to a point of order. I apologise to the House. I am absolutely shocked that the Department of Transport does not have a destination-specific numberplate for the Sunshine Coast. I think they should. It is one of our premier destinations in Queensland and I strongly recommend to my colleague the Minister for Transport and Minister for Main Roads that there should, in fact, be a Sunshine Coast numberplate.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST **Public Liability Insurance Premiums**

Mr HORAN (Toowoomba South—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.30 a.m.): Today, I want to speak once again about the very important matter of insurance and the serious problems that are besetting so many of our community festivals, our community organisations, and so many of our sports clubs in Queensland. If we do not address the issue of the cost of insurance, particularly public liability insurance, we will end up with sterile communities that are not able to do anything. Instead, people in those communities will stand still like stone statues because they are not in a financial position to do anything for the members of their community—to allow them to enjoy their sport, to enjoy their fun, to enjoy the activities of the local festivals.

If we are to solve this problem of litigation and the cost of insurance, this parliament and this government must address three principles: the cost of public liability insurance; the problem of trawling by some major legal firms, which has created increased levels of litigation; and the amount of compensation being awarded by the court system. The cost of public liability insurance for our constituents and for our organisations—our volunteers and community organisations—is reaching the point at which they will no longer be able to provide their services. In this the Year of the Volunteer, as well as recognising volunteers and handing out certificates and all the other things that we have done, we should put in place a system that financially protects our volunteers who work for clubs and organisations and associations so that they can continue their work with confidence.

The government, through the Queensland Events Corporation, has undertaken a review and we have been told that there has been a huge response from the public to it. I think that recently the Premier also announced that he was extending the time in which submissions would be received. We support that, but we also say that once all the submissions are received, we should have some action. Local councils, sporting associations, festivals, event organisations, hall associations—so many of these non-profit organisations that are the backbone of our community—are all affected by this problem. They are working to make our community a better,

brighter and happier place. So many of the things they do create opportunities for young people to be active in the community, to take part in many events, and for elderly people to be part of associations or organisations without the fear of litigation. As I said, I have spoken about this issue before and, in doing so, have pointed out that these organisations are the backbone of our community. We need to stay focused on supporting those organisations.

The opposition has also spoken in this parliament before about the need to create a community insurance fund that could be underwritten by the state government to safeguard some of the community events and festivals from a blow-out in insurance costs, which is causing many of them to consider closing down. In fact, some have closed down. That fund could be based on the principles of the compulsory third-party insurance scheme that is operated by the Motor Accident Insurance Commission. This scheme could be a financially sound, sensible and practical scheme that allowed organisations that need public liability insurance to pool their resources so that their premiums could be capped at a reasonable level. But I also make the point that that is only one part of the jigsaw. There has to be some form of capping system to litigation. Otherwise, this community pooling system would eventually be drained in a year or two by these ever-increasing compensation payments that are being awarded.

We also have to recognise that insurance companies have to be able to make a profit. Otherwise, they collapse. That is another reason why there needs to be a cap on the amount of compensation. We have to investigate how, through both the state and federal governments, we can impose a cap on the amount of compensation that is being awarded. We want to see people properly and fairly protected in those circumstances where, through no fault of their own, or because of incorrect preparation of an event, or incorrect staging of an event, people are seriously injured. It is important that those people who are injured, through no fault of their own, receive fair and adequate compensation. But I think that everyone in the community realises that if compensation levels are not controlled, we will not have any organisations, we will not have any events, we will not have any clubs, we will not have anyone playing sport, we will not have anyone putting on concerts; we will have absolutely nothing in our communities.

I have spoken previously in this parliament about the support that the opposition has received from the Queensland Council of Social Services. The council wrote to the opposition and enclosed a report titled *The cost of community service*, produced by QCOS in July this year. That report details the findings of a survey of the broad non-profit sector spanning community services, social clubs and other non-profit associations. It was conducted after the HIH collapse in response to concerns of members that their insurance costs, particularly public liability insurance, were increasing. The survey found that 47 per cent of the respondents reported that their insurance premiums had increased. However, many organisations had not yet received their insurance renewal and only eight per cent of all of those who were contacted or responded could say that their premiums were unaffected.

The insurance premium increases that some organisations are facing are alarming. Some organisations reported increases in premiums of well over 100 per cent. Small organisations and child-care organisations seemed to be worst affected by this trend. Some organisations reported that it was almost impossible to find insurers willing to cover their risk.

In its letter, QCOS stated that it continues to receive calls on a weekly basis from organisations that are either unable to find an insurer or are experiencing massive increases of up to 600 per cent in their public liability policies. That is another endorsement of what we have been saying in this parliament. This very important issue needs to be addressed and needs to be addressed smartly.

Recently, one sporting club in Kalbar in the Ipswich area was hit with a 5,000 per cent premium hike to cover its sporting carnival for this year. The club's insurance cost for a three-day event blew out from \$490 last year to \$24,000. The organiser said that blow-out meant that if the increases were not controlled the event was in danger of folding. It is just impossible for organisations, particularly those that are run by volunteers, to deal with such increases. Sadly, that club has already been warned that the premium could increase to as much as \$50,000 next year. So that is an increase of something like 10,000 per cent.

As I said earlier, the sad thing is that people are getting too frightened to be members of committees and organisations. They are not only frightened that they will not be covered by insurance but also they are frightened that they will not be able to raise the money through their voluntary activities for the insurance premiums. The organisations that are being hit the hardest are sporting clubs. Many members of this parliament have been, or still are, involved with sporting clubs. The cost of litigation for these clubs is becoming tremendous. I know what the club that I

am associated with has had to do to try to raise the money for its public liability insurance premium. For those volunteers who man pie stalls, sell raffle tickets and so on, it is becoming a problem that is out of control.

It is time that this parliament and the government—and the opposition will support the government on this—put in place a practical plan. This needs to go to COAG. We need federal government support. It needs to be effective across the state and across the nation. We need to address the three principles involved in actual capping the litigation while still providing fair and reasonable compensation for those in need; ensuring that the massive trawling by the big capital city firms is controlled and managed; and ensuring that the government can underwrite or help bring together, into an organised system, those kindred organisations that can have a reasonable level of payment for their public liability insurance.

We will support that. The National Party wants to see this happen. Resolutions to this effect were passed at our last state conference because our members, who are involved in the community, recognise the problems that exist. We give our practical support to such a proposal.

Time expired.

Cairns

Ms BOYLE (Cairns—ALP) (11.40 a.m.): I rise this morning to inform honourable members of the House about the state of play in the fair city of Cairns at this time. Over the last few days, people have kindly asked me, 'How is beautiful Cairns?' I am pleased to report that it is still very beautiful. However, it is in some difficulty. As members would understand, tourism is the prime economic base for Cairns and the urban area of far-north Queensland. The events of 11 September and subsequent attitudes towards and actual activity in tourism around the world, as well as the fall of Ansett, have had a dramatic impact in Cairns.

I am pleased to report that leaders in our business and tourism organisations, and the tourist industry generally, have not been sitting around crying. Instead, they have activated all of their networks and all of their expertise in an effort to recover the situation as rapidly as possible. I am pleased to say that of domestic flights into Cairns, Qantas has restored 80 per cent of the capacity that we had prior to the collapse of Ansett. However, this is not sufficient. Even that 80 per cent is pushed to the limit and there is not a spare seat on a domestic plane in or out of Cairns at this time.

Internationally, I am pleased to report that we have managed to hold on fairly well in the circumstances. Cancellations have not been as great as we had earlier feared. Nonetheless, it is an uncertain circumstance. It is the 'what happens next' more than 'what is happening this week' that is of concern to the industry in Cairns. Cairns is coming into its off-peak season. Many people from around the world and southern Australia do not choose to be in the tropics at Christmas time. As much as I might enjoy it, others choose to come to us in the cooler months of the year.

Nonetheless, the question is, 'What will happen next year?' I want honourable members to do what they can to support Cairns. We have not yet given up on Ansett. It is important that we get Ansett back in the skies so that Qantas, as it has admitted quite properly, has competition not only on the major capital city routes but also on regional routes. We seek the loud lobbying efforts of all in Brisbane to be directed at the administrator to ensure that, regardless of the final decision, Ansett returns to the skies in Cairns. We thank the Premier and Merri Rose, the Tourism Minister, for their tremendous efforts in this regard.

Several other fine possibilities may see us in a much happier position in the year 2002. Cairns is in the running to become the home base of the new Qantas airline to be named, ironically, Australian Airlines. I am tempted to remark that the more things change, the more they stay the same. It would certainly be a great boost to jobs and the tourism industry if Cairns was chosen as the home base for that airline. We expect that Virgin Airlines will tackle the difficult Cairns market early in 2002. Of course, Cairns is a safe and clean destination. While there is a tremendous nervousness about travelling within the United States and among Europeans and the Japanese wishing to travel to the United States, those people may instead choose Cairns and Queensland for their overseas holidays.

It is fortunate that over the past five or so years we have done a lot of work to diversify the economic base of far-north Queensland. Now would be a good time for us to properly study and recognise the fact that we are holding up better because of the greater concentration on tertiary education services, the broadening marine industry, the burgeoning super yacht industry, the

growth in IT&T industries and various other industries that are all a part of rounding out the city of Cairns and protecting it against international and national events that can sometimes shake the tourism industry. However, Cairns has a bright future. I hope that, by early 2002, I will have evidence to present before the House to bear me out in that respect.

Special Olympics Basketball; Slacks Creek State School

Ms STONE (Springwood—ALP) (11.45 a.m.): This morning I have two matters to speak about. Firstly, on Sunday, 21 October, Logan city hosted the Special Olympics Queensland State Basketball at the Cornubia Insports Sports Centre in the electorate of Springwood. Special Olympics is a volunteer organisation that provides people with an intellectual disability to develop sporting skills and talents. Teams from all over Queensland travelled to Logan city to participate in the opening and closing ceremonies and, of course, to play basketball. Like the Sydney Olympics, the athletes marched in a spectacular opening ceremony.

I think the highlight of the day was the sincere motivational speech made by Leroy Loggins. He got all of the athletes geared up and ready to take on the world. Leroy is a very special athlete, not only because of his sporting talent but also because of his caring nature, which certainly came through during his speech. He found time in his busy schedule not only to deliver an inspiring speech but also to spend time with the athletes. The look of joy on the faces of all of those who got a high five from Leroy made the day very special.

Dancing displays from young local dancers to the tune of the Special Olympics Queensland song was terrific to watch and added to the excitement of this spectacular event. A torch relay was enjoyed by all and the torchbearers were very proud athletes. Of course, who could forget the lighting of the flame?

In the International Year of the Volunteer, it is important to recognise the hard work done by so many generous people in our community. The people of Logan came together to support this event and to ensure that the day was a success. I have had over 500 nominations for volunteer certificates of appreciation. I have had the pleasure of presenting many of those certificates to people from a diverse range of organisations. I look forward to this Sunday when I will present medallions for outstanding voluntary contributions to the community, and Brian Kerle will help present sports medals to the people of the electorate.

Special Olympics believes that people with an intellectual disability can benefit from participation in team sports through the dedication of coaches who give support, instruction and encouragement. All of the athletes were true to their oath: let me win, but if I cannot win let me be brave in the attempt. I was extremely proud that the Springwood electorate was selected as the venue for this great event.

The second matter that I would like to talk about is the young people of the Slacks Creek State School. As I travel around the electorate, I see and hear of many wonderful opportunities being created for those young people. The Slacks Creek State School is a small school that is achieving very big things. The 128-year-old school recently guided community leaders, staff, parents, students and me on a space journey. This was a futuristic workshop to gather views about the kind of institution that we would like the school to become. As we entered the twilight zone, strategic goals were developed in areas of importance to the school's operation. Close encounters of the third kind will see this information taken back to the school council and a plan for the future will be implemented.

I pay tribute to the principal, Mr Garth Stephens, who brought us back to earth safely. I also congratulate the parents, staff and students who are working hard to create an enhanced educational opportunity and a caring community atmosphere at the school. Like so many of the Springwood schools, Slacks Creek also has a record of developing environmental programs. The school presented one of its environmental initiatives at the Kingston Butter Factory, and I was privileged enough to have a sneak preview of this preparation. Let me tell honourable members that it is a great initiative. It is called Cleaning Up Your Backyard. It discusses programs in place at the school for recycling, gardening, worm farming and other environmental programs.

Recently, a group of runners carrying a torch for world peace was supposed to come to the school. Unfortunately, those runners were subjected to physical attacks in Europe and were unable to continue through to the Springwood electorate and to the Slacks Creek State School. But the students of this school did not let that stop their prayers and their thoughts on peace. It was obvious from talking to the children that the events of 11 September had had an effect on how they view the world.

I would like to share the messages of peace presented to me by the preschoolers of the Slacks Creek State School. They asked me to bring them to this parliament in the hope that we would learn from their messages. On a fantastic poster they have asked us to 'Please bear in mind that we don't pinch, kick or hit' and that there is to be 'no throwing mud'. They have asked us to play with each other nicely, not to throw toys and not to stand on other people's toes. Most of all, they have asked us to be very smart on the beach and wear a hat. They particularly asked us to please bear in mind that there was to be 'no yelling'. I am sure we can learn from all of these messages. I thank the preschoolers for sharing their thoughts and prayers with me.

Computers in Schools; Sameway Milk

Mrs PRATT (Nanango—Ind) (11.50 a.m.): An incident whereby a school dumped old computers in the rubbish has inspired a group of volunteers to come together to try to help overcome the great divide in information technology that is developing between rural and city schoolchildren. A volunteer group calling itself Computers for School Children has recently been formed to rehabilitate old, unwanted computers and donate them to deserving schoolchildren. Principals and a panel from the schools will decide who the children receiving them will be.

Don Hansford and his computer students at Kingaroy TAFE have assisted in the rehabilitation of these computers. The reason, they say, is that practice makes perfect and that doing something for free for the students is a pleasure. Not only is this an educational advantage for the TAFE students involved; their community-minded generosity is to be admired by all. The assistance of Bob Ferguson, the Principal of Kingaroy State School, with the donation of some motherboards was also very much appreciated.

On Thursday, 6 September 2001 the first computer, which was actually one of mine, was donated to a school student from Kingaroy State School. In an electorate which has a majority of low-income earners and a high unemployment rate, owning a computer is beyond the means of many. Erin Smith, who is in year seven, lives alone with her mother. Her written answer to the question 'Why do I deserve to receive a free computer?' was as follows: 'We would need to win the lotto to ever get a computer at our house.' Erin was so overwhelmed that she cried volumes of tears when she discovered that she was the winner. There was even a sign of maturity in the rest of the schoolchildren assembled there; every student was happy for Erin to receive this computer, and I think that made it even better and made us all realise that it was definitely the right choice.

There is the potential for a great number of underprivileged schoolchildren in my electorate to have the chance to keep up with technology that they would not have been able to access were it not for the group Computers for School Children. Other computers are now in the process of being repaired. Two such computers came from the Wooroolin tip and had many salvageable components. Upon repair, they will also be donated to another school in the area.

To avoid copyright problems, those computers that do not have Windows installed will come with a free program called Linux. Any person or company donating computers or components will be acknowledged at the handover ceremony at the schools to which these computers go. This week, a further two were to go to the Taabinga State School.

Another issue that I wish to raise is that of Sameday Fresh, which has now been called Sameway Milk. Dick Smith accompanied me in officially opening the Sameday Fresh Milk processing factory 12 months ago, and I congratulate John and Merrilyn on their first year of production. The Calvert family began production early in 2000. At the opening, there was a huge crowd of community and industry well-wishers.

This is a case of David and Goliath. Just like the Bible story, the Calverts are succeeding against the big boys. They are working at the grassroots and people in Queensland are supporting them. The Calvert operation is the exact opposite of globalisation. It is small businesses like this that are helping to support our children in jobs and our country.

As most honourable members would know, the majority of companies stating that their products are Australian made are in fact foreign owned companies. They might employ Australians, but the wealth is going overseas. They constantly drain profits from the country and we suffer in the short and long term.

Four generations of the Calvert family have worked the dairy property in the 50 years since Cliff Calvert came to the farm. As I said, Mr Calvert's son John, and Merrilyn, set up Sameday Fresh Milk one year ago. At the tender age of 13, Mr Calvert became a dairy farmer. Never in his

wildest dreams did he envisage starting a production facility. Deregulation and the threatened loss of the farm ensured he made the hard decision, thus ensuring jobs for himself and his sons.

I am very sorry to say that during the company's first year the big boys came down like a tonne of bricks, but the Calverts fought on and are winning. In the latter part of 2000 it was reported that the ACCC received an allegation that Paul's Limited had indicated to local traders that it would discontinue supply of Paul's associated products if they stocked milk by independent producers. As I said, earlier this year the company was forced to change its name from Sameday Fresh Milk to Sameway Milk. I congratulate the Calverts on their tenacity and perseverance.

Police Resources

Mrs CARRYN SULLIVAN (Pumicestone—ALP) (11.55 a.m.): I would like to share with honourable members the commitment of the Beattie government with regard to the safety of the people of Queensland. The member for Noosa has already highlighted recently her keen interest in community safety, particularly with reference to policing issues on the Sunshine Coast, and I share her interest within the Pumicestone electorate.

I, like the member for Noosa, receive complaints from the public and stories from victims of crime, and their main concerns are about the perception of there not being enough police in the area where they live and that they want quicker response times. Because of these perceptions, I am appalled at the recent action of the Mayor of the Caboolture Shire Council requesting the council to contact the local police to evict a councillor for whom I have a great deal of respect and in whom I have absolute faith.

Councillor Lynette Devereaux, an experienced councillor of some 11 years, was threatened with these bullying tactics after a notice of motion that she had handed in to council some five weeks beforehand was deemed illegal by the CEO on the day she was to speak to it in council. Cr Devereaux told fellow councillors that she had had a deluge of complaints about recent hikes in dump fees and she was simply bringing their concerns to the council to debate them. That is her job and she was prevented from representing her ratepayers.

At this point I will say that I support both her and Councillor John McNaught's fight to reduce the dump fees. Had Councillor Devereaux been abusive, either verbally or physically, councillors' actions would have been warranted. However, all she did was use the 'm' word. That is right; the 'm' word. She told the mayor in open council that the decision of council to gag debate made a mockery of democracy. And because she refused to retract it, the police were called.

All elected representatives must have the opportunity to represent the concerns of the people who put them there without fear of being threatened with forcible ejection. And I hope that these tactics will never be used again. The use of police in this matter is what many consider a disgraceful waste of state government resources.

I am pleased to announce that funding has been allocated for an extra police officer for the Bribie Island station. This brings the total to nine and will ease the busy times on the island, Sandstone Point, Godwin Beach and Ningi. There has been constant lobbying via the electorate office from constituents to the Minister for Police, through me, and we were delighted with the news. We are looking forward to the appointment being filled prior to the Christmas holidays. I take this opportunity to farewell Sergeant Allan Darby and wish him well in his retirement from the Queensland Police Service. He visited me at the electorate office each month, where we were able to discuss local policing issues. I was most grateful for his time in keeping me informed. His position at Bribie Island station will also be filled before the Christmas holidays.

This increase to local police numbers follows other positive steps that the Beattie government has taken to curb crime. The establishment of traffic response teams as part of the State Traffic Task Force will be available to help with the escalating problems of hooning. The Beattie government is listening to people's concerns. The commitment of also initiating 16 new tactical crime squads throughout the state during its second term shows that the real issues are being tackled.

Police play a vital role in society and any assistance they receive in helping prevent crime is very much appreciated. The valuable assistance of Neighbourhood Watch groups in communities does not go unnoticed. They consist entirely of volunteers who are ever vigilant in preventing crime in their neighbourhoods. Their aim is to improve the quality of life in their areas so that people feel safer in their homes and on the streets.

I am fortunate in Pumicestone to have a number of well run neighbourhood watches, and most area coordinators visit the office regularly to supply their monthly informative newsletter. I attend meetings when I can and so does a representative of the police, either from the Bribie or Caboolture station. Because of this regular contact, I have been able to get to know some coordinators very well. Mr Ray Bliss from Bongaree; Bill Burns from Bellara; Norm Shoveller from Beachmere; and Les Duncan from Toorbul are all regular visitors to the office and are a wealth of community information. I have also had the pleasure of meeting Jennie Mitchell from Banksia Beach; Arthur Hirst from Ningi; and Mark Earner from Woorim. They are all passionate about their community role, but they would like to see more people join their neighbourhood watches to make them even more effective. I am proud to know these people and the hundreds of other volunteers involved in the safety of residents. They deserve our heartfelt thanks for the effort and hours that they put into their work.

Small Business, Extended Trading Hours

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory—NPA) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12.00 p.m.): I rise to speak on a very important and topical issue that is of vital importance to the economic wellbeing of Queensland. I am referring here to the very complex issue of extended trading hours for small business. There have been many calls by those who wish to cosy up to big business to have trading hours extended across-the-board. However, if we look after small business, big business will look after itself. I think that is a very important issue. Any such calls are grossly irresponsible and oversimplistic and we do not think this will work.

The National Party opposition has not called for broad, sweeping extensions to small business trading hours because this is not a black and white issue. There are many competing interests that make this issue difficult to resolve. I will give some examples. Greater amenity to consumers has to be balanced against loopholes in legislation that allow for large multinationals to extend their market share, thereby sending smaller enterprises to the wall. It also has to be considered in light of calls by unions for penalty hours for extended trading hours and the ability of smaller business to pay, as well as the social cost to small business owners and their employees.

When we look at big business we see that lot of the big operators use junior staff on a weekend. The small business operators cannot use junior staff on a weekend. They have to use their regular employees who, most times, are senior people. This is another anomaly that has to be addressed in this very important issue. That makes this such a complex issue. How we define small business is a difficult question. I know it is very difficult to differentiate or determine. However, I ask: is it the mum and dad businesses? Is it the sole traders? Is it the franchise underwritten by the multinationals? I think it is all of these things.

Small business represents the most diverse section of enterprise of our economy. Small business employs more people than any other business of the economy. From that perspective alone the trading hours equation must be evaluated properly, consulting with the widest possible stakeholder group. Extended shopping hours are all very well for the consumer, but we must be very responsible and look after the needs of small business to keep them on a level playing field in a viable and fair environment. The real fact here is that it is only through such consultation that the government can hope to be properly informed of all the issues facing the entire small business community, not just a select proportion.

The other thing that government must recognise is that the small business environment varies considerably from one region to another. Take, for example, the Gold Coast, Brisbane, the Sunshine Coast, Mount Isa, Emerald, Dalby and even places like Longreach and Charleville. Everywhere is different. We have to look at the rights of small business in those centres. Why? Because the Premier does not know what to do here. That is the real issue. He cannot work out what the smart shopping hours are. I know what he has done with his numberplates; he has turned that around again this morning. Queensland is made up of more than the south-east quarter. I know that this is a sensitive and complex issue. We have to look after businesses here in the south-east quarter just as we must do right across the state.

It is not the right decision to allow the Industrial Relations Commission to make that decision. We have to make absolutely certain that small business has a voice and is not outrun by big business, which has the clout and the financial muscle to win its case through the courts in question. Considering that Queensland has the highest jobless rate in mainland Australia, we would think that the Premier would be on the front foot in terms of helping small business, especially as they are the largest employers in this state. When we look at all small business

against the multinationals we see that they are the ones who are the leaders in employment. If the Premier is going to reach his unemployment target of five per cent—and I hope he does—it is certainly going to be small business that can achieve this if this government plays its policy right.

Why has this not been done? Because the Premier does not know what he can do to get the job right. He wants to let an unelected body determine the future of these small business operators. Will this commission tell the respected bank managers that their clients have gone to the wall because of poor government policy or inaction by a government? It is the people who elect governments to make the decision. People do not elect industrial commissions to make decisions as to whether a business operator is going to be allowed to advantage his or her cause on an unlevel playing field that exists because of poor determination of government policy. It is absolutely paramount at this point that we respect the ideals of all members of the business community, whether they be large business or small business and regardless of where they live or are located.

BreastScreen Queensland—Northside

Ms LIDDY CLARK (Clayfield—ALP) (12.05 p.m.): I rise today not only to commend an organisation that is saving the lives of women every day but also to send a message to every woman in this chamber and outside and to the families who love them. I had the honour of attending BreastScreen Queensland—Northside's sea of hands last week and speaking to women about the work of BreastScreen Queensland—Northside. In researching my speech, I came to the uneasy realisation that many women do not have the necessary respect for their bodies and their own wellbeing. I came to the realisation that we have all been socially conditioned to accept the fear and uncertainty surrounding cancer, to shy away from painful and difficult realities and that all too often this acceptance means that we fail to take control until it is too late.

BreastScreen Queensland is a great group of people providing a complete detection and referral service for women in Queensland. Every woman over 40 is eligible for a screen and it is totally free. Provided by Queensland Health and jointly funded by the state and Commonwealth Australian BreastScreen Program, BreastScreen Queensland is reflective of the fact that breast cancer kills more Australian women than any other cancer.

BreastScreen Queensland has just celebrated its 10th birthday and is credited with being one of the most successful health initiatives of the last decade. Fifty-seven per cent of women in the 50-to-69 age bracket have been screened under the BreastScreen Program since its inception in 1991—over one million women. Yet it also means that 43 per cent of women have not been screened, and one in 14 Australian women will develop breast cancer. I think that that figure is changing daily.

There are two things here that I must stress. First, I must comment publicly on the professionalism, care and respect that BreastScreen Queensland—Northside provides. BreastScreen Queensland—Northside is tackling a tough issue and doing everything in its power to encourage Queensland women to take control of their bodies and to empower them to face any challenges that they may find in this life. I was touched when I attended and spoke at the sea of hands not only because of the service they are providing to all Queensland women but also because of the way in which they handle the tragic statistics behind this disease.

Breast cancer is the most common cause of cancer death in women. About 1,400 women are diagnosed with breast cancer in Queensland each year and approximately 430 of these women will die. Seventy per cent of new breast cancers are diagnosed in women over the age of 50. A figure of 93.6 per cent of women who are screened have no signs of breast cancer detected, and these women will be followed up every two years as part of the fight for early detection. It does not matter whether people live in the city or rural or regional areas; BreastScreen will come to them. Its mobile offices mean that even the most remote places are accessed for screening and referral. This means that BreastScreen will do everything in its power to ensure that we take responsibility for our health and our futures, which brings me to my second point.

BreastScreen Queensland—Northside is doing so much to help women fight this disease, yet many of us do not support it in this endeavour. BreastScreen Queensland—Northside cannot make us take personal responsibility for our own health. The support and care they provide can only serve to further instil in us a sense of safety and courage when we face this disease. However, there is only so much that BreastScreen Queensland—Northside can do when it comes

to individual responsibility. I beg the indulgence of the House and its members to call on all women to take this individual responsibility.

When I looked out at the sea of hands—each representing a woman, a sister, who has died from breast cancer—I thought of their families, their friends and loved ones whose lives are the less for their loss. It was then that I realised that we must take responsibility not only for ourselves but also for women everywhere and the people who love them. BreastScreen Queensland—Northside provides an excellent yet vital service to the community. It is up to all of us to take that personal responsibility—women, the families who love them and the community. Congratulations to BreastScreen Queensland—Northside on its 10th anniversary. Congratulations on the service you provide and the lives you save.

Daylight Saving

Mr QUINN (Robina—Lib) (12.10 p.m.): Earlier this week many businesses on the Gold Coast moved to daylight saving time because they clearly understand the impact that the time differential between the Gold Coast and the southern states will have on their businesses. The reality for many of those businesses was that if they did not do so it would have cost them jobs. Interestingly enough, IT companies on the Gold Coast were at the forefront of moving their businesses to daylight saving time. Their actions are a black mark against the Premier's Smart State initiative when in reality not moving to daylight saving would have cost them jobs. It is also interesting to note that the Gold Coast City Council has allowed certain sections of its work force to move to daylight saving time because of lifestyle issues. All of this quite clearly shows that businesses on the Gold Coast are following a range of times, because some companies operate wholly on daylight saving time, other companies remain on eastern standard time and other organisations such as the Gold Coast City Council are on a mixture of both. If that is not a recipe for confusion and disaster, I do not know what is.

What does the Premier say about this issue? He says that this is the perfect solution, washes his hands and marches off. This issue has quite clearly demonstrated a lack of leadership on behalf of the Premier to resolve this issue. More importantly, what about the seven Labor Party members on the Gold Coast? What do they say about this issue? All they have done is find the biggest hole they can dive into and pull the lid over their heads, because they do not want to have a say on this issue at all. Rather, they have abandoned their constituents despite promises and commitments prior to their election that they would support daylight saving. The member for Burleigh came in here today and said that she had sent out a survey on the issue to 17,000 homes in her electorate and received only 155 responses, and she asks why. The reason is that electors know that even if they do give their opinion to the Labor member for Burleigh she will not act on it, but ignore it. So why would electors take the time and effort to fill in a survey form and return it to the member? It would be a waste of time.

ALP members on the Gold Coast will not stand up for their own constituencies and will not stand up for the Gold Coast. Instead, they come in here and vote every time according to the line fed to them by the Premier and ALP policy. They are about as useful as a hip pocket on a singlet to the Gold Coast community. They will not stand up for the issues that affect Gold Coast people. They failed their first test. When a motion was put before the House to have an independent study into the effects of daylight saving in the south-east corner of the state, they walked away from that opportunity. That was an opportunity to progress the issue, to find a way through it, but they walked away from it, just as the Premier walked away from it.

For those members to now say that they support the Premier and that this is the perfect solution to the problem is just a nonsense. It shows that they do not have the wherewithal to fight for the Gold Coast and promote the Gold Coast to get the best deal for the Gold Coast. They have left it up to the Premier. They do not want to have a bar of it. They understand that they have been caught in a position where they cannot represent their constituency because of their affiliation with the ALP. They have put their commitment to the ALP ahead of their commitment to their constituents. That is what has happened with regard to this issue. Seven Gold Coast members of the ALP have left the Gold Coast on its own. They will not stand up—

Mr Lawlor interjected.

Mr QUINN: Before the election, Mr Lawlor, the member for Southport, was in favour of daylight saving. He should come in here and vote with his feet. He should stand up and be counted. When he was given the opportunity, what did he do? He went to water. He does not have the courage of his convictions. Why would anyone on the Gold Coast believe what ALP

members representing the Gold Coast say they are going to do for the Gold Coast? What is the use of sending surveys out and getting people's opinions but ignoring them? And those opposite wonder why their constituents do not send back surveys! No wonder the member for Burleigh got only 150 replies after sending out 17,000 surveys. Together with the rest of the Gold Coast members, she has made herself irrelevant to the Gold Coast. So why would they bother? The constituents can sort the wheat from the chaff, and they have already done it within six months. The daylight saving issue on the Gold Coast will not go away.

Time expired.

Clothing Industry

Mr PURCELL (Bulimba—ALP) (12.15 p.m.): Today I wish to bring to the attention of this House the fact that Queensland jobs within the clothing industry are going interstate, which is assisting those unscrupulous employers who use sweatshops. With 440,000 children in state schools and 176,000 children in non-state schools in Queensland, the majority of whom are required to wear school uniforms purchased by their parents, it is estimated that the total market sales for uniforms is well in excess of \$60 million per annum. At least 50 per cent of these school uniforms are being manufactured by sweatshops. I am sure all members will do the sums and realise that I am talking about a large sum of money. The size and nature of the school uniform market makes it particularly prone to exploitation by those suppliers who use sweatshops. One of the primary objectives of the state purchasing policy is to support the growth of employment in Queensland. This objective has been brought in by the state government to enhance the employment prospects of Queenslanders. This policy adheres to the national employment policy. The key element is net employment growth for Queensland.

I have been given the names of a number of Queensland school uniform contractors which have outsourced their contracts to sweatshops for peanuts, and I have also been given the names of the schools. Everyone associated with these schools would be horrified to learn that the school uniforms which they wear, which were paid for by their parents and which represent their school, were made in a sweatshop. The company whose name appears on the contract does not necessarily directly employ the staff to make the uniforms. They outsource the work to other companies who further outsource it to sweatshops. There are reputable clothing companies in Queensland trying to do their best to win contracts and create employment for Queenslanders. I have been personally assured by one Queensland company that, if it was to win the government uniform tender currently being let by Queensland Health, it would provide immediate employment for an additional 30 to 40 machinists, distribution and support staff.

Alternatively, other nationally based companies, whilst manufacturing the specific contracted garments in Queensland, shift their other work to their interstate factories. The net gain for the Queensland economy in this instance is zero. Superficially, it would appear to provide a benefit to Queensland and meet the purchasing policy objectives of supporting Queensland jobs. One possible solution is that tenderers of significant contracts such as the one I mentioned previously with Queensland Health be required to submit, along with their tender, a cost-benefit model similar to that used by Queensland Treasury. Any commitment to additional employment of staff would form part of their proposal and be assessed objectively as part of the tender evaluation process. This may appear to some people to be heavy handed, but in the interests of Queensland and unemployed Queenslanders it would be a worthwhile exercise. The cost to the tenderer, particularly in the case of substantial contracts, is relatively insignificant.

There is a need to maintain a competitive position with regard to pricing, garment quality control and other factors important to any evaluation process. Queensland government contracts which have a positive outcome on employment numbers and which ultimately benefit Queensland in general should be given due recognition within the tender evaluation process. Minister Robert Schwarten, the Department of Public Works and the Department of Housing have put together the Queensland purchasing code of practice. This code of practice was written to ensure that Queensland gets its fair share of work and that Queensland employees are paid a fair wage, are covered by the occupational workplace health and safety provisions of the act and are covered by workers compensation. I urge government officials in a decision-making position with regard to government contracts to make themselves familiar with the purchasing code of practice and to use its guidelines when awarding contracts.

Jack Morrell of the Textile Clothing and Footwear Union is a dedicated union official. He has worked extremely hard in assisting to formulate the code of practice on employment and outwork

obligations for textile clothing and footwear suppliers. This document has been made available through the Department of Industrial Relations. It clearly sets out what has been agreed to by the union and Queensland manufacturers.

The people responsible for the letting of government contracts need to make sure before awarding contracts that successful tenderers do adhere to this code. The code has been set up to maximise employment for Queenslanders. In the textile, clothing and footwear industry, the people who are employed are usually highly skilled, but unscrupulous employers take advantage of the fact that a great many of them do not have English as their first language. In many instances the workers are unable to read contracts and understand what terms of employment they are agreeing to. Their skills lie in other areas and they trust employers to respect their skills and do the right thing by them. The code of practice is to protect all Queensland workers and their families from exploitation.

Diesel Fuel Rebate Scheme

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (12.20 p.m.): I rise to speak on behalf of a group of businesspeople in my electorate—the small to medium earthmoving companies who have been affected quite significantly by information bulletins recently distributed to them. In July last year, information bulletin No. 13 from the Office of State Revenue outlined the Queensland fuel subsidy scheme and the changes to that scheme brought about by the agreement between the state and federal governments on the distribution of GST revenue. The state government returned to the federal government the right to administer the diesel fuel rebate scheme. That was done because the Democrats required some control over the diesel fuel rebate as one part of its package of requirements to be met before it would agree to the implementation of the GST. So there is responsibility on the part of both the state and federal governments.

At the time this bulletin came out I had meetings with a fuel distributor in my electorate. I also received a number of complaints from and had discussions with members of the fishing industry. Two contacts were made by earthmoving companies and the remaining vast majority it now appears knew nothing about it. About a week ago people were made aware of information bulletin No. 20, which states—

Attention All Commercial Users of Off-Road Diesel

Do you buy diesel from a service station or other fuel retailer?

Do you use some or all of that diesel off-road?

If you have answered yes to both questions, this information bulletin applies to you.

This bulletin was not sent to people directly. They just got it through their garages. The upshot is that these users have been given an amnesty—it is not an amnesty in the sense of forgiving the outstanding amount—until the end of October, during which time they must pay back to the government 8.354c per litre for diesel used off road.

There are a huge number of practical difficulties with this demand from the state government. It stems initially from the fact that the information regarding obligations for receipt of the fuel subsidy was not properly distributed and circulated in July last year. We can argue about whether that should have been the responsibility of the state government or the federal government. The reality is that the state government accepted that responsibility when it distributed bulletin No. 13. However, the distribution of the bulletin was very targeted and it certainly did not get to all of those who were affected. Now these businesses are being asked to retrospectively estimate the amount of fuel subsidy they should not have received. The threat in tandem with information bulletin No. 20 is that, if that estimate is not made, then the discrepancy will be shown up during an audit.

In the main, the people affected are those with a backhoe or two, a truck to cart material and other machinery. Both the backhoes and trucks work off road and on road. These people have not kept records of on-road and off-road use, yet they are being asked now to retrospectively estimate that use for a 12-month period. Then they must find the capital, in the light of GST payments from BAS statements and so on, to pay that amount of money at a time when their next BAS payment is due. Just assessing the amount of money owed by them is almost impossible. I have a number of questions which I will be asking ministers during the week if I get the opportunity.

The problem highlighted back in July last year is that bowsers in petrol stations do not differentiate between diesel to be used on road and off road, and neither do the tills. At the time I

asked State Revenue whether the garage owners had an obligation to ask purchasers whether the fuel was to be used on road or off road. The answer was no if the purchase was for less than 2,000 litres. So operators that have fuelled up vehicles, 44-gallon drums and so on have not kept a record of on-road and off-road use and they are now being asked to make an estimation. The amount of time that will be required to fulfil that obligation is enormous. An estimation cannot be done with accuracy, yet these operators are threatened with an audit if they do not comply.

The best solution would be for the outstanding amounts, up to 31 October, to be forgiven, for there to be a clear line of communication between the government and all those required to pay this off-road diesel subsidy and for the obligation to start from 1 November.

Time expired.

Russell Mining Equipment

Mr SHINE (Toowoomba North—ALP) (12.25 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak in this debate. I foreshadow that during this speech I will make an announcement of great importance to a Toowoomba industry. As we all know, the Premier's awards for excellence in exports are a much sought prize in the export community and businesses are highly competitive for them. This year a record 93 exporters were nominated in nine core categories of the awards. I am proud to say that a Toowoomba company took out the award for regional exporter of the year.

Russell Mineral Equipment is a specialist mining equipment designer which has its manufacturing plant based in Toowoomba. I am proud to say that it is in the electorate of Toowoomba North. I have been lobbying the Premier to make a visit to this business in Toowoomba, and I am pleased to announce that the Premier will visit this firm next Tuesday in a visit to Toowoomba for that purpose. I am particularly grateful for the Premier giving his time, bearing in mind that he was in Toowoomba only a week ago.

Since it was founded in 1987, Russell Mineral Equipment has taken the skills and ethics of high powered mechanical engineering design consultancy and cleverly combined them with the additional step of manufacturing those designs. Consequently, support and demand for its products and services are unsurpassed by any other mining manufacturing firm in Australia. The company has successfully developed a strong reputation around the world as a designer of equipment that delivers effective solutions to everyday processing problems. The ambition of its engineering team is to develop equipment used by mine operators to reduce mill down time in the process of replacing wear parts within the grinding mill areas of the concentrator.

The Australian mining market quickly adopted the solutions developed during the growth of the mining industry in the early 1990s and consumed 70 per cent of RME's production. Since 1996 the company has effectively developed a successful export market, to the point where 95 per cent of its products now travel overseas. RME equipment is used in most world mining markets including Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, South Africa, Ghana, Canada, USA, Chile, Argentina and Tanzania. Today, its mill relining machines, along with its recently developed recoilless jackhammer, have revolutionised the mining industry.

It is because of this that in 2000 Russell Mineral Equipment won the Queensland government's exporter of the year award for the small to medium manufacturer category. It was the first year that RME had entered the competition. This year it followed up that achievement by being named as Queensland's regional exporter of the year. Russell Mineral Equipment has demonstrated a major improvement to the mining market. As a consequence, it has strengthened and enhanced the capacity of mining in Australia and overseas, created significant job initiatives and encouraged communication and consultation with all clients to meet their diverse needs. It is a well deserved winner of the much sought after Premier's regional exporter of the year award.

The founder of the company is John Russell. He graduated from the Queensland Institute of Technology in 1979 and worked as a mechanical engineer for Mount Isa Mines for five years. In 1985 he saw problems with the mining equipment used by the mine operators and wanted to start his own business to try to solve those industry problems. It was not easy sailing for the first five years. He had to convince someone to buy his first machine. Success took off very quickly after that, and he formed the company Russell Mineral Equipment.

Mr Russell has been a strong supporter of the University of Southern Queensland and is a benefactor of the faculty of engineering at that university. Mr Russell has always been concerned

that students will spend four years at university learning the theory and process of engineering and finish their degree without a good understanding of the financial, business and administrative aspects of running an engineering firm. Working with the University of Southern Queensland to change that has been his pattern over the past few years. He has also developed a graduate training program at Russell Mineral Equipment. I know that the whole of Toowoomba and Queensland will be behind Russell Engineering when it contests the Australian export awards in November.

Time expired.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McNamara): Order! The time allotted for Matters of Public Interest has expired.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (12.31 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

That leave be granted to bring in a bill for an act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for departments for the financial year starting 1 July 2000.

Motion agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McNamara) read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending the necessary appropriation.

First Reading

Bill and explanatory notes presented and bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (12.32 p.m.): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to introduce a supplementary Appropriation Bill for departments as stated in the schedule attached to the bill. The Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2001 provides supplementary appropriation for unforeseen expenditure incurred by departments in the 2000-01 financial year.

For each department, the total amount mentioned in the schedule is appropriated for the department for application to its departmental outputs, equity adjustment and administered items for the 2000-01 financial year. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Horan, adjourned.

APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL (No. 2)

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (12.33 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

That leave be granted to bring in a bill for an act authorising the Treasurer to pay an amount from the consolidated fund for the Legislative Assembly and Parliamentary Service for the financial year starting 1 July 2000.

Motion agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Jarratt) read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending the necessary appropriation.

First Reading

Bill and explanatory notes presented and bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (12.34 p.m.): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I rise to introduce a supplementary Appropriation Bill for the Legislative Assembly and the Parliamentary Service for the financial year starting 1 July 2000. This bill is consistent with recent convention and ensures that the Legislative Assembly and Parliamentary Service's appropriation is separate from the supplementary Appropriation Bill for the other activities of government.

The Appropriation (Parliament) Bill (No. 2) 2001 provides supplementary appropriation for unforeseen expenditure incurred by the Legislative Assembly and the Parliamentary Service in the 2000-01 financial year. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Horan, adjourned.

GAS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (12.35 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

That leave be granted to bring in a bill for an act to amend the Gas Act 1965.

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and explanatory notes presented and bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Sport) (12.36 p.m.): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Gas Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2001 is to create new provisions in the Gas Act 1965 which will enable me, as minister, to create a code of conduct setting out rules relating to gas network operation in a contestable market. The bill also seeks to consolidate existing provisions of the Gas Act 1965 relating to gas market contestability.

In order to progress gas market reform at the pace we believe best suits the Queensland gas industry and community, the government recently proposed amendments to the Gas Act 1965. The House supported these amendments, which had the effect of introducing retail contestability for gas customers using at least 100 terajoules per annum, known as tranche 1, on 1 July 2001, and deferring contestability for all other gas customers until 1 January 2003, subject of course to the results of a detailed cost-benefit study.

As seen with reforms in the electricity market, the government is taking a considered and responsible approach to deregulation of the gas market. Large industrial customers will gain early access to the competitive market with an assessment of the costs and benefits preceding any decision on competition in the domestic market.

In order to facilitate the tranche 1 contestable market, a code of conduct is being developed. The bill allows the making of a regulation to give legal effect to the code once it is finalised. The code will address certain procedures and rules governing business activities in the tranche 1 gas retail market. It will provide—

- business procedures for managing gas flow in a distribution network when there is more than one retailer on the network;
- rules to govern the transfer of customers between retailers; and
- enforceable dispute resolution mechanisms.

We believe the code will provide the best mechanism to manage business-to-business information transactions in the tranche 1 contestable market and the amendment will provide the best mechanism to ensure industry parties comply with the rules and procedures set out in the code.

We have also taken the opportunity to consolidate into a new part those sections of the Gas Act 1965 which relate directly to contestability. We believe this will improve the readability of the act and simplify some administration arrangements in the transition to the future Petroleum and Gas Act. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Horan, adjourned.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Hon. T. McGRADY (Mount Isa—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister Assisting the Premier on the Carpentaria Minerals Province) (12.40 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

That leave be granted to bring in a bill for an act to amend the Corrective Services Act 2000.

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and explanatory notes presented and bill, on motion of Mr McGrady, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. T. McGRADY (Mount Isa—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister Assisting the Premier on the Carpentaria Minerals Province) (12.40 p.m.): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

It is my responsibility to introduce this bill, which will ensure that the government's intention of establishing a consistent scheme of post-prison community based release is achieved with certainty. The bill will also simplify the prosecution of offenders who have been found to be unlawfully at large. The Corrective Services Act 2000 commenced operation on 1 July this year. Chapter 5 of the act sets out a scheme of post-prison community based release which was intended to be the only scheme after 1 July for determining eligibility for a release to work, home detention or parole order.

Under administrative arrangements made under the Corrective Services Act 1988, it was generally possible for a prisoner to be eligible for release to the community under a leave of absence for release to work up to 10 months before their earliest parole eligibility date. Similarly, it was generally possible for a prisoner to be eligible for release to home detention up to four months before their earliest parole eligibility date.

With the commencement of chapter 5, it was intended that, in most cases, a prisoner could not be eligible for release to work or home detention until their parole eligibility date. Recently, however, a Supreme Court judge held that a particular prisoner had a right or at least a privilege, under the repealed 1988 act and the guidelines issued under that act, to have his application for home detention considered and determined on the eligibility dates set out under the guidelines. The judge found that no section of the Corrective Services Act 2000 explicitly took that right away from him. If such a right or privilege exists as was found in this decision, it is the intention of this bill to extinguish such rights, privileges or expectations to ensure that the government's intention of establishing a consistent scheme of post-prison community based release is achieved.

In taking this step, it is acknowledged that one consequence of creating a consistent scheme of post-prison community based release in chapter 5 of the Corrective Services Act 2000 is its impact on prior prisoner expectations of eligibility under previous administrative arrangements. If a right or privilege to an earlier eligibility date under a previous arrangement exists, then the argument for the preservation of those must be balanced against the desirability of having a consistent scheme of post-prison community based release. More importantly, preserving prisoners' expectations must be balanced against the benefit to community safety achieved by prisoners serving the pre-parole period of their sentence in custody. This bill resolves those competing interests in favour of community safety.

In respect of the prosecution of prisoners found to be 'unlawfully at large', this bill will more clearly identify the circumstances which give rise to the commission of an offence. The bill will link the offence of being unlawfully at large to the definition in schedule 3 of the act where a prisoner has remained in the community after certain release orders have been suspended or cancelled. For example, if a prisoner on a home detention order is found to be missing from their home after the order has been cancelled or suspended, without reasonable excuse, the prisoner can be prosecuted for an offence and liable to a maximum sentence of two years imprisonment. What amounts to a reasonable excuse is a matter for a court to determine. However, I anticipate that prisoners who have been caught deliberately flouting the requirements of these orders, say by being found at a hotel or casino, after their order has been suspended or cancelled, will have a hard time persuading a court that they ought not be punished for their behaviour. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

CRIME AND MISCONDUCT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 16 October (see p. 2823).

Mr HORAN (Toowoomba South—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.46 p.m.): The Crime and Misconduct Bill has been rushed into the parliament. I understand it will be subject to a number of amendments and I appreciate that briefings are available on those amendments. This is a very important bill for Queensland. It sets out with three major objectives. Firstly, it sets out to repeal the Criminal Justice Act 1989 and the Crime Commission Act 1997 and replace them with legislation that merges the Criminal Justice Commission and the Queensland Crime Commission into a new commission. Secondly, the new Crime and Misconduct Commission will integrate the functions of the Queensland Crime Commission and the CJC. This legislation also recognises the long-standing arrangements for the resolution of police misconduct by giving the Queensland Police Service more responsibility but maintaining a strong monitoring role for the commission.

Importantly, this bill will do away with the strong, specialised responsibilities and abilities of the Queensland Crime Commission to be a specialist acting solely on matters of major crime and paedophilia and it will merge those particular facilities into the Crime and Misconduct Commission. Likewise, the Criminal Justice Commission, which has been acting as a specialised watchdog over corruption, misconduct and official misconduct and also as a specialised independent research division, will have its activities merged into the Crime and Misconduct Commission.

In addition, a portion of that independent research facility from the Criminal Justice Commission will transfer to the Premier's Department, such that a political entity will receive and accept this research section of the CJC into its department, with all the consequent problems that will arise. I will be touching on that further.

I make it very clear at the outset that this is a backward step in the provision of a specialised corruption, misconduct and official misconduct watchdog for Queensland. It will be a new organisation that will not specialise solely in that watchdog role. It is a backward step for Queensland because the Queensland Crime Commission, with its specialised core business, will be merged into the Crime and Misconduct Commission, which has a number of roles, including a watchdog role of the functions of the former CJC.

The opposition believes very strongly that this will weaken the watchdog role of the CJC and the major crime and paedophilia investigation role of the Queensland Crime Commission. This legislation melds those two organisations into one bigger organisation that will undertake all of those roles all in the name, supposedly, of some saving in administration. The opposition is strongly of the belief that this is a backward step for the state and a forward step for those criminals who commit major crime and paedophilia.

In the 1990s when the Criminal Justice Commission was established, we saw the absolute failure of that organisation to be able to successfully conduct investigations into paedophilia and major crime whilst it undertook its other role of being the corruption watchdog and the independent investigative research organisation for the state. There is no point in going back to this failed model. If we have a priority in this state in the area of justice and law and order, that priority has to be to get right to the bottom of major organised crime, particularly crime that is associated with drugs, which is the scourge of our society, particularly of our young people. We have to get right to the bottom of paedophilia so that those people who are inclined to be involved in paedophilia know that an organisation in Queensland specialises in investigating, detecting and prosecuting paedophilia—an organisation that can work very, very closely with the Queensland Police Service in bringing about that result.

There is another very strong principle as to why we should oppose this bill. One of the major roles of the Criminal Justice Commission has been the investigation of allegations of misconduct, or official misconduct directed against the Queensland Police Service. It is not the sort of organisation that can work in a close, friendly, harmonious, and cooperative partnership with the Queensland Police Service in the important role of investigating major crime and paedophilia when it also has the role of investigating the Queensland Police Service and doing so without fear or favour. That is an important principle. How can we expect an organisation such as the Criminal Justice Commission to be able to work closely with the Queensland Police Service free of any suspicions, free of any antagonism between the two, when it has a role to investigate the Queensland Police Service?

It makes no sense whatsoever to merge the CJC and the Queensland Crime Commission into one organisation and expect that organisation, which through its misconduct division has a

role in investigating police and police officers, at the same time to have a role, supposedly, of working hand in glove with the Queensland Police Service at the highest possible level of cooperation in endeavouring to investigate major crime and paedophilia. That was one of the reasons for the separation of the two roles and the implementation of the Queensland Crime Commission. The Criminal Justice Commission has proved to be successful and has proved that it can work in a close, harmonious partnership with the Queensland Police Service. There is no element of suspicion or dislike because it is also charged with the responsibility of investigating all the allegations that are made against the Queensland Police Service, particularly claims of official misconduct.

If we want a watchdog in this state that is relevant and meets the expectations of our modern society in providing accountable, honest, accurate, and open government, then we need to support one organisation that specialises in that role, is able to undertake that role well and openly, and is able to undertake that role with the full confidence of the public. That is the position of the National Party—the position of the opposition. We support having a specialised corruption watchdog, a specialised official misconduct watchdog. In the world of modern politics, all political parties have to accept that and put in place something that can do that and do it well with the confidence of the public.

We are no longer going to see that, because we are going back to that failed system of mixing the role of the Criminal Justice Commission with the role of investigating paedophilia and major organised crime. The opposition will be opposing this bill and throughout my speech I will give some of the reasons why we will be opposing it. I want to make it very clear that the National Party in government will be putting in place a watchdog whose only task is to be a watchdog and to do that job well. Everybody will know what that organisation will do. It will not have any other responsibilities or roles; it will be the watchdog for official misconduct and for corruption. We will put in place a crime commission that will work solely on organised crime and paedophilia. It will investigate those issues and work in close harmony and partnership with the Queensland Police Service—a partnership that will not be eroded by feelings of mistrust that would exist naturally in any organisation which knows that the group that it is working with in its day-to-day operations of investigating crimes is also the group that would be investigating any allegations, whether they are right or wrong, of official misconduct, or misconduct, or corruption in their organisation. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever to combine these two organisations when those basic principles that I have espoused do not operate. We need to make the organisation a sensible, well-defined structure that can address those important issues.

As I said, the opposition does not support this bill. There has not been any public outcry or public demand for the establishment of this new commission. Therefore, one has to wonder the reasons behind the legislation. Why does the government want to do this? Obviously, the government believes that it will assist them in some way or another. This legislation contains an extremely dark and dangerous element, and that is the transfer of a section of the independent research division to the Premier's office. I will speak more about that later, because it is a very dangerous move for this state.

On 6 August 1998, shortly after the Premier took office, he decided that the Crime Commission had to go. In a ministerial statement made in parliament the Premier stated—

On the front page of today's Courier-Mail there is a claim that the Queensland Crime Commission seeks a 50% funding boost to \$4.6m so that it can fight paedophilia and organised crime over the next year.

As honourable members will recall, the Premier went on to state—

... I opposed—and the Opposition opposed—

he claimed—

the creation of the Crime Commission in its present structure for two important reasons. First, I believed that the establishment of a stand-alone Crime Commission diminished the role and authority of the Criminal Justice Commission, which has withstood the twin tests of time and politics and, therefore, warranted more resources, not fewer. Second—and this is the crux of the issue—I believed that the establishment of the Crime Commission would lead to unnecessary duplication of administrative staff and, therefore, unnecessary costs.

The submission to the Cabinet Budget Review Committee for extra funding confirms my worst fears.

Back on that day, 8 August 1998, the Premier decided that the Crime Commission had to go. It was just a matter of time. It was interesting to note the Premier's position, for he is on the public record as a strong proponent and supporter of a crime commission. All honourable members will recall the Premier's masters thesis on the subject. But also we will all remember a ministerial statement by the former Police Minister, the Honourable Russell Cooper MP, which was delivered on 5 March 1998 and in which a copy of a press release issued on 13 August 1996 by the then

Opposition Leader, Peter Beattie, was tabled. The former Police Minister quoted from the press release, in which the former Opposition Leader spoke of the need for a proper, comprehensive investigation into paedophilia in Queensland. I reiterate that quote—

"There needs to be a strategic attack on paedophilia and it may well require the establishment of a State Crime Commission to bring it about."

He went on—

"Such a commission would not be in addition to the role currently carried out by the Criminal Justice Commission.

"I have long argued that consideration should be given to removing organised crime and the fight against drugs from the CJC's roles."

So there we have the Premier, as the former Opposition Leader, speaking about the need for a state crime commission having a separate role to the Criminal Justice Commission and that consideration should be given to removing organised crime and the fight against drugs from the CJC's roles. If it made sense then, why does it not make sense now? In that ministerial statement, Mr Beattie is reported as stating further—

I believe that the CJC should concentrate on the role originally envisaged for it by the Fitzgerald Report—which is primarily to act as a corruption watchdog.

That is what I have stated in plain and simple language today in my speech. Mr Beattie is reported to have stated further—

A State Crime Commission would be properly resourced to be pro-active in fighting specialised crime whereas the Police Service is reactive in that it spends much of its time investigating and solving crimes that have occurred.

Once again, that complements and backs our stand as to the folly of the principles of this bill.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

Mr HORAN: Just before the lunch break I was referring to a 1996 press release by the Premier, who was then the Opposition Leader. That press release discussed the need for a strategic attack on paedophilia which could well require the establishment of a state crime commission. He went on to say that he had long argued that consideration should be given to removing organised crime and the fight against drugs from the CJC's role. He said that he believed that the CJC should concentrate on the role originally envisaged for it by the Fitzgerald report, which is primarily to act as a corruption watchdog. That is exactly the stance that the opposition is taking. We want to have a specialised corruption/official misconduct watchdog and, separate from that, a specialised major crime and paedophilia investigative organisation.

In his press release, the then Opposition Leader went on to say—

A State Crime Commission would be properly resourced to be pro-active in fighting specialised crime whereas the Police Service is re-active in that it spends much of its time investigating and solving crimes that have occurred.

That is so typical of the Premier. This morning we saw him change his position on the numberplate issue. That is another example of him changing his position depending on the particular quirk or whim of the day.

In examining the Crime Commission and its advantages, we should revisit the second reading speech of then Police Minister Cooper, who introduced the Crime Commission Bill on 30 October 1997. According to that second reading speech—

The establishment of a permanent Crime Commission with the role of investigating organised crime and paedophilia delivers the intent of this Parliament and delivers a commitment by this Government—

the Borbidge government—

to the people of Queensland to have an effective assault against the criminal low-lives striking at our communities. It has long been recognised that traditional law enforcement methods and powers are simply not effective enough to deal with certain types of offences and offenders and the increasingly sophisticated nature of organised crime. Hence the need for a specific body with special powers to combat organised crime.

That was one of the principles and the logic behind the establishment of the Queensland Crime Commission. Minister Cooper's statement went on to say—

There have been concerns expressed in this Parliament and in the broader community that existing law enforcement efforts have not fulfilled expectations where pursuing major and organised crime is concerned, and that a much more focused and concentrated effort is required.

That sentiment still exists. The Borbidge government gave the Crime Commission the special powers and safeguards that were essential to penetrate the secretive and sophisticated nature of organised crime and paedophilia groups, particularly networked paedophile groups.

Nevertheless, the former Opposition Leader, who was a strong advocate and fan of the crime commission concept, showed how principled he could be. He sold out his principles when

political opportunism got the better of him. His principles on long-term support for the Crime Commission were cast aside and he foolishly allowed political opportunism to convince him that there was a benefit to be had by suddenly changing his position. Indeed, when the debate came on he did not even take part in it.

It is noted that the Crime Commission worked closely with the Queensland Police Service, the Criminal Justice Commission and other law enforcement agencies. It was supported by a management committee that was chaired by the commission chairman, Tim Carmody, and included the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission, the Police Commissioner, the Chairman of the National Crime Authority, the Children's Commissioner, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee and two community representatives, one being a female and the other having a demonstrated interest in civil liberties. The commission was driven by references made by that management committee. If any members claimed that the commission never delivered results, they would in fact be criticising the ability of the management committee that delivered those references to the Queensland Crime Commission.

Further evidence that the Borbidge government was determined to be effective in handling crime was given when the government introduced the Telecommunications (Interception) Queensland Bill on 5 March 1998. That was a further display that the government was committed to providing the Queensland Police Service and other Queensland criminal law enforcement bodies with the tools to counter those who consider themselves untouchable or above the law. Telecommunications is one of the tools that are necessary in modern policing and it complemented other investigative measures that were given to the police under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, which was passed by the parliament in November 1997. Telecommunications interception is critical in identifying the nature of the offences involved, the extent of a network—for example, a drug network—and the location of purposely concealed assets that could be derived from some intolerable drug or major organised crime activity.

Those situations were the very reason that, as early as 1986, it was recommended by the Stewart royal commission that the power to use telecommunications interception in order to fight serious crime should be granted to state and territory law enforcement bodies. Telephones, fax machines and computers are used daily by people all over Australia to communicate with one another. We see our Queensland Police Service and our Queensland Crime Commission hamstrung in the way that they can investigate in a modern and technically efficient way because they do not have those powers. Those powers definitely need to be in place, and they need to operate under very strict independent surveillance. A system of permission needs to be enacted for their use so that the civil liberties of innocent people are not infringed in any way. A system such as the Public Interest Monitor, which is used for approvals for various covert systems of surveillance, or an even more stringent system would provide the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Crime Commission with a very necessary tool of modern policing and investigation. At the moment Queensland simply does not have such a tool, although virtually every other state of Australia has. It is amazing to think that the government will not introduce that tool.

The legislation that we are examining today allows for an extension of powers so that an investigative body can monitor computer data on a touch-type system and even emails can be intercepted. Why can't the telephone system be similarly intercepted? The current system allows investigative authorities to tap into the information technology systems of the day, that is, computers and email, but they cannot tap into the telephone system. That should be allowed, with appropriate oversights so that public civil liberties are not in any way infringed.

Earlier I spoke about the necessity for introducing this bill. There has not been a public demand or a public outcry. It is clear that there is a political agenda, as outlined by the Premier in a ministerial statement of 6 August 1998. The political agenda is, for some reason or other, the abolition of the Crime Commission. Why is there a rush? The time frame to finalise the appointment of the Chairman of the Crime and Misconduct Commission has been imposed by the Premier. Once again, we have an example of the arrogance of this government. Before this bill has even been through the House for examination and debate by its members, the government has advertised the position of the Chairman of the Crime and Misconduct Commission. It is arrogantly disregarding the debate that might occur in this House and arrogantly—

Mr Livingstone: I guess we'll just use our numbers.

Mr HORAN: That interjection shows the arrogance of the government. The member for Ipswich West said, 'I guess we'll just use our numbers.' So they will ram it through. They might as well not turn up and debate these issues if they are just going to use their numbers to ram through legislation and advertise for these positions well in advance. They could at least show some respect for the parliament and advertise for this position after it has been created. The position is not even in effect. This bill has not been passed by the parliament. The legislation has not been enacted, yet the government is advertising the position in arrogant disdain for the parliament. That is typical of so many other things it does.

Mr Livingstone: Your people don't even want to speak on it. There's only about three people from your side of the House. Why aren't you up there with all your speakers?

Mr HORAN: I just took the member's interjection that they want to use their numbers to ram through this legislation.

Mr Livingstone: Put all your speakers on it.

Mr HORAN: There are plenty of our members speaking to this, and we will probably make a lot more sense than the member ever will. I bet the member does not even agree with this; he will just toe the party line as usual.

In relation to the rush for the legislation, new amendments have been tabled today. I thank the Premier's staff for paying us the courtesy of going through those amendments. It is clear that parliamentary counsel have been rushed into preparing this legislation and that there is an inordinate rush to have it enacted.

About the only sensible argument that I have heard for the amalgamation of the Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission has been that there will be some savings in administration. If we really want to get to the bottom of major crime and paedophilia, what is the point in saving on a few wages by rationalising the administration, as the government proposes to do, if it defeats the whole purpose of why the Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission are in place? The most important issue is that we have specialised organisations that can undertake investigations successfully and that each is not mixed up with another organisation that is there for a totally different purpose.

Another issue that is of great concern to the opposition is that the criminal research unit derived from within the independent research unit of the Criminal Justice Commission will be located within the government—within the political oversight of the Premier's Department. This proposal is very alarming. I would like to read an excerpt from the Premier's second reading speech to this bill. He stated—

The criminal justice research unit will be located within government and will inform government policy and resource decision making. The purpose of this unit is to have better informed decision makers, not to somehow cover up information on the criminal justice system ...

At the moment the Justice Department, Police and Corrections all have databases that mostly serve their own purposes. This unit will draw from that vast bank of information and actively encourage information sharing between criminal justice agencies. Rather than stifling information on the criminal justice system, the unit will make it more accessible and intelligible.

What I think we have here is the potential for the Premier and the Labor government to reinvent the special branch. We will have within the Premier's Department a research group, taken across from the Criminal Justice Commission, that will 'draw from that vast bank of information'. It states—

At the moment the Justice Department, Police and Corrections all have databases that mostly serve their own purposes.

So here we will have the Premier's Department tapping into the databases of the Justice Department, the Police Service and Corrections. Can members remember back a few years when we had all of the controversy about the ministerial office of the then Police Commissioner, Mr Mackenroth? Do members remember the controversy about the computer linked to the police department and all of the concerns over that issue? Here we will have exactly the same thing. In the Premier's Department we will have the Criminal Justice Research Unit with access to the databases of the Justice Department, police and corrections and drawing from that vast bank of information. The great civil 'liberationist' Matt Foley is sitting opposite.

Mr Foley: Libertarian.

Mr HORAN: That is a special word I have invented for him; he fits the bill. I wonder what the minister's position is on this unit being transferred from the Criminal Justice Commission into the

Premier's Department and having access to all of the databases of the police department, Corrective Services and the Justice Department.

Mr Foley: I support the legislation. Tell us about Connolly-Ryan.

Mr HORAN: They reckon a leopard cannot change its spots. I certainly see that happening with respect to the minister; the spots have dropped off his hide. We see this proposal as most alarming.

Mr Foley: You tried to nobble the CJC and you didn't get away with it.

Mr HORAN: Is this the get square? The government wants to get a bit of control over everything by putting an investigative unit in the Premier's Department. It wants to bring the two units back together so that it can control them. It probably wants to manage the budget and move moneys around internally so that cutbacks can be made to the watchdog. The government would not be able to cut back the budget of the Criminal Justice Commission if it was a stand-alone corruption watchdog, but if it is amalgamated with the Queensland Crime Commission the government can probably do so under that umbrella by shuffling a bit of money one way or the other. In that way, the government will be able to do what it has always wanted to do and cut back the watchdog's powers by cutting back on its funding and staff.

I can tell the minister here and now that when we get into government we will be reinstating a proper corruption watchdog—a specialist watchdog on its own. That was the role of the Criminal Justice Commission. Its role is to be specialised and to be able to oversee and eliminate corruption, official misconduct and misconduct.

Mr Foley: Why did you approve the establishment of Connolly-Ryan?

Mr HORAN: The member should tell us why he did not stand up to this. Is he happy about this? He should tell us if he is happy to see the special investigative and research unit being moved from the realm of independence under the Criminal Justice Commission and being put in a political office—in the Premier's Department—with that office being given access to all of the databases for the police, Corrective Services and the Justice Department? The minister should tell us where he stands on that.

As I said, this is one of the most alarming proposals that this parliament has seen. I hope that those people who have espoused the principles of the Criminal Justice Commission and have written about it, researched it and taken it seriously see this for what it is. This is a grab for extra research and investigative powers by shifting it into the Criminal Justice Commission, taking it into the Premier's Department and at the same time providing an open door for the government to get into all of these databases.

We have heard a lot about the secret state. We know how the government has trundled truckloads of information through the cabinet process. Today in the parliament we have seen the damning report by the Ombudsman on what the government has done. We have seen the government's tactics through a bill that will start to whack on a charge for freedom of information requests. The government will do anything it can to put a hurdle or impediment in the way of democracy in this state. The government has made it 10 times harder for local government aldermen to stand for state government positions. Mr Deputy Speaker, you were one of the architects of that. You proudly espouse that you were. You have put councillors in this state in the same category as criminals and bankrupts by putting every possible barrier in front of them in standing for parliament. Other people can simply take leave without pay from their job, stand for a position and then return to that job if they are unsuccessful. This is typical of the government's placing one hurdle after another in the way of democracy in this state. This proposal is the most alarming proposal of all. I hope that the good commentators out there will see this secret, dark move that is being undertaken. To think that in the Premier's Department we will have a unit—

Mr Reeves: There are no secrets around here.

Mr HORAN: It might not be secret now, but it will be secret when it gets into the Premier's Department. The member knows that. It provides the sorts of opportunities, as I said, for a special branch type of operation. The Premier's Department will be able to have access to whatever information it wants out of those three departments and their enormous databases. Again, that is something that we will be opposing in this bill, just as we oppose the bill in its entirety.

Surely this research unit will provide the Premier and his Labor Party hacks with access to highly confidential records and information on just about everyone in this state. Doesn't this have serious ramifications? Doesn't this enable the Premier and his mates to be the state's new special branch, enabling the Premier and his mates to establish dirt files on anyone who directly or

indirectly upsets them? We know the extent to which they will go regarding freedom of information. If they cannot stop applications by putting truck loads of information through cabinet, they will do it by introducing a charge for accessing the information. We know the extent to which they will go. Surely this action would constitute a serious breach of the Privacy Act.

As well, the Premier is hell-bent on politicising the research capabilities of so-called independent entities. He has diminished the research capabilities of the Parliamentary Library and now we have this invasive assault on the criminal justice system itself. I find it amazing that people such as Minister Foley and Minister Wells are a part of this when we consider their pontificating over the years about the Criminal Justice Commission and about having a system—

Mr Foley: Tell us about Connolly-Ryan. Why did you try to nobble the CJC?

Mr HORAN: The minister should try to answer these arguments. He just wants to cover it up. He is embarrassed by where he stands. He is embarrassed by the fact that he is a party to this. He is embarrassed by the fact that he is a hypocrite.

Mr Foley: On the contrary. We tried to reform it, unlike you lot, who tried to nobble the CJC to get Borbidge and other people off the hook. You sat around that cabinet table.

Mr HORAN: A few years ago, when it suited him, he pontificated on all these issues. Now it suits him to have a special branch in the Premier's Department, and he sits there and just acquiesces and says, 'Yes, that's what we're going to do.'

The role of the chairman of the new body being the chair of a public hearing is an important issue because this legislation sets out that public hearings can only be undertaken by the chairman of the CMC. However, what is going to happen in the event of something like the Shepherdson inquiry, when an inquiry is ongoing for months upon months upon months? Who is going to undertake any other public inquiries? Or do we have a waiting list for necessary public inquiries, just as we have waiting lists for many other things under this government? This particular proposal will result in a slowing down of any proper public hearing—any necessary public hearing—into matters of importance, into matters relating to corruption or official misconduct.

We are going to strongly oppose this bill. When we return to government we will reverse this legislation to ensure that Queensland has a specialised anticorruption and a specialised anti-official misconduct organisation so that Queenslanders who expect to have one of those modern pillars of democracy such as the Criminal Justice Commission can have confidence that once again Queensland will have such an organisation. Whether politicians want it or not, it has to be there. It is expected of modern government; it is expected of this parliament. This government is intent on endeavouring to water it down and to go back to a failed system.

We will set up an organised crime and paedophilia fighting organisation—which will be like the Queensland Crime Commission—that can specialise. Our organisation will have its own core business and will not be distracted by being part of an organisation that also investigates the Queensland Police Service, with which the organised crime investigative body should be working carefully, closely and hand in glove. That just will not work because the underlying resentment that could arise will see all of that cooperation and close working relationship evaporate.

The Crime Commission's real problem has been the lack of government support from the Labor government and the lack of laws to facilitate the seizure of criminal assets. I can tell this parliament that a National Party government will fix that, too, so that we have a Queensland Crime Commission that will not only be specialised but will also be provided with the necessary financial resources. It will be fully funded and it will be supported by legislation that enables it to seize assets and undertake the modern investigation that is required.

There are a couple of other matters that I want to touch on. There is an interesting part in the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee report No. 6 of February 1995. It says—

There is no doubt that the CJC has played a useful role in fighting organised crime jointly with the Queensland Police Service and other agencies. But a different institutional approach would have advantages. There is no reason why that useful role could not be carried on by a separate crime commission, outside the CJC, which would not have the possible conflict of having to investigate police involved in a joint operation.

That is exactly what I have been saying over and over again: there is no reason why that useful role could not be carried out by a separate crime commission, outside the CJC, which would not have the possible conflict of having to investigate police involved in a joint operation. It is that very role of the Criminal Justice Commission, in which it has to stand on its own by virtue of its role, which will always make it difficult to be part of an organisation and at the same time be working with the Queensland Police Service on many, many issues of paedophilia and major crime that

have been referred to it. It makes no sense whatsoever for it to have those two particular functions.

I want to go through a few points that were made in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on Friday, 26 October by Phil Dickie, the journalist who was involved in much of the investigative journalism that led to the Fitzgerald inquiry. If anyone could understand the dark intent that exists in the transfer of this investigative research unit from the CJC to the Premier's Department it would probably be him. He really sees that that particular transfer seems to be the final stage of the junking of Tony Fitzgerald's scheme for turning Queensland into a bright beacon of best practice in crime control and criminal justice. He goes on to say—

Department officers would not usually be able to examine an issue at such depth or with such little restriction—
as used to happen under the Criminal Justice Commission. He says—

It is also unlikely that the fruits of their work would be permitted to be shared around at all, or shared without censorship.

He is probably making a further point to that which I have made today. He is making the point that if they were doing research, for example, into the effectiveness of the policing of break and enters, or statistics on the increases in crime and the factors behind that and the outcome was not good for the government, there is every chance that such a report would not be true or honest or open. It could well be censored. It might not even be released. Are we going to have a register of all the investigations that this particular research unit carries out? I bet we do not.

We have another shift of people to the Premier's Department, which is massively staffed at the moment for reasons of propaganda and so forth. More researchers are to come in, either to do more research for the Labor Party or to do more research into criminal justice matters, the result of which will not be released if it is a nasty result for the government or, more insidiously, if it is able to access these data systems of the three departments I mentioned previously—Police, Justice and Corrections—and have the potential to be used as a quasi special branch under the political umbrella of the Premier's Department.

I want to go through some of the briefings that were given to me by the staff of the Premier's Department and touch briefly on some of those issues. Currently the Criminal Justice Commission has five commissioners as well as the chair. We are going to see the Crime and Misconduct Commission being virtually the same as the Criminal Justice Commission, which has a full-time chairman and four part-time commissioners. So under this bill it is proposed that the Crime and Misconduct Commission will comprise the chair and four community representatives representing civil liberties; public sector management review; criminology, sociology, crime prevention and research; and community service. There will be two additional non-voting members—that is, Assistant Commissioner of Crime and Assistant Commissioner of Misconduct. They will be able to sit in on meetings but will have no voting rights.

As I said, the commission will be split into two divisions—the misconduct division and the crime division. This is one aspect in the bill where the systems of relaying allegations of official misconduct either to the commission or to the Queensland Police Service have been detailed and set out in accordance with where they have been moved to in line with trials undertaken by the Queensland Police Service regarding allegations of misconduct and official misconduct. Following those trials, there has been some adjustment in the way that complaints of misconduct and official misconduct can be made. When there is a complaint of misconduct, the police have primary responsibility. At the same time, the police must notify the commission and the police must commence action. In the case of official misconduct, they must identify the official misconduct and refer it to the commission expeditiously and the commission may refer some official misconduct back to the police for investigation.

These changes are one part of this legislation that we see as a gradual improvement, but that does not take away from the fact that we believe the very basic principles of this bill are completely wrong. It takes the whole system backwards and loses its real effect and usefulness. While commenting on that system of complaints to the Queensland Police Service, I make note of something that came out of the Wood inquiry in New South Wales—that is, if the police were not responsible for the standards within their service, they could abdicate the oversight role, the process of dealing with complaints and responsibility for overall behaviour. Even though that is an improvement, it is totally wrong because it sits within the umbrella of this bill.

I conclude my contribution to this debate by reiterating what I said from the outset in keeping with the principles as to why the opposition will not be supporting this bill. Queensland has come a long way since the Fitzgerald inquiry and since the inception of the Criminal Justice Commission.

Politicians and political parties from both sides have had problems with it, but all politicians and political parties have to accept that, as part of modern politics and modern government, the intelligent communities we represent expect openness and accountability from us. The community expects there to be an organisation they can trust that will honestly and accurately investigate complaints without fear or favour, an organisation that is monitored by this parliament through the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, an organisation that is good at what it does, an organisation that does nothing else but concentrate on that role, and an organisation that does that role well and earns the respect and trust of our community. They do not want an organisation involved with a bigger organisation responsible for other roles which will be added to by this bill of investigating major crime and paedophilia, roles that it did not do well when it had that responsibility in the early part of the 1990s.

During that time it was clearly demonstrated that it was far better to have an organisation with simply one role—that is, an official watchdog over corruption, misconduct and official misconduct which sets out standards, which produces fearless reports on research into justice, which researches trends in Queensland of major crime or other investigative activities, which researches trends regarding the prevention of crime in this state, which researches trends regarding the way departments are run and that they use every endeavour to ensure that everything is handled in a proper, open and accountable way. That is the true and proper role of the Criminal Justice Commission. With this bill, that role will be usurped and mixed with other roles which it was unsuccessful in properly undertaking previously.

As a result of the coalition government establishing the Queensland Crime Commission, we have a specialised unit. It is one that the Premier in his previous role as Opposition Leader approved of. Because of its speciality, he believed that it could do its job in a better way. As I have said a number of times today, it is a role it could undertake in harmony with the Queensland Police Service because it is not the organisation charged with responsibility for investigating police officers or investigating claims or allegations made against the Queensland Police Service. It makes no sense whatsoever to have an organisation that has a specific responsibility to investigate all claims of misconduct made against the Queensland Police Service to a greater extent than any other government department. It makes no sense to have that same organisation charged with working hand in glove in close partnership with the Queensland Police Service on matters of a great investigative nature, on matters of serious networking, on matters that need resolution and that can only be resolved if there is absolute and total cooperation between the two organisations.

The principles behind this bill are illogical and make no sense whatsoever. This bill is a backwards step. This bill reduces the chance of Queensland having the best watchdog in Australia. This bill reduces the chance of Queensland having the best fighter of major crime and paedophilia in Australia. This bill reduces the chance of having an organisation that can work effectively in close cooperation with the Queensland Police Service to bring its additional powers of investigation and interrogation to assist the Queensland Police Service in difficult and intricate investigations.

Mr Welford: You should stop making it up as you go along. You should stick to the script. You are not making sense.

Mr HORAN: That just demonstrates that those opposite treat this with such frivolity. They treat this parliament as a joke. I will not take any more notice of the member opposite. He is only the Attorney-General, so he probably would not know a lot about things that make sense.

Our final objection to this bill is the serious transfer of the research unit from the Criminal Justice Commission into the Premier's Department and its access to the entire databank of the Queensland Police Service regarding the justice system and the corrective services system. We will not only oppose this bill but in good time will bring about measures that can fix all the serious problems and give Queensland a better corruption watchdog and a better Crime Commission.

Mr BRISKEY (Cleveland—ALP) (3.08 p.m.): I rise in support of the Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001 which sensibly amalgamates the Crime Commission and the CJC into one body, the Crime and Misconduct Commission. The commission will have two core functions—fighting against corruption and the fight against major and organised crime. I want to use the time allotted to me to address some aspects of organised crime and why this bill is so important in the fight against this activity. During the 1970s and early 1980s a series of royal commissions conducted by Justices Moffitt, Woodward, Williams, Stewart and Mr Frank Costigan QC reported that organised crime clearly existed in Australia and that there was a need to take more effective action to combat it.

Combined with the murder of antidrug campaigner Donald Mackay in Griffith, the spotlight of public attention was starkly drawn to the issue and significance of organised crime. In its 1984 report on the National Crime Authority Bill 1983, the Senate Standing Committee on Constitutional and Legal Affairs described the types of criminality which the NCA was to counter in the following terms. The report states—

The criminal activities identified by recent royal commissioners have been variously (and loosely) described as 'white collar', organised, complex and sophisticated crimes. The label is unimportant. In Australia such types of crime have been identified by royal commissions as being rife in the areas of taxation evasion, bankruptcy-fraud, theft, fraud, illegal gambling, currency violation, illegal drug dealings, financial exploitation of others in vice rackets and the wrongful use of the corporate veil to achieve unlawful purposes and ends.

Some 17 years later we can add to this list two more insidious activities—paedophilia and refugee trafficking. These represent two more means of profiting from the trade in human misery. These new and tragic areas of crime are of particular importance to me. As many members would know, before entering parliament I was a teacher. I took very seriously the great responsibility of caring for and nurturing our children in the classroom. For that reason I am proud to support these changes that will strengthen measures and enhance the fight against the evil of paedophilia. Similarly, my close involvement with the ethnic communities in Queensland gives me an even greater appreciation of the tragedy of people smuggling that we see unfolding each night on our televisions.

The principal characteristic that distinguishes organised crime from other forms of criminal behaviour is the underlying objective of this illicit activity. The major goal of organised crime is to maximise economic gain. It responds to a particular demand, and the profits of the activities go to people who stand back and are not directly involved in committing the crime.

Increasing mobility and declining international restrictions on the movement of goods, money and services have created new global markets with transnational business opportunities. The globalisation of trade facilitated access to foreign markets, and the advantages offered by technological innovations have made many enterprises expand their activities across borders and seek to develop their activities on a global scale.

The economic opportunities offered by globalisation are not exclusive to legitimate organisations. Although many criminal organisations appear to operate predominantly on a national level, there is growing evidence that organised crime systematically creates international structures and violates the legislation of more than one country to benefit from the changes in world markets and their regulations. Organised crime has quickly responded to the emergence of global trading and international financial networks by adapting organisational and operational structures to the challenges of global activities.

In order to exploit illegal market opportunities in other countries, criminal organisations have learned to use the discrepancies that occur between different national legal and financial systems to their best advantage. There are a number of special features which apply to these illegal markets. Firstly, contracts and ownership are not protected by law and participants cannot seek protection from courts and law enforcement activities. Secondly, threats, intimidation and violence are commonly used as means of enforcement. Thirdly, there is the establishment of defences against penetration by law enforcement and sometimes competing criminal interests. These defences can include factors ranging from ethnicity of membership through to the use of modern telecommunications and computing technologies. Fourthly, systematic corruption and bribery have become essential features of contemporary organised crime. Fifthly, there is resulting monopolisation by destroying competition and extortion as the price for allowing somebody else's business to continue.

Queensland is not immune to organised crime by any means. In the 1990s the NCA investigated allegations that organised crime groups were using Brisbane fruit and vegetable markets to move illegal drugs interstate. It is known that the Mafia, triads and other organised crime groups have operated in this state. Certainly Australia, and indeed Queensland, does not have the depth of crime and corruption of some other countries of the world, but history has shown that we are not unaffected.

I have already mentioned the increasing use of sophisticated computer technology and tools such as the Internet, which criminal enterprises are exploiting. John Broome, former chairperson of the National Crime Authority, stated—

While not everyone involved in organised crime is personally sophisticated, most are adept at using the most up-to-the-minute techniques and facilities to run their operations smoothly.

Many of today's big operators are based overseas and most have elaborate ways of protecting their interests through complex financial arrangements, the use of tax havens and via willing third parties. For example, they may pay professionals such as lawyers and accountants to help them capitalise on the proceeds of their crimes and these days their henchmen are more likely to wield a calculator than a crowbar.

This bill introduces a new and important tool which will allow the commission to conduct electronic data surveillance. This will allow surveillance of serious criminal activities on computers.

The very fabric of our society is undermined by the by-products of organised crime and its attendant corruption and violence. This country cannot reach its greatest economic potential if we as a government do not play our part in the fight against organised crime. The enormous cost to our society of the criminal activity which affects our children and our youth is sufficient in itself to warrant the changes which this bill will bring about—greater efficiency and, more importantly, greater effectiveness in the war against organised crime. I have great pleasure, therefore, in supporting this bill.

Mr FLYNN (Lockyer—ONP) (3.16 p.m.): I rise to speak briefly to the Crime and Misconduct Bill. Some very worthy speakers before me have covered the bases quite well, but I have concern over a number of clauses that appear either unclear or unfair. My concerns are duplicated in relation to similar powers under other acts, but those acts are not referred to here.

I concur with the need to cover all bases in the fight against crime and misconduct. However, when shifting certain provisions from one act to another to make the jobs of the commission and the police easier, it is all too easy for inequity to enter the equation. As an example, clause 82, which recasts section 95 of the Crime Commission Act and incorporates section 74 of the Criminal Justice Act, refers to the issue of attendance notices and the requirement to state thereon the general nature of matters about which a person may be questioned. It also states that if such detail is missing the commission may still question the person about any matter related to a particular investigation. If this were to be the case, plainly slipshod procedures would be being employed by the commission. To a degree, it fails to address the principles of justice as they relate to the provision of legal advice to a person appearing before the commission. While I fully support the drive to arrive at the truth, we must be careful that we do not forget the principles of justice. I am fairly sure that the commission would not tolerate similar errors by other parties to proceedings.

With respect to search warrants, I refer to clause 97 of the Crime and Misconduct Bill, which provides a requirement for post-search approval where urgent circumstances required a search without a warrant. That situation is presently catered for under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. In my opinion, this requirement has always created a danger for police officers and other authorised officers—that is, although perhaps unintentional, an officer or officers may have performed an act or acts in the process of a search, indicating to the magistrate that a post-search warrant or approval should not be issued. I would imagine that in such a circumstance police might not go ahead with the case, no matter how well founded the evidence may have been. That is due to the fact that many prosecutions fail primarily due to ill-founded warrants. To clarify this statement, I believe that, where officers proceed to court with evidence gained in part or in whole as a result of a search with no warrant, the issue of the legality of the search should be a matter for the deliberation of the court, and not by a magistrate as such.

Clause 167 in connection with the issue of arrest warrants states that a judge can refuse to consider the application until requisite information is provided. If the matter is of such a nature that an arrest may not be effected without warrant, then surely in such circumstances a judge must refuse the application.

Clause 197 shows that where a witness is compelled to produce a document or answer a question and a ground of privilege against self-incrimination would otherwise apply, the answer or document may not be used against them in any subsequent civil or criminal proceeding. This condition appears to sabotage the very legislation designed to assist the prosecution or investigative process. Provided the person had access to independent legal counsel, there should be no such protection against self-incrimination; if you answer a question and you incriminate yourself, tough.

With regard to the transfer of staff from the commission to the Premier's Department and the ready access of government departments to sensitive data on different departmental computers, I concur with the member for Toowoomba South in expressing concern about political access to such sensitive information, and I ask—and I think we should demand—that the government should consider that, although it may believe in its own integrity beyond doubt, there are those who do not. And even if the government's intentions are honourable, it may not be here forever.

Not even the Premier should have general access, only the right to be briefed on any issue on a case-by-case basis. Other than these considerations, I generally support the concept of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mickel): Order! Before calling the next speaker, I remind members that this is a debate on the second reading of the bill. It is inappropriate to go through it clause by clause. The chair has been lenient on this occasion, but I would advise further speakers that it is a debate on the second reading of the bill.

Mr PURCELL (Bulimba—ALP) (3.21 p.m.): Over recent months the CJC chairman, Brendan Butler, the Crime Commissioner, Mr Tim Carmody, and the Commissioner of Police, Mr Bob Atkinson, have been closely consulted in the development of this model and the bill to implement it. So it has been talked about for some time. The bill will deal with the primary areas of a new era for public integrity and law enforcement in Queensland.

Despite what our opposition friends are saying, we are bringing both of these agencies together. They will not be working at cross-purposes; they will be working together. It will save money and make them both more accountable. It will make for a better crime-fighting outfit. We have experienced some very serious crime from time to time. I heard what my colleague from Cleveland said. We probably do not have the crime figures here in Queensland that they have in the southern states, but I can assure members that we have our share. This will equip those bodies better to fight criminals. The operations of the combined organisation will be virtually the same when they are brought together. We will not lose any bodies. The powers will stay the same, except for the ability to conduct electronic data surveillance which, I understand, will be done through computers.

The commission will be brought to a higher level in combating misconduct by pro-actively building the capacity of the units of public administration to handle misconduct within their own agencies. That needs to be done. Who watches the watchers? Something that I think we are all aware of is that we give agencies enormous powers and then we find that five, 10 or 20 years later those agencies have become a law unto themselves because nobody has been keeping a close enough eye on them to prevent that from happening.

I am pleased that, through this bill, the Queensland Police Service will take responsibility for police misconduct. That is putting that responsibility back where it should be. Obviously, in the past it was not working. Police who were investigating other police had enormous pressures put on them from within the service. I think that people can now feel confident that the Police Service will be able to look after its own bad apples, if you like, and weed them out. This has probably been happening for some time. The CJC has been flicking back police misconduct matters—or supposedly misconduct matters—to the police for them to investigate. Obviously, it is the police within the CJC who investigate them. So it is a matter of whether they have their CJC police hat on or their hat from the Valley, Mount Gravatt or Roma Street—wherever they are doing the investigation. The police should be looking after their own and making sure that they aim upwards. I know that from time to time we hear the Police Union saying that we use double standards or that we have harder standards for police than for others in the community. That is because of their job and the enormous power that they can wield. As we have seen from what Fitzgerald found, they can become a law unto themselves.

There will be greater accountability of the commission. That is important. If a commissioned officer is suspected of improper conduct, the commission chair will be required to notify the parliamentary committee. Members of the parliamentary committee—the member for Ferny Grove and his colleagues—will carry a grave responsibility to ensure that matters that are referred to them are investigated to their satisfaction and that they are happy with the outcomes. Also, they can only investigate something if the required information comes their way to enable them to make a decision. Therefore, we really are relying on the CJC to make information available so that the committee members can evaluate the matters brought before them.

I am pleased that the commissioner will be conducting all public hearings. The engagement of outside counsel from time to time is okay, but in the legal profession legal eagles look after legal eagles. It is fairly common for one part of an industry to look after the other. They set up commissions which run forever and go over budget. And then, when one considers their findings, one really must wonder what they were doing there in the first place and what they were looking for. So with the commissioner himself heading up those inquiries, that will keep people's minds on the job and make sure that the outcomes of the inquiries will be what they should be.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr PURCELL: If the member is saying that the new CJC person is going to bend to political parties, that is really an indictment of the person who is to be appointed.

Mr McNamara: A disgraceful slur.

Mr PURCELL: That is a disgraceful slur, as my colleague the member for Hervey Bay said. That will not happen.

Everybody knows that the wheel turns. We will not be here forever. We will be here for 30 or 40 years, I suppose, but we will have a turn in government, and we would expect members opposite to act in the same way as we do—with integrity and making sure that the people who are appointed do the job that they are appointed to do.

The people I am talking about will be appointed by a panel: Gary Crooke QC—that is an unfortunate name—from the National Crime Authority will be the chair; Catherine Sinclair of the Consultancy Bureau; Archbishop Bathersby—is anybody going to cast a slur on Archbishop Bathersby and what he would say about who would be appointed? I ask members to put their hands up and I will name them if they want me to. Other members of the panel will be the chair and deputy chair of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, who currently are Geoff Wilson MP and Howard Hobbs MP. The Assistant Commissioner, Crime, and the Assistant Commissioner, Misconduct, will be selected by the same panel. Appointments will be made after consultation with the commission chair and the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Toowoomba South will be consulted and, if he had concerns, obviously he would raise them. He is not a person who remains behind the door when he wants to make his opinions known. He will have that opportunity.

A different matter is electronic surveillance on computers and so forth. I might not know a great deal about computers, but I believe that lots of criminals use them to sell goods, to communicate and to do all sorts of things. We need to know what these criminals are about, because their activities cross state and national boundaries without any trouble at all. We need to know what is coming in and going out of our country. With those few words, I support the bill.

Mr SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—NPA) (3.30 p.m.): I rise to oppose the bill before the parliament and I do so for good reason. Members should cast their minds back to 1997 and consider some of the issues surrounding the then commencement of the deconstruction of the CJC into two separate entities, being the modern Criminal Justice Commission and the Queensland Crime Commission.

We have heard much today from honourable members opposite about the great benefits which will accrue to the people of Queensland from the amalgamation of those two bodies—one dealing with corruption and official misconduct, the other dealing with organised crime and paedophilia—into the new Crime and Misconduct Commission. I am extremely concerned about what this will mean. I have seen no example whatsoever of any great benefit which will accrue to the people of Queensland.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mickel): Order! I interrupt proceedings to welcome the parents, students and teachers from the Chatsworth State School in the Gympie electorate.

Mr SPRINGBORG: It should be clearly demonstrated to this parliament that there will be a general benefit when any action is taken. Having followed this issue from the moment it was first mooted by the Premier and discussed generally, I have not seen that there will be a general advantage for Queenslanders. Whether it is people involved in tracking down and tackling organised crime, those involved in dealing with corruption and official misconduct or the taxpayers of Queensland, the amalgamation of those two bodies does not accrue a particular benefit to the people of Queensland. If a decision is made in this place, members should be assured that there is a good reason for it and that there will be a benefit from it. Most members of this parliament have indicated a fundamental belief in openness, transparency and accountability in government. However, the way those particular objectives are achieved and the way members evaluate one another's performances are somewhat subjective.

The CJC was established in the early 1990s to ensure the existence of a body capable of dealing with official misconduct, corruption and organised crime. It can be fairly said that the subsequent performance of the then CJC was not satisfactory or up to the mark. For that reason, it was deconstructed and separated into the CJC and the Queensland Crime Commission. Can honourable members here today demonstrate any occasions on which it has been less efficient operating as two separate bodies than it was when operating as one body up until about 1997? It seems that no demonstrable evidence can be brought before this parliament to show that, because in its original form the CJC did not work very well or very effectively.

Mr McNamara interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: Members are hearing a lot of rhetoric in this parliament from people such as the honourable member for Hervey Bay, who will no doubt catch some sort of script from the Attorney-General or the Premier and rise this afternoon to waffle on with some sort of insincere diatribe. However, there is no demonstrable benefit to the people of Queensland from this decision to amalgamate—absolutely none whatsoever. The fact is that the CJC—

Mr Welford interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: The minister cannot even fix up the problems in the drug court or in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions or put technology in the courts. The minister should not be speaking in this House about the CJC and the Crime Commission working better as one entity when his past performance does not bode well for that sort of amalgamation.

There has not been any evidence demonstrated here whatsoever. The CJC, as it has operated to date, has been far more effective, efficient and focused under Chairman Brendan Butler than under previous chairmen. Further, the Crime Commission, under Tim Carmody, has worked extremely well in tackling and dealing with issues of organised crime. There is always room for improvement—there is no doubt about that—but what the government—

Mr McNamara interjected

Mr SPRINGBORG: I think I heard someone behind me indicating that there is some sort of effusive support for the amalgamation of those two bodies. I am not necessarily sure that that is the case. There was a great degree of reluctance and reticence, at least in the initial stages. However, once faced with the inevitable, there is little that one can do except lie down and try to enjoy what is being foisted upon one. I think there is still a degree of reluctance on the part of workers within those two bodies to be involved in what the government is seeking to do here today.

With its coercive powers and through the actions of its extremely professional officers, the Queensland Crime Commission has been quite effective in dealing with issues of organised crime in this state. As I said, there is always room for improvement. Given its resources, it could have done little better than it did—as is the case with the CJC. Prior to the deconstruction or the splitting of the CJC and the creation of the two separate bodies, it had a bigger budget than it presently has, but it did not operate anywhere near as effectively and efficiently as it does today.

My concern is that some time down the track—whether it be two, three, six, 12 or 18 months—this new body will have been formed and we will not be able to discern the same degree of effectiveness from it that we have seen from those two bodies. That is a real worry. Apart from the rhetoric we have heard from the government, I want to hear something which is a real justification of the aims, achievements and objectives that will flow from actually doing this.

I also wish to examine the government's taking the capacity of the independent research division of the CJC and supplanting it into the Premier's Department. That should create a great degree of concern for any decent Queenslanders who is concerned about openness and transparency and access to unbiased information that has not had a spin put on it in this state. I am surprised that the Attorney-General and the former Attorney-General, the much lauded civil libertarian and member for Yeronga, would even sit around a cabinet table and let that happen. When such a division is taken away from an independent body and supplanted into the Premier's Department there is the very real risk that there will be some sort of filtering of that information and that there is going to be a greater capacity for the government to be able to temper it in such a way that it agrees with its viewpoint and also would mitigate against any negative findings against the government.

I return to one matter that I raised with the Premier last year and to which I have not even had a response. He put on the government web page something that said that if a paedophile comes to Queensland then he is going to be caught, he is going to be convicted and he is going to be sent to jail. I provided the Premier with information and case examples of where people had been convicted of child sex offences but in Queensland were not even convicted, let alone sent to jail, and indicated that his web site was, in fact, portraying false information. That site did not disappear until two months later. It used to have an arrow that blinked indicating people to click on a site. That site was for anyone who was thinking of doing those sorts of things in Queensland and anyone who wanted to think that the government was tough on law and order. After several months, the Premier still did not have the capacity to be able to independently get that information from kindred government departments and then even the decency to respond and take the site off in a timely manner. If that is the level of evaluation of information that we have in

Queensland, then I have little confidence that we are going to see any sort of unbiased application, interpretation or release of information by the Premier's Department.

The simple reality is that if the research power is under the agency of the Premier and contained within the Executive Building, then there is a very real risk that it is going to be used for political purposes. I think that that is a risk that we in the parliament cannot take. That sort of independent gathering, evaluation and dissemination of critical information regarding official misconduct, crime—whatever the case may be—should be done by an independent organisation.

One thing that needs to be said about the CJC is that its research division is extremely good. We could probably have made much better use of that information to ensure good policy in Queensland and more proactive policy development. Nevertheless, it was good information. I think that if it is not broke we should not fix it. We should not throw the baby out with the bathwater. In that regard, I say to the members of the government to really reconsider what they are planning to implement.

A little while ago the member for Bulimba touched on an issue that I do not think was a very good response to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition relating to the fact that the person who will head this body will have the responsibility of overseeing all inquiries. I am extremely concerned about that. I am not saying that that person, whether they are male or female, is not going to be up to the job. The simple fact is that information forthcoming from the public or disclosed in this parliament could require investigation and evaluation by professional people. To say that the person who will head this body has the capacity and has the time to sit down and oversee every inquiry is something that should create a lot of concern for members of this parliament. I could go on about Carruthers, Shepherdson or a range of issues, but my very grave concern is that that capacity, as contained in this bill, may be used to close down investigation and inquiry into matters that deserve to be considered far more fully. I would like to hear the Attorney-General respond to that issue in his reply.

Earlier I indicated that, generally, the Queensland Crime Commission has done a very good job. It could have done an even better job if this government was not so lethargic in providing it with the tools to do the job. It is all very well for the government members to come into this place and talk about wonderful, new legislation that will give us the best anti-official misconduct, anticorruption and anti-organised crime-fighting body in the world, but if they are not prepared to overcome their inherent and somewhat silly civil libertarian bent to provide that body with the capacity and the tools that it needs, it does not matter what sort of structure is put in place, it is not going to be able to deliver the expectations of the people of Queensland and also get to the nub of a lot of issues.

For three years now the Queensland Crime Commission, the CJC and the Police Service have been crying out for a far better regime in Queensland to ensure the confiscation of the proceeds of crime. This government has sat on its hands and has not been prepared to come forward and provide those bodies with those modern crime-fighting tools. We know that often people get involved in organised crime because of their capacity to profit from it to the most extraordinary extent possible. If people know that those bodies have a limited capacity to catch them and prosecute them and that, even if they are caught, successfully prosecuted and sent to jail, they will still have a lovely little nest egg of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars, accrued as a consequence of their various nefarious activities that they cannot lose, that is a fairly good incentive. One of the best things that we can do in Queensland is to take away that great incentive.

It was always envisaged that, when the original CJC was split into the current CJC and the Queensland Crime Commission, there would be an overhaul of that confiscation of the proceeds of crime legislation. That started. As I understand it, there was template legislation in the department when the current government came to power in its first term, but it has never been acted upon. The current Attorney-General seeks to provide an assurance in this parliament and also outside this parliament that he is going to act at some time to ensure that that very much-needed tool is going to be made a part of the crime-fighting armoury in Queensland. But we really have not seen any great evidence of that.

I understand that the civil libertarian members of the government, who include some ministers in the cabinet, are locked in a sort of death struggle with other members of the government over some of the principles behind the amendments that are necessary to ensure the confiscation of the proceeds of crime. Those amendments involve extending the current reverse onus of proof mechanisms. Those reverse onus of proof mechanisms exist in the case of drug trafficking, that is, if people involved in major drug trafficking are caught and convicted, the

authorities can then take them to court to make them prove that they have made that money from legitimate means. By and large, for every other sort of criminal activity involving transactions of extraordinary amounts of money the state has to prove that people gained that extraordinary amount of money from illegal means. That places an onerous burden on the state.

The other important tool that needs to be considered in terms of the confiscation of proceeds of crime is a civil confiscation. Some people might say that they have concerns about that. I do not think that those concerns are legitimate. Although in many cases authorities may not have sufficient evidence to prove something beyond reasonable doubt, they can go to a civil court and prove that on the balance of probabilities. I would say that if every member of this parliament received a knock on their doors tomorrow they would be able to pull out their group certificates, pull out their share certificates, or whatever the case may be, and prove the sources of their income. If a bricklayer, a farmer or somebody else has 14 Rolls Royces, a couple of investment units and a lot of cash in the bank, we know that something is going on. As I said, authorities might not be able to prove that to a criminal standard, but they may be able to prove it to a civil standard.

We need a mechanism like that to ensure that we can crack down on the extraordinary amount of money that can be made out of organised crime, which creates the incentive for people to become involved. It is not going to be a panacea, but it is another arrow in the armoury for our crime-fighting bodies as they deal with criminals who are extremely well resourced with the latest technology and the latest capacity to be able to evade detection and capture.

I am also very disappointed that this legislation does not provide our crime-fighting authorities with sufficient capacity to be able to intercept telephones and data. As I understand it, there is some limited capacity for them to be able to intercept data transfer, but it is certainly not comprehensive. I think that it is constrained to detection one way. No doubt, it is sophisticated in the way in which it will be applied and used. However, for authorities to be completely up to speed in their capacity to detect and crack down on these sophisticated organised criminal gangs, they need to have telephone interception powers. I think that just about all the other state jurisdictions have that power. Certainly, the Commonwealth—under the National Crime Authority and the Australian Federal Police—has that power because traditionally it has been involved in the administration of telecommunications. The government argues that, if the Queensland authorities need it, then they can work in cooperation with the Federal Police. That creates a rather turgid and stymied operation. Queensland needs to have that power, the exercise of which could be overseen by a public interest monitor and also requiring the consent of the Supreme Court of Queensland.

I ask: if it is good enough for other state jurisdictions to have that data and telephone interception power, why is it not good enough for Queensland crime-fighting bodies to have a similar capacity? I concede that Queensland already has some capacity to intercept data, but it is not absolute. I think that the government needs to consider that issue. All it indicates to me is that, even if the crime-fighting bodies have some capacity for data interception, if organised criminals know that they have no telephone-tapping powers, they might go back to using the good, old-fashioned telephone, or they may set a carrier pigeon off out the window, or something or other. I just do not think that our powers are really up to it.

This is a half-hearted effort to provide our crime-fighting bodies with the capacity that they need to intercept and crack down on organised crime. We know that it is becoming a lot more sophisticated. As the member for Bulimba said, it works not only within states but also within the country and across international boundaries. Those people are using the latest and the best in encryption technology. We know that that encryption technology is extremely hard to intercept and crack. Even with its super computers, the FBI can take months to intercept and crack data with 128 Kb encryption. Therefore, we have a lot of challenges ahead of us.

I am not convinced that what the government is doing today will provide any real step forward in the state's ability to respond to the organised crime issues that are so prolific, not only here but in other areas as well. As I said, our authorities are doing a reasonable job. They can always do better, but they have to work with the tools that the government gives them. I do not think anything is achieved by the amalgamation of official misconduct and anticorruption units. There was good reason for splitting them to start with and that has worked far more effectively than the old CJC did. Returning to the way that it was prior to 1997 will achieve very little for good public policy in this state. I believe that we will regret it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Phillips): Order! Before calling the honourable member for Hervey Bay, I welcome to the chamber students and teachers from Corinda State High School in the electorate of Mount Ommaney.

Mr McNAMARA (Hervey Bay—ALP) (3.51 p.m.): It is with great pleasure and an appreciation of historic occasion that I rise to take part in today's debate on the Crime and Misconduct Bill. As a new member of the parliament this year, but with a longstanding passion for politics and the law, I am intensely mindful of the serious work that we do here today. The political, legal and administrative upheaval in Queensland's affairs that followed the Fitzgerald inquiry was essential to restore integrity to our institutions of government, particularly the Queensland Police Service. However, the reforms recommended by Tony Fitzgerald QC, which were implemented in the form of the Criminal Justice Act 1989, were the start of a living, breathing and evolving framework for public accountability. The protection of honesty in government, the maintenance of the rule of law and the preservation of public faith in our police force are the big issues that we are here to confront.

Like every member in this place, I treat those responsibilities with the utmost seriousness. I am very aware that in another 12 years Queenslanders will look back and ask if what we did here today has served the state as well as those first Fitzgerald reforms in 1989. I firmly believe that they will.

I am pleased to support the legislation introduced by the Premier and the amendments to be moved in committee today. The bill will usher in the next era for public integrity and law enforcement in Queensland. However, it is a continuation of the Fitzgerald reforms, not a revocation. This bill recognises that during the past 12 years public administration in Queensland has been transformed. It is a matter of fact that doing business with government is now a transparent, honest, tender based process. Our police force is now free of the institutionalised corruption at its top that forced good cops out and allowed criminal behaviour to flourish.

I note in passing the recent misguided attempts by some to rehabilitate the reputation of disgraced former Police Commissioner Terry Lewis. Such efforts are doomed to failure and Terry Lewis will be remembered as a liar and a thief who betrayed the people of Queensland. Eventually, I expect that his name will be recalled only as a synonym for things murky and unpleasant as in, 'That fish isn't just off, it's completely Terry Lewis,' or 'I think I have just stepped in some Terry Lewis.' His name will be a pejorative term and its derivation will be lost in the mists of time.

Today is a day to celebrate the reform process that exposed Lewis and his cronies and to look forward to an updated framework for protecting public integrity and honest law enforcement. Today is a day to give thanks to those honest and hardworking police who have strived relentlessly to restore the proud reputation of the Queensland police force, to the point where it is once again recognised as the most accountable, honest and dedicated police service in this nation. Indeed, this bill explicitly recognises the great strides that have been made in the past 12 years by giving back to the Queensland Police Service the day-to-day responsibility for investigating police misconduct.

I would like particularly to make comments in relation to the reasons for and the implications of shifting primary responsibility for investigating police misconduct back to the Queensland Police Service. The bill provides that the Commissioner of Police has primary responsibility for dealing with complaints, information or matters that the Police Commissioner reasonably suspects involve police misconduct. It is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police to deal with those matters. This shifting of primary responsibility for investigating police misconduct back to the police is an explicit recognition that the Queensland Police Service has developed significantly since the Fitzgerald recommendations were first implemented. It is also a recognition of the evolved practices in the CJC's daily operations.

In recent years, the CJC has increasingly referred police misconduct to the police to investigate. Even matters that were investigated by the CJC itself are often handled by police officers stationed at the CJC. The rotation back into the Queensland Police Service of police officers who have served at the CJC has given today's Police Service a very high skills and procedures base upon which to undertake police misconduct investigations.

Today's Police Service, under the exemplary leadership of Commissioner Bob Atkinson, has demonstrated that it is capable of effectively investigating and acting on police misconduct. The service's commitment to integrity and enhancement of ethical standards has been demonstrated by the establishment of the Ethical Standards Command and the fine work that it has undertaken.

This bill does not strip the new Crime and Misconduct Commission of the old CJC's powers in relation to police misconduct. The complaint resolution process set out is both transparent and sensible. The police will have the primary responsibility to investigate police misconduct, but the Queensland Police Service is required to notify the commission of all complaints.

The bill provides that the commission may issue guidelines for investigations or may audit, review or even take over any investigation. The bill thus recognises the need for police senior management to take responsibility for the day-to-day management of policing issues, including misconduct, while at the same time preserving a valuable watchdog role for the new commission. This approach is consistent with recommendations adopted in New South Wales as a result of the Wood Royal Commission. It clears the current double handling inherent in the system of police passing all police misconduct complaints to the CJC, which then refers most of them back to the police to investigate anyway.

The new arrangements will free commission resources to focus on more significant investigations. The outcome will be a merged body in the form of the Crime and Misconduct Commission, benefiting from a tighter focus and improved efficiencies. The provisions for extensive monitoring and oversight by the CMC follow the recommendations of the fourth PCJC in its three-year review.

I am firmly of the view that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that the 50th Parliament will consider. I know that the public in general and the members of the Queensland Police Service in particular will take note of what is said here today. On the government side, let it be said loudly and clearly that this legislation recognises and relies upon the honesty and integrity that is the hallmark of today's Police Service. It is a vote of confidence in our Police Service and I support it strongly.

Since being elected to this place, and indeed before that in my previous working life as a solicitor practising in the criminal jurisdiction, I have had plenty to do with my local police force. The Maryborough Police District is headed by Inspector Pat Ryan and the officer in charge of the Hervey Bay station is Senior Sergeant Bernie Martin. They are both much more than good police officers. They are community leaders who are deeply involved in the life of the district that surrounds the walls of the local police stations. Those men and the police officers who serve under them are out there, day in day out, building the reputation of our Police Service. They and others like them have restored the faith of ordinary Queenslanders in their police service.

It is not just the improvement in most areas of crime prevention and crime solving that has won praise. Hervey Bay in particular is now recording falling numbers of offences against the person and offences against property and increasing clean-up rates which are the result of good, solid police work. Most important is the improvement in police morale that comes from a combination of good leadership and proper attention being paid to resourcing issues.

The Beattie government and its Police Minister, Tony McGrady, have backed the Police Service with yet another record budget: \$801 million in 2000-01, with an 8.6 per cent increase in 2001-2002. I was delighted to note the announcement yesterday by Premier Peter Beattie and the Police Minister that a new \$300,000, 9.8 metre catamaran will be purchased to replace the *S. W. Gill* for the water police in Hervey Bay in 2002.

Across the state the Queensland Police Service has responded with increased pride and dedication to the increased resourcing that the government has given it. This bill recognises that quiet but enormously important revolution. I commend it to the House.

Mr QUINN (Robina—Lib) (4.00 p.m.): The bill before the House today is the latest effort by governments of various persuasions to come to grips with the changing nature of crime and misconduct in Queensland. We started off with the Criminal Justice Commission in its full-blown entirety post Fitzgerald. We moved then to a split model with the CJC and the Crime Commission. The government is now moving them back into one body. In doing so, I think it is instructive to review the past, where we have been and where we are trying to go in the future.

We ought to have a model that suits our current circumstances, not one that tries to address where we have been in the past. We should always review the model, make sure that it is contemporary in its approach to the problems that face Queensland both in terms of official misconduct and serious crime in Queensland and not be afraid to make changes where they are warranted every three or four years. We ought not be stuck with one model for the next 20 years.

The government has had a review. Some of us on this side may not agree with the model, but we ought not be afraid to have these sorts of reviews, put the necessary legislation in the House and debate it fully and openly, because out of that process will come a better model for

the future and one which addresses the needs of a contemporary Queensland rather than where we have been in the past.

What delights me with respect to this model is that we have recognised that the Queensland Police Service has made significant strides in the past in terms of addressing issues within its own force. It has now arrived at a stage where it can competently and with a great deal of trust and purpose investigate complaints made against its own officers. That is a huge vote of confidence in the Queensland Police Service by both sides of the House and the people of Queensland in particular.

The Police Service ought to be enormously proud of the strides it has made over the past couple of years. I fully support handing back to the Queensland Police Service the investigation of complaints of disciplinary matters and misconduct and for that organisation to manage itself. Unless it owns that problem and can put in place procedures that prevent the problem from arising in the first place, we will always have the need for some sort of body sitting on top of the Police Service, monitoring it and keeping an eye on it. That does not engender confidence within the Police Service itself or among the public of Queensland about the integrity of the Police Service.

One of the good aspects of this bill and the Police Service in general is that we have now arrived at this point in Queensland, post Fitzgerald, where we can say that quite confidently in the public arena and the police can be quite proud of making those gains in the past couple of years. That is not to say that everything about the bill is good, and I have outlined my concerns about it in the past. However, I think that issue is one of the highlights of the bill.

A few other points ought to be made. If we are going to have a new model, we also ought to be reviewing the tools that this new organisation has. If we are serious about combating organised crime and serious crime, particularly now that the criminals always seem to be one step ahead of the police in this respect, we ought to be able to give our major crime-fighting organisation in this state the most up-to-date resources, skills and legislation with which to tackle the criminals in the state, otherwise we will always be behind the eight ball.

One of the things that is also commendable about the bill is the move to give the data surveillance powers to the organisation. That is overdue, because more and more organised crime is becoming highly sophisticated, dependent upon technology and willing to invest huge sums to make sure that they stay one step ahead of the law enforcement authorities. But that is one aspect. I am saddened by the fact that the government, at the same time, did not give it additional resources to use in terms of the legislation. For instance, it could have gone down the path as suggested by the member for Southern Downs and given the new organisation civil forfeiture laws whereupon the onus of proof is on a suspected criminal and he or she has to prove how they came by assets rather than the reverse situation, where the prosecuting authority or the CJC, the CMC—whatever the organisation might be—has to prove that they were obtained through the proceeds of crime. Other jurisdictions have gone down the path of reversing the onus of proof in these instances and I think we in Queensland could have done the same. It was a recommendation from the Crime Commission that we ought to do that. I am disappointed that the government has not moved in that direction as well, because I think that would have sent a powerful message to organised crime and criminals in this state that we are serious about cracking down and are willing to use all of the legislative tools at our disposal to aim for that sort of activity. I am disappointed that the government has not moved in that direction, but I am glad that it made the data surveillance changes that were necessary.

I am also disappointed that the government has moved to take away some of the independence of the organisation in terms of its research capacity. I think putting in Premier's the part of the research capacity that resides currently with the CJC is inappropriate in Queensland. What we need in Queensland are frank and honest assessments of our criminal justice system. We cannot get that from the politically charged environment of the Premier's Department. The temptation to colour, if you like, or to adjust the statistics or the research findings would be too great for any government, not just this government. If we move down the path of giving Premier's the responsibility of assessing those aspects of the criminal justice system, I think we are on dangerous turf; as I said, the temptation is always there. One of the good things about the CJC's roles and functions in the past has been that without fear or favour it has put out into the public arena its findings in terms of the results of its investigations into the criminal justice system in Queensland. I think the proposed change is a real negative, and we ought not be afraid to say that. Hopefully, at some stage down the track the government will change its mind.

I am also not convinced by the government's argument that putting the two bodies together will lead to greater effectiveness. That is part of its argument. It seems to me that the major portion of its argument for doing this is one of efficiency and tacked onto that is the argument about effectiveness. If we are going to go down the track of reviewing the model every four or five years and updating it all the time, the sole aim of that review and the initiation of a new model ought to be a more effective crime-fighting body. We can have the efficiency argument, but that has to be secondary to the effectiveness argument. I do not see anywhere in what is being proposed the possibility of a more effective outcome. We could have achieved the same outcomes if we had the two bodies there at the moment with some mechanism for increasing cooperation. I think that has been recognised in other forums. I am not convinced that this will be a more effective organisation other than just a more efficient organisation.

The other aspect I would like to raise is the appointment of the chairman. I notice the member for Bulimba challenged anyone to make adverse comments about the panel that will select the new chairman—Archbishop Bathersby and all of the other people on it. It would be a brave soul who made any adverse comments about the quality of the panel. That is not my intention. My intention is simply to raise the question: why? We have had this accepted practice within the parliamentary committee which has overseen the CJC over a number of years now of selecting chairmen, and it has worked quite well over a long period with bipartisan support. Suddenly now to depart from that process when we are going to put a new model in place does not send a very good message about the government's confidence in the ability of PCJC members to choose a new chairman for this organisation.

We have a process in place and it ought to be ongoing. We ought not change it every time we want to change the model and put a piece of legislation into the House which affects the model. I think that is a negative. I understand the argument in terms of timing: the Premier wants this up and running by 1 January next year. However, that is not a compelling argument in my book for changing the selection process. The Premier ought to have made time adjustments or legislative changes—whatever was required—to make sure that the selection process that has been in place for a long period was maintained. We can hardly engender confidence in the model if we do not have confidence in those people who are selecting the chairman to start with.

Mr Foley: What was the selection process in Ryan?

Mr QUINN: I understand the argument there. I am saying that, unless there is continuity in the selection process in such a way that we express confidence in the ability of parliamentarians and the Premier to interact to select a chairman, I do not think the time issue is a valid argument.

As I said, it is a function of this House to make sure that the crime-fighting bodies in this state are up to speed in terms of their legislation, their resources and their focus. We ought not be afraid to review and renew them as necessary. Whether or not this is a more effective organisation I think is open to question. It may be efficient perhaps, given the fact that the Premier has indicated that there will be the same resource base as the two previous organisations. That ought to drive a better result, but I am not convinced from looking at the current legislation.

Ms KEECH (Albert—ALP) (4.10 p.m.): In common with the member for Hervey Bay I am delighted to speak today on the Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001. This bill heralds a new phase in the post-Fitzgerald reforms by building a stronger and more accountable public sector for Queensland. In the Premier's second reading speech he stated that this bill marks the beginning of a new era for public integrity, accountability and cooperation on the one hand and, on the other, law enforcement. It does this in a number of ways: by combining the fight against major organised crime, including paedophilia, with that of misconduct. The bill establishes a new Crime and Misconduct Commission, integrating functions of the Queensland Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission. It also recognises longstanding arrangements for the resolution of police misconduct, giving the Queensland police force more responsibility but maintaining a strong monitoring role for the commission. I add that the people of Albert are indeed fortunate to have the level of professionalism and expertise we do in Albert. We have tremendous officers in the Queensland Police Service and, indeed, we are fortunate to have the service that they offer to our community.

I would now like to speak about the make-up of the commission. In common with the CJC, the commission has five members: a chairperson and four part-time community representatives. The Assistant Commissioner, Crime and Assistant Commissioner, Misconduct will be entitled to attend meetings of the commission but will not be members or be entitled to vote in proceedings. In addition, it is important that during the transition to the Crime and Misconduct Commission

continuity is provided. The proposed commencement of the act is 1 January 2002. Therefore, it is very important that this transition period for the amalgamation be identified.

The appointments of the Criminal Justice Commission and members of the Crime Commission management committee, appropriately renamed the 'reference committee', will continue. This will ensure that the new commission benefits from the wealth of experience and corporate knowledge. The significant contributions of these members are recognised and certainly appreciated. I am glad to say also that no jobs will be lost through the amalgamation and that the entitlements of employees will be protected.

Initially, the three full-time statutory positions of the commission will be filled before commencement. The appointments of the assistant commissioners are contingent upon the appointments of a chair. So the appointments must be staggered. The appointment processes will be open and fair to ensure the inaugural appointees have legitimacy and respect. As has been discussed, the chair will be selected by an appointment panel of six, which will be chaired by the outgoing director-general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the incoming vice-chancellor of Griffith University—and what a great university it is.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Ms KEECH: Look at all these proud graduates of Griffith University—and also my children. The incoming vice-chancellor of Griffith University—and what a fine appointment that is—is Dr Glyn Davis.

Mr Reeves: Hear, hear!

Ms KEECH: I take that interjection.

The panel will include the Chair of the National Crime Authority, Gary Crooke QC; Catherine Sinclair of the Consultancy Bureau; Archbishop Bathurst; and the chair and deputy chair of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, Geoff Wilson and Howard Hobbs. The four part-time CMC commissioners must have appropriate qualifications and, I note, a demonstrated interest in civil liberties—as they should. They will be appointed after a state-wide advertising campaign. There will also be consultation with the chair and the support of the PCJC will be sought.

I note that the new commission establishes a crime reference committee. Under the new bill the previous management committee of the CJC is renamed the Reference Committee. This is to reflect the shifting of its management focus to the commission and to receive references from the committee. The decision to refer matters of major crime for investigation will continue to be made by a committee of law enforcement experts and community representatives.

This bill has been in development for some time. Over recent times there has been much consultation. In particular, the Criminal Justice Commission Chairperson, Brendan Butler SC, the Crime Commission, Tim Carmody SC, and the Commissioner of Police—and what a fine Commissioner of Police he is—Mr Bob Atkinson, have been closely consulted in the development of this model and the bill to implement it.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Ms KEECH: I am glad that he has a lot of fans here because he works so hard.

This bill ensures that the reforms implemented by Tony Fitzgerald QC are progressed and strengthened by delivering an updated framework of public accountability. The people of Albert have had to endure maladministration at the public level for some time, going all the way back to Russ Hinze and his brown paper bags. Labor swept that away in its electoral victory of 2 December 1989. This bill is part of a structure to ensure that the people of Albert and the people of Queensland have access to integrity and accountability. The bill and its amendments have my full support.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego—NPA) (4.17 p.m.): I am pleased today to be able to talk to the Crime and Misconduct Bill. I would like to mention a number of issues. First of all, as has been stated by other speakers before me, the opposition is opposing this legislation for a few reasons. Generally speaking, the new CMC will work, but it will not work as well as it should. That is principally the reason there are objections to this legislation that is before us today. The first one is that we really have not been given enough reasons as to why there should be a change to the existing model. We know there are some problems there, as always happens in any structure as big as the CJC or the QCC that is put in place. Obviously there is going to be some need to tweak the edges and things like that. We all appreciate that.

The other objection is with the self-imposed time frame of 1 January 2002. I do not doubt that we want to get things moving. It is fine to make a change and get on with the job. However, yet again I have not had a chance to go through the amendments that have been put forward today. They may be minor; they may not be. Once again in this House we have this government—and this is its hallmark—bringing in legislation and it is almost mandatory that some amendments will come later on. We do not really know what is in those amendments and we have not had a chance to study them, although we certainly will between now and the committee stage. There could be changes in those amendments that may shed some light on why things have happened, or maybe they may raise a few more questions to which we will want answers.

Generally speaking, the current Queensland Crime Commission's fight against major organised crime has been successful, and I think everyone would have to agree with that. However, the QCC has had one hand tied behind its back in a couple of areas. One relates to the government's lack of enthusiasm to legislate for the confiscation of the proceeds of crime. Other states have legislated in this area, and Western Australia has very forceful legislation where people have to prove that they received the money in question by legal means. While some may argue that that is too strong, the reality is that we have to do something strong to stop crime. People do not realise how much crime there is in relation to money laundering, drugs and paedophilia until they become involved in it. It certainly exists. Quite a substantial sum of money has been lost to the government because it has not been prepared to put legislation in place that allows it to recoup the proceeds of crime.

In contrast, that has been one of the more successful plans of attack in relation to the war against terrorism throughout the world. Most nations of the world have agreed to control and confiscate the finances of terrorists, yet here we have our own terrorists running around drugging our kids and we are not able to control them. We have to look seriously at doing something about it. We must at least progress it in some manner or form so we can try to break the backs of these people. They are committing horrendous crimes. We see the impacts of drugs on families and the destruction that that causes, yet these people are allowed to get away with it. We need a system whereby we can break their backs. If they know they may lose the lot, they may think twice, whereas presently they can get away with it without much trouble at all.

The QCC has also been underresourced over the years. That is just the way it has been, but it is a crime-fighting body that we need to do more work with. It may help that under this new legislation additional resources may be reallocated within the structure to help in peak periods or whatever the case may be, so there may be some benefit in the short term. But at the end of the day will the personnel involved in misconduct be compatible with the personnel involved in the normal investigation of crime? There may be some problems there. One issue contributing to the success of the QCC has been the specialised nature of the people involved. There has been a very strict selection process which has tried to find the right people to fit into the right places, and that has contributed to its success. You cannot put square pegs in round holes. It is as simple as that. In order to have the right people, we need the right processes in place so they can be employed properly.

The CJC has had a chequered career. It has been in and out of the news for various reasons for a number of years, and one had to look at what side of politics one came from or what barrow people were pushing at the time to determine whether they thought the CJC was on the right track or not. One only has to look at the court records to see the number of legal challenges and counter-challenges made by Queenslanders against the CJC to understand that it has not been a perfect model. However, this bill gives the opportunity to refocus in this regard, and that will be of benefit. It will enable the QCC and the CJC an opportunity to refocus on some of those issues, and that will be of benefit.

We on this side of the House believe that this legislation has three major problems that have not been properly thought through. For instance, the chair of the commission must conduct all public hearings of the commission or an acting chair of the CMC must be appointed. What happens in the event that there are two or three cases running simultaneously? All that will do is slow the whole process down. If there are a few cases being heard at the same time, I do not see why there cannot be a provision in the legislation that allows another judge to be appointed. That is very practical.

I turn now to the area of research, a topic which has been mentioned by a few members already. We are talking about only four or six people out of 28 going to the Premier's Department, but that is quite a significant number when we consider that there will be more people involved overall in relation to administration. We have to ask ourselves a few questions. How will they do

research if they are based in the Premier's office? What links will they have to the Crime and Misconduct Commission? Does it mean that those people based at the Premier's office doing research still have links to all files of the CMC? Do they have total access to it? We have all talked about the separation of powers and about being accountable, yet it would appear to me—and perhaps we need some answers to this—that there is a direct pipeline to the brewery in a sense.

How will the public know what information is provided? Presently, if a body such as the CJC or the CMC does research, it is then on the public record. We all know that no matter which government and Premier are in power they will tell us the information they want us to hear. They will not release all the findings of the research. If there is a need to increase funding for a particular crime-fighting method, you can bet your boots it will be announced at election time or at another appropriate time. It will be information and research used purely for political purposes. There needs to be a mechanism to ensure that the people of Queensland can have confidence that that research will be used for genuine purposes to benefit the community and not benefit the government of the day, whoever that may be.

Another issue of interest relates to telephone surveillance, and I do not know why the government is opposed to it. Even though there has been a high profile court case going on for quite some time, I do not think it would have any implications in relation to the government's philosophy. If we are genuine in wanting to reduce crime and paedophilia, catch crooks, stop money laundering and gangs and freeze bank accounts containing the proceeds of crime, there should be some method whereby the appropriate authorities under the appropriate conditions have proper telephone surveillance measures put in place. Another issue of concern relates to part-time commissioners. I was intrigued—and maybe the Premier can inform me when he sums up the debate—to see that part-time commissioners have to have some sort of accreditation with civil liberties. We are talking about crime. We are talking about crooks, yet part-time commissioners have to have some sort of civil libertarian background. I find that difficult to follow and, as I say, maybe someone can enlighten me.

The second reading speech of the Premier states—

When making decisions about how both police misconduct and official misconduct is best investigated, the commission is required to have regard to:

- the capacity of, and resources available to agencies;
- the nature and seriousness of the misconduct; and
- the public interest in the commission investigating the misconduct itself.

While the third point is quite reasonable, I have questions about the first two points. I do not know why the capacity of or resources available to agencies would have any bearing on misconduct being investigated. Misconduct is misconduct. It would be handled either by the QPS under the new arrangement or by the CMC in serious cases. That is exactly why those agencies have the resources they do.

Under the new arrangements, the research function will be handled by the Premier's office. The second reading speech states—

In the 12 years of its existence the CJC has not reported specifically on the effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

Is that a valid reason for placing the research section in the Premier's office? If it really wanted to, the Premier's office could just employ four more people to do their own research. I think placing people with specific research skills into a political office will have some serious ramifications. I would like the Premier to address that point when he replies to the debate.

I refer to the parliamentary committee, which has an oversight role. The work of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee is interesting, but the new structure will result in a lot more work for its members. I am sure they will be willing to take on that work, but members should be aware of what a huge task overseeing these types of bodies is.

The role of the parliamentary commissioner is an important one. Like the CJC, the Office of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Commissioner has had a chequered career. People on various sides of politics have various reasons for supporting it or not, but at the end of the day it is a watchdog the parliament can use. We can report to the people of Queensland that in relation to a particular case that made the news everything was okay or otherwise. I think those resources need to be available.

Under this legislation the Office of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Commissioner will have more limited powers than it currently has, but any major case can be referred by the parliamentary

committee and on special occasions the commissioner will be given a lot of the powers currently available. So the resources are available to investigate any problem that may arise or the mishandling of any issue. We must have some faith and confidence in Queensland's criminal justice system. While the opposition does have some reservations about the bill, no doubt it will work. The legislation certainly could work much better if we had a more time and more thought was put into it.

Dr LESLEY CLARK (Barron River—ALP) (4.34 p.m.): It has been said that the Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001 will usher in a new era of public integrity and law enforcement in Queensland. While that is true, this bill also heralds a return to a previous era when the fight against major organised crime and misconduct was managed under one roof. The creation of the Queensland Crime Commission by the Borbidge-led coalition was part and parcel of its deliberate strategy to undermine and destroy the Criminal Justice Commission for its own political purposes. The critical links between official misconduct, on the part of the police in particular, and organised crime have always been evident, and the artificial creation of two separate agencies has never made sense, not from a crime-fighting perspective nor from a perspective of effectiveness or efficiency.

The new Crime and Misconduct Commission retains the best features of the previous organisations whilst allowing for improved effectiveness combined with transparency and accountability. Thus the commission will have a chairperson and four part-time community representatives of high personal integrity and community standing, as occurs with the CJC. In fact, the existing part-time commissioners will be retained to provide continuity in the transition to the new commission. The new commission is also accountable to parliament via the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, which will be the new name for the existing Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee. This represents an improvement in the parliamentary accountability of the Crime Commission, because only the chair of the PCJC currently sits on the commission management committee.

The parliamentary commissioner will continue to assist the parliamentary committee to ensure accountability. However, the commissioner's royal commission powers have been codified and tailored to better fit the role. Powers to compel the production of information will now apply only to commission officers, and hearings will only be conducted with the bipartisan support of the parliamentary committee.

The bill makes it clear that the parliamentary commissioner is an agent of the parliamentary committee who acts on directions of the committee and has no powers to act on his or her own motion. As a past member of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, I believe that this reform establishes the appropriate relationship between the parliamentary commissioner and the parliamentary committee.

Integrity in public administration is critical if the community is to have confidence in the government. I will focus my contribution to the debate today on this aspect of the bill. Honesty and integrity are fundamental principles of an accountable public sector. Whilst external oversight by an independent commission is essential, as every good teacher knows internal self-discipline can be far more powerful and enduring and must be encouraged. Thus, this bill aims to proactively build the capacity of units of public administration to handle misconduct within their own agencies and promote integrity in public administration, with a greater emphasis on corruption prevention.

Clause 24 of the bill sets out clearly how the commission is to perform its prevention function, in particular in paragraphs (e), (h) and (i). These paragraphs indicate that the commission should provide information to, consult with and make recommendations to units of public administration and generally increase the capacity of units of public administration to prevent misconduct by providing advice and training to the units and, if asked, to other entities and also to report on ways to prevent major crime and misconduct.

In this regard the new commission will build on the excellent work in this area already undertaken by the CJC, as outlined in the 1999-2000 annual report. Just one such example was the development of a councillors information kit, which was launched in Cairns last year. The kit, which was provided to each of Queensland's 1,250 councillors, consists of 10 prevention pointers to help newly elected councillors understand their roles, obligations and responsibilities under the Local Government Act.

The commission will also work more proactively with units of public administration in performing its misconduct functions. Clause 34 of the bill states—

It is the Parliament's intention that the commission apply the following principles when performing its misconduct functions—

- (a) Cooperation
to the greatest extent practicable, the commission and units of public administration should work cooperatively to prevent misconduct
the commission and units of public administration should work cooperatively to deal with misconduct
- (b) Capacity building
the commission has a lead role in building the capacity of units of public administration to prevent and deal with cases of misconduct effectively and appropriately
- (c) Devolution
subject to the cooperation and public interest principles and the capacity of the unit of public administration, action to prevent and deal with misconduct in a unit of public administration should generally happen within the unit

Whilst units of public administration will be supported and encouraged to handle misconduct within their own agencies, the bill ensures that the commission will retain primary responsibility for investigating official misconduct and retains firm control over referred official misconduct investigations. Thus, it can issue directions for the investigation, audit and review or take over and complete investigations.

Official misconduct by the police is a particularly important area that requires constant vigilance. While I was a member of the PCJC I joined the chairman, Brendan Butler, on his regional visit to Cairns to listen to the views of the police regarding the operations of the CJC. One of the most consistent complaints—and I know that Cairns was not unique—was about the length of time taken to finalise CJC investigations and the fear of police that they would be the subject of vexatious complaints to the CJC merely for carrying out their duty. Police talked of how their lives and careers could be placed in limbo for long periods and that innocent officers experience high degrees of stress as a result of CJC investigations.

The bill recognises that the Queensland Police Service has proved in the last decade that it has become one of the best and most honest in the world and will, I am sure, continue to enjoy that reputation under the fine leadership of Police Commissioner Bob Atkinson, whom I had the privilege to know when he served as assistant commissioner of the far-north region.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Dr LESLEY CLARK: I do acknowledge the interjections of my fellow members because there is wide appreciation of the capacity and integrity of our commissioner, Bob Atkinson.

In recent times the CJC has referred increasing numbers of police misconduct complaints back to the police to investigate under their supervision, and this trend is further encouraged in the bill. Thus complaints about police misconduct made to the commission must be rapidly assessed and referred to police to consider fully and deal with, subject to monitoring by the commission as outlined previously. If the complaint is made directly to the Police Commissioner, the commission should allow police to continue to deal with the complaint, again subject to the commission's monitoring code.

This major step in the bill to ensure duplication on complaints handling is minimised and cases dealt with expeditiously will, I am sure, be welcomed by the police, as will the provision of clause 46 of the bill, which allows the commission to take no action if it is satisfied that the complaint is frivolous, vexatious or lacks substance in credibility or that investigating it would be an unjustified use of resources.

While the commission must obviously exercise this power carefully, I am sure that all members would know of cases where people have misused the CJC for personal or political ends and lodged complaints that were clearly vexatious or frivolous, thereby costing taxpayers thousands of dollars and, in some cases, destroying people's lives. However, in all cases where a complaint is lodged, the commission is required to inform the complainant of the outcome of their complaint, any action taken or not taken and the reasons behind the decisions made. This client focus should also enhance the public perception of the operation of the new commission. The bill should not, however, be misinterpreted as going soft on police, and the commission will be able to make policy recommendations about the Police Service. Furthermore, if the Police Minister decides not to follow such recommendations, the minister must table in the parliament his or her reasons for not doing so.

In conclusion, this bill will ensure that the Crime and Misconduct Commission will deliver greater efficiency and effectiveness in the fight against serious crime, including paedophilia, and

provide for even higher levels of integrity in public administration in Queensland. This complex bill has been developed in close consultation with both the Crime Commissioner and the chairman of the CJC, who have expressed satisfaction with the bill, and I join with the Premier in thanking them for their contribution. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (4.42 p.m.): I rise to speak to the Crime and Misconduct Bill. In doing so, I acknowledge that the object of this bill, as indicated by the explanatory notes, is to repeal the Criminal Justice Act 1989 and the Crime Commission Act 1997 and replace them with new legislation merging the two commissions into one commission aimed at corruption prevention and enhancing the integrity of the public sector as well as the provision of major and organised crime and paedophilia functions.

One of the main reasons provided by the Premier for the amalgamation of the two commissions was to try to achieve greater efficiencies in the fight against serious crime and corruption. I do understand how the amalgamation of the two commissions may lead to increased efficiencies through reducing the bureaucracy and duplication of some duties, but notwithstanding this I do ask the Premier for his assurance that there will be no reduction in the investigative powers of the new commission as a result of this amalgamation. Without the assurance from the Premier that the effect of this amalgamation will in no way hinder the commission's ability to investigate and take action against serious crimes and like offences, I will be unable to support the bill. I also ask the Premier to explain why part of the research unit will be linked with the Premier's Department. Justice must not just be done but must be seen to be done. Accordingly, I look forward to the Premier's explanation of the linkage of the research unit with his department.

I note that in clauses 225 and 230 of the bill reference is made to the appointment of part-time commissioners. Clause 225(a) states—

A person is qualified for appointment as a part-time commissioner if the person—

(a) is in actual practice as a lawyer and has a demonstrated interest in civil liberties ...

And it goes on. I am concerned that this statutory requirement is a formal restriction to a large number of lawyers who could be considered suitable for this appointment.

Clause 230(2) goes on to stipulate that at least one of the part-time commissioners must demonstrate a very clear interest in civil liberties. I thought that the focus of this bill was about taking action against serious crimes and like offences. I do not believe it is appropriate in this bill to be focusing so strongly on protecting the civil liberties of suspect Mr Bigs of the criminal world. I realise that the Premier has the numbers to push this bill through irrespective of the opposition; but nevertheless, I ask the Premier why he has used such wording in clause 232, namely, where it refers to the fact that at least one of the part-time commissioners must be in actual practice as a lawyer and have demonstrated an interest in civil liberties.

I interpret these sections as allowing a number of people to be appointed to the position of part-time commissioner because of their demonstrated interest in civil liberties. I certainly have concerns about the appointment of possible part-time commissioners who are focused on protecting the civil liberties of the very suspect Mr Bigs of the criminal world when they are the very people that the investigating officers want to investigate. I will be listening to the Premier's response to this issue.

I note that the bill gives investigating officers powers to use the modern electronic surveillance devices. Yet the investigators do not have the power to listen to the common old telephone call. I cannot believe that the government is so reluctant to give the investigators power to listen in to telephone calls made by the suspect Mr Bigs of the criminal world while, at the same time, allowing investigators to use other more technical and modern surveillance devices. Again, if the Premier and his government are so fair dinkum about allowing investigators to investigate the serious crimes, why will they not give the powers to the investigators to listen in on the telephone conversations of these alleged criminals?

I understand that a number of amendments to this bill will be introduced and that the amendments are by and large technical in nature. But notwithstanding this, I thank the Premier for the briefings and for preparing explanatory notes to go with those amendments. I certainly will be listening to the Premier's response, not just to the questions that I have raised this afternoon but also to the other matters raised during this debate, in order to decide whether I will support or oppose the bill.

Mr WILSON (Ferny Grove—ALP) (4.47 p.m.): It is my great pleasure to speak in support of the Crime and Misconduct Bill before the House today. Queenslanders deserve a public sector of the highest integrity, and they deserve a crime-fighting body that is equipped to attack organised

and major crime when normal policing methods are not sufficient to meet the threat coming from that area. It is due to the work of the Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission in recent years that we are able to say that overall, in the largest measure possible, Queenslanders have been delivered with such a public sector and a crime-fighting body.

But what is needed to be maintained is a range of checks and balances within the system. We have to balance the accountability of the public sector in all its parts to the people of Queensland. We have to balance the effectiveness of crime fighting within the Queensland Police Service as well as the Crime Commission. We also have to balance the civil liberties of not only the public servants working for the state of Queensland but also the general public.

When I first joined the Commonwealth public service in the late 1970s, what was emerging then was the new body of law and structures to create integrity within the Commonwealth public sector, ensuring accountability to the people of Australia. The Administrative Appeals Tribunal had just been set up. The Commonwealth ombudsman had just been set up. Likewise, the Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act had just been introduced. Freedom of information laws were also introduced and, more recently, the National Crime Authority has been established federally. There remains a limited parliamentary oversight at the federal level of those structures. Indeed, they still do not have a Criminal Justice Commission—notwithstanding the good experience of New South Wales and Queensland in the last 10 or 12 years. During the late 1970s I understand there was only the existence of the Queensland Ombudsman, dating from 1974.

Since that time and only in the last 12 years or so, in addition to the Ombudsman there has been: the introduction of freedom of information legislation; the establishment of the Criminal Justice Commission and, more lately, the Crime Commission off-shoot from it; the establishment of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee and the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Commissioner; the establishment of the Public Interest Monitor and the Ethical Standards Command of the Queensland Police Service, in conjunction with misconduct tribunals; and the establishment of the Office of Public Sector Merit and Equity.

Members will see that the question of the Crime and Misconduct Commission cannot be looked at alone. It actually sits in the middle of a constellation of other agencies that have been established in the last decade or so to provide an assurance to Queenslanders that there is integrity and honesty within our public sector—particularly within the Queensland Police Service—and that the crime-fighting capacity of the state of Queensland is as well equipped as possible.

Looking briefly at the evolution of this matter from the passing of the Criminal Justice Act in 1989, a member commented earlier that it was not until 1997 that the functions that are now being merged were, in fact, split. For approximately seven years the functions of the Crime Commission, as it now is, and the Criminal Justice Commission were combined. The only area of doubt and controversy in 1997 was the capacity of the then CJC, with its broadened jurisdiction, to undertake investigation into criminal paedophilia in its own right, as distinct from an involvement in some other aspect of major crime, organised crime or official misconduct. What members are witnessing is the re-amalgamation of those two bodies, the Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission, to re-establish the unity that applied before 1997. The Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, which will become the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, will continue unbroken in its operations since 1989. The parliamentary commissioner will also continue.

I wish to address a number of matters set out in the bill, specifically in relation to the parliamentary committee and the parliamentary commissioner. Overall, 95 per cent of the arrangements in this bill in relation to the committee and the commissioner are a continuation of those presently in existence and are quite unexceptional in that regard. The committee continues to comprise seven members, four from the government side and three from the non-government side. The chair is elected from the government side and the deputy chair from the non-government side. In all key decisions, it is required to operate in a bipartisan way in that there must be a multiparty majority. Its obligation is to monitor and review the operations of the Criminal Justice Commission, now to become the Crime and Misconduct Commission. Further, there are other more particularised aspects to its functions.

The Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, to become the Crime and Misconduct Committee, will have the ability to direct the CMC in relation to tabling of reports, and the CMC will be consulted in relation to the appointment of the chair of the new commission and the commissioners, except for the first occasion. I will come to that in a moment. The oversight of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee is now broadened not only to the misconduct

division of the new commission but to the crime division of the new commission. As one member alluded to earlier, that will to some extent involve an increase in the workload of the committee and possibly also the parliamentary commissioner. The bill provides that, whilst the committee has continuity of existence between parliaments, there is provision for the replacement of a committee member who is defeated in any election occurring between successive parliaments. That is an advisable step to take. On a more technical level, the functions of the new committee are more precisely tailored to reporting on the commission's functions and activities to give a sharper focus in that regard.

Further, the CMC will be required to notify the parliamentary committee of any instances that come to its attention of possible misconduct or improper conduct by its own officers. That formalises at a statutory level what presently applies pursuant to agreed protocols which have been in place for the last two years and were the result of work done by the PCJC, the CJC and the former parliamentary commissioner.

The reference committee of the crime division of the new commission is the modified current management committee of the Crime Commission and will not include the chair and the deputy chair of the parliamentary committee. That seems appropriate given that the activities of the crime division of the new commission are themselves, by virtue of being part of the amalgamated Crime and Misconduct Commission, the subject of monitoring and oversight by the parliamentary committee in any event. Another new dimension is that the parliamentary committee must authorise hearings to be conducted by the parliamentary commissioner. I will come to that in a moment.

Further, an administrative process has been foreshadowed for the selection and appointment of the inaugural chairperson of the amalgamated commission. It involves a selection panel incorporating, among others, the present chairperson and deputy chairperson of the parliamentary committee. The reason for that is to import into that selection process the bipartisan consideration that otherwise would have been applied by the parliamentary committee when it, in the ordinary course of events, was consulted by the minister prior to the appointment of a preferred candidate to the position of chair of the commission.

Whereas in the past for the CJC and whereas in the future for the CMC the parliamentary committee will be consulted by virtue of the statute and the committee must provide support to the proposed appointee on a multiparty basis before that proposed appointee can take office, in this exceptional situation that will not happen under the statute because the appointment needs to be made by 1 January. But the same outcome is achieved administratively by having the chair and the deputy chair of the committee being part of the selection process in the first instance. In the past, there were two steps. In the future there will be two steps. On this occasion, the two steps are consolidated into one by an administrative arrangement. In my view, the same outcome is achieved.

As I stated earlier, most of the existing provisions regarding the parliamentary commissioner continue to apply to the new commissioner, save for a number of matters to which I will draw attention. Within the statutory provisions, it is possible and it is the case that the parliamentary commissioner is appointed on a part-time basis. In the future, that appointment will be enshrined in the statute as a part-time position. That is appropriate, because the workload of the parliamentary commissioner is nowhere near the level it was when the position of parliamentary commissioner was established in 1997 to handle the Connolly-Ryan records and to initiate the early review of complaints against the CJC referred to it by the parliamentary committee.

The compulsive powers of the commissioner are limited to commission officers, Queensland Police Service employees, and other public servants employed in units of public administration. They do not apply to the general public. They are what are loosely called the royal commission powers. In this bill, they are now codified in the legislation and are targeted expressly to the individuals who will potentially be the subject of investigation by the parliamentary committee when there is a complaint about the behaviour of the new commission. Hearings by the parliamentary commissioner can be undertaken by him or her only after he or she has obtained the authority of the parliamentary committee to do that on a bipartisan basis and having also established to the satisfaction of the committee that all other reasonable steps had been taken to obtain the information that the parliamentary commissioner needs.

Another feature of this legislation is that it makes absolutely clear what was well understood by most but not by some, and that is that the parliamentary commissioner is the servant and agent of the parliamentary committee and acts at the direction of the parliamentary committee. Correspondingly, the parliamentary commissioner and documents generated by the parliamentary

commissioner are subject to parliamentary privilege in the same way as is anything undertaken by the parliamentary committee itself.

Overall, although I have focused on the provisions of the bill as they affect the parliamentary committee and the commissioner, I think that it is highly commendable legislation. It combines the research capacity of the two commissions. Likewise, the amalgamation of the intelligence units of each commission strengthens their capacity. The bill provides the capacity to share expensive and limited surveillance resources, subject to the express statutory limitation that the tools available to the crime division are limited to tools separate from the tools available to the misconduct division in the pursuit of their functions. I also note that electronic data surveillance is added to the crime function, and that is a very big plus.

Under the new amalgamated commission, the crime function and the misconduct function have equal status. However, most particularly, this legislation enables this body to move from the complaints-driven approach of the CJC's jurisdiction to a proactive building of the capacity of units of public administration to take responsibility at a management level for establishing systems that are best designed to build in, as integral to the way they function, requirements about honesty and integrity. In that way, the new commission assists units of public administration to create a self-generating capacity to minimise the risk of instances of official misconduct in the future.

There is also greater accountability of the new amalgamated commission to this parliament through the parliamentary committee because the Crime Commission functions are now the subject of oversight and monitoring by the new committee. Additionally, the legislation provides that not only the activities of the new commission but also the act will be reviewed within two years. As I stated earlier, the codified powers of the parliamentary commissioner set beyond any doubt now that the parliamentary commissioner is the servant and agent of the parliamentary committee. This is very good legislation and it is my great pleasure to support it wholeheartedly. I commend it to the House.

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (5.06 p.m.): I rise to speak to this legislation for a number of reasons, but particularly because the creation of the two entities in 1997 was one in which I was involved. The rationale behind the creation of those entities, or a perception of the rationale for their creation, has been mentioned by a number of speakers already. I would like to touch on that as well. In speaking to this bill, I place on the record my appreciation of the police in my electorate for doing a marvellous job not only in enforcing law and order or creating a peaceful environment in which people can live but also in solving crimes and bringing perpetrators to justice.

Through this bill, it is intended that a great number of the functions of misconduct investigations relating to allegations of misconduct within the Police Service be returned to the Police Service. I know that for quite a long time that has been agitated for, particularly by the Police Union but also by a number of police officers, because they felt that in great measure, even when the smallest issue was referred to the CJC, because of the time that the CJC often took to investigate the complaint, that officer was under a cloud. I know of instances—not in the Police Service but resulting from other CJC inquiries, and I am sure they apply to the Police Service—where, at the conclusion of the investigation, the officer or the person who was the target of the complaint was advised that no action would be taken at this time, even though the complaint may have been frivolous or vexatious. That person found themselves the subject of an investigation that was not finalised by the CJC and which, to all intents and purposes, was a blight on their work history. So I am not surprised that police officers, not only for reasons of expediency but also for other reasons, have lobbied hard to get misconduct allegations, particularly minor misconduct allegations, investigated within the Police Service.

When the Queensland Crime Commission legislation was passed, the intention was always that there would be a review. In the bill, and subsequently in the act, it was intended that in five years there would be a review of the Queensland Crime Commission to ensure that it was achieving the goals and the expectations that that act had set up. The bill before us pre-empts that review. There will be no formal review. The effectiveness of the Queensland Crime Commission and the CJC in its amended form will not be specifically the target of a review, and I mean 'target' in the right sense of the word. In five years time, whether I am here or not, I look forward to seeing just how effective the division of the responsibilities will have been.

At the time, quite a lot of political allegations were made about motives. However, from my perspective, I supported the establishment of the Queensland Crime Commission because it was a major step forward in giving protection to our children, particularly in regard to its standing reference on paedophilia. At that time, quite a number of issues regarding paedophilia activity

had been uncovered. Commensurately, the body that was responsible for investigations into paedophilia was the CJC. However, it had had an inadequate amount of time and resources to effectively fulfil that responsibility. At the time I felt, and I continue in the view, that that was a major betrayal of our children because the issue of paedophilia, whether it is active and tangible or whether it occurs through the Internet—no matter what avenue paedophilia takes—is one of the most destructive forms of violence against our children.

The Queensland Crime Commission was given a standing reference on paedophilia not only to react to allegations and complaints but also to actively investigate, stop, thwart and intervene in paedophile activity. I still hold the view that our children deserve that standing reference. It is disappointing to me that in his second reading speech the Premier said that paedophilia becomes reference based, and the amendments that have been circulated state that the standing reference to investigate criminal paedophilia mentioned in section 46(7) of the repealed Crime Commission Act 1997 ended on that act's repeal. I believe that we are doing our children a disservice. Irrespective of the well-meaning intentions of the new Crime and Misconduct Commission, I believe that we will take a backward step when this bill is passed as far as monitoring paedophile activity in our state is concerned.

Mr Welford: I think you'll find that the act still requires that to be one of the primary functions of the new Crime Commission. The only reason it is not a standing reference under the whole legislation is because the old legislation has been repealed.

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM: It is changed. It was a standing reference to the Queensland Crime Commission.

Mr Welford: It still is.

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM: It is not. I have asked that specific question. Unless the advice that I was given was wrong, I am told that the new commission will be reactive rather than proactive in that area. I supported the Queensland Crime Commission because the CJC had had insufficient time and resources to actively concentrate on paedophilia. Its time was completely taken up with misconduct and corruption allegations. Major crime and paedophilia went to the Queensland Crime Commission, specifically so that it could ensure that each was sufficiently resourced. I look forward to that correction, if that is right.

As I understand it, the current proposition is that misconduct allegations in the police force will be investigated by the police force and, quite rightly, the CMC will have a monitoring role. If misconduct allegations are sent inadvertently to it, it will refer them back to the police. However, if allegations are sent straight to the police, there is an obligation on the police force to advise the CMC that an investigation is occurring. It is my understanding that the CMC will look at misconduct, corruption and major crime including paedophilia.

The other statement that was made was that the Crime Commission was created to undermine the CJC. I do not know the motives of every member who was in the chamber in 1997. However, I can honestly say that from my perspective that was not the intention. The Queensland Crime Commission was established, and I supported its establishment, predominantly to give it a focus on major crime and paedophilia, and to allow the CJC to fulfil its rightful role in dealing with misconduct and corruption issues.

I will be interested to hear the Premier's response on the question of the transfer of four to six researchers from what will be the Crime and Misconduct Commission. It has been stated in the House that the transfer will come from the Premier's department, but the notes that I have just say 'to government'. I share the concern of others in this chamber who have said that that will be seen as a politicisation of the advice that those researchers provide. It may be that the advice will relate to the development of policy processes, the amendment of acts and so on. However, whenever a research division is placed within a department, it is always going to be viewed, particularly by the sceptics perhaps, as being politicised. That would be a shame because the intention of research groups is to provide objective, non-party political advice. In the area of crime—and much of this legislation covers major crime—that advice needs to be seen to be unbiased by political input.

Another question that has been touched on by members is the change in the management committee. Previously there were nine members: the Commissioner of what was the Crime Commission, the Commissioner of Police, the Chair of the NCA, the Chair of the CJC, the Children's Commissioner, the Chair and Deputy Chair of the PCJC and two community representatives, one being a female and one having a demonstrated commitment to civil liberties to prevent the inappropriate use of compulsive and extraordinary powers.

The member for Bulimba fairly provocatively challenged anyone to question the credentials of those who are proposed to be on the management committee. I will not question anything that the member might deck me for, and I certainly would not question the credentials of John Bathersby. I hasten to add that I am not alleging physical violence on Pat's part. When I was in my room I listened to the honourable member and I thought, 'Someone will stand up and challenge that statement.' I certainly would not question John Bathersby or any others. However, there has been a change in the process of the management committee. I would be interested in hearing the rationale behind that. I apologise to the member for Bulimba if I have offended him.

A government member: He's a sensitive man.

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM: Yes. The other question that I am sure that the Premier will clarify in his response relates to the qualifications for appointment as a part-time commissioner. There will be four and they have to be lawyers.

Mr Lawlor: What's wrong with that?

Mr McNamara: Is there a problem?

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM: Yes, there is a problem. They have to be lawyers and fulfil one or more of the following criteria: public sector management and review expertise, criminology, sociology, research related to crime or crime prevention, and all of those are fine. Then we get to the qualification that a member has to have civil libertarian experience. As I asked when the coalition government was in power—so I am being rude to both sides—considering that very targeted description, does the government already have in mind a person who can fulfil that position? Have the qualifications and the criteria been written around somebody like Terry O'Gorman, whose advice on civil libertarian issues I have appreciated on many occasions? The description sounded as if somebody had been chosen already and the description fitted that person.

Irrespective of what structure any government adopts in combating major crime and misconduct there will always be those who support the structure and those who detract from it. Firstly, we had the CJC, and then in 1997 the CJC became two entities—the CJC and the Queensland Crime Commission. In 2001 it is proposed—and because of the numbers in the House it will be successful—to change it to the Crime and Misconduct Commission. However, my hope is that irrespective of the politics involved in the restructuring of any of those entities our primary achievement—not our goal—will be the protection of our community from those small number of people who will do all in their power to undermine freedom, to head organised crime, including prostitution, and including all of those base activities that undermine the freedom and right of enjoyment to a free society that we have and which our families—our mothers and fathers—have worked for so many years to create; and, more importantly, that we always have an entity free of politics that will ensure that the protection of children is paramount in its obligation. I believe this obligation, particularly in regard to paedophilia, is undermined in the Crime and Misconduct Bill. My support or non-support for it will depend on the response to the questions that have been put to the Premier in the second reading debate. However, my overall hope is that in passing this change our children are not betrayed in the process.

Ms MALE (Glass House—ALP) (5.20 p.m.): Today I rise in support of this historic and timely bill. In the past 12 years of Queensland's history, there is probably no institution which has been as revered and reviled as the Criminal Justice Commission. The advantage of hindsight is good, but I can confidently say that strong passions about the CJC were always going to be stirred when it was formed after the Fitzgerald inquiry. We cannot invest so much power and control into one organisation without drawing both praise and criticism.

In its early history, the CJC did not do itself any favours with its sloppy and poorly researched report into on-line gambling and its amateurish inquiry into the politically charged subject of parliamentary travel. These early blunders unfortunately tended to make people highly suspicious of the motives and direction of the CJC. However, no amount of suspicion could have justified the utter bastardry shown towards the CJC by the Borbidge-Sheldon government from 1996 to 1998. They went out with a clear agenda to discredit and dismantle the CJC and would have succeeded had they not run out of time. The Borbidge-Sheldon government reign will go down in Queensland's history as one of the darkest periods for public administration. It is almost as dark as the period under the Bjelke-Petersen government, where corruption and maladministration flourished.

The bill before us today partly deals with cleaning up the mess left behind by the Borbidge government machinations but also includes some important provisions which improve

accountability in public administration. The Queensland Crime Commission was born in a time of high political drama. The Borbidge government was keen to deflect the public's attention away from the debacle of the Connolly-Ryan inquiry and rushed through the formation of the Queensland Crime Commission.

It was also part of the Borbidge government's agenda to neuter the CJC and starve it of funding. Despite the inglorious start for the QCC, it has performed well, which is largely due to the hard work of Crime Commissioner Tim Carmody and his small band of investigators. They have been able to strike blows against paedophilia and major crime in recent times from the relatively limited amount of resources available. The CJC and QCC have been able to work well together, but the need to expend scant resources on duplicating administration support and investigative power has been unnecessary and unfortunate. Reuniting our crime-fighting and investigative bodies once more is a sensible approach which can only enhance life in Queensland.

Investigating crime, especially something as elusive as paedophilia and major crime, can be frustrating enough without fighting over resources and lines of responsibility. When the Beattie government was elected in 1998, Crime Commissioner Carmody must have realised the day would come when the Queensland Crime Commission would be amalgamated with the CJC. It is a credit to him that he was able to work constructively with the Premier's Department to establish a model which will advance the aims of the QCC and the CJC.

However, amalgamating the two bodies is only one of the positive outcomes of this bill. It also cleans up a big mess called the Criminal Justice Legislation Amendment Act 1997 which completely removed the CJC's chairperson from the day-to-day decision-making process and vested it in the commission as a whole. Over the past four years, it has meant that the chair has had his hands tied and the commission has had to laboriously work through simple administrative decisions which would have taken only a few minutes by a CEO of any other organisation. Talk about a bureaucratic nightmare created by a coalition government.

The National Party then has the temerity to criticise the chair for not getting directly involved in CJC inquiries. No wonder the chair does not; most of his time has been spent in meetings, working out who can go on leave and other such pedestrian matters. Giving the day-to-day management decision making back to the chair and requiring the chair to conduct all public hearings where possible is a good move and restores the clout and authority of the chair where it should be.

The move to enhance the Crime and Misconduct Commission's surveillance powers to cover computers is also sensible. It may draw the ire of some civil libertarians, but it is necessary when we consider the sophisticated networks paedophiles have established via the Internet. These networks are one of the downsides to the information revolution and investigators must have the powers and capacity to break into encrypted data transmissions. Only those who are doing something wrong have anything to fear from this step.

This bill also strengthens the commission's ability to investigate misconduct in public administration, which can only be a good thing. The move to invest more power in the police to carry out their own investigations into misconduct has drawn some criticism. However, the truth of the matter has been that the police have already been carrying out these investigations for years but through a costly, time-consuming referral system from the CJC. Streamlining this process will cut down investigation time, which addresses one of the main criticisms of the current process.

However, it puts a huge responsibility on senior police to ensure that corruption and misconduct do not become rife within the service. The checks and safeguards in place must be allowed to work by the Police Service, because these powers of self-investigation are a heavy responsibility and what is given can be easily taken away. However, with the excellent legacy left by Jim O'Sullivan and the integrity and commitment of the current Police Commissioner, Bob Atkinson, I am confident that the Police Service will avoid the pitfalls of the past.

The move to give more responsibility to the Police Service also frees up resources in the commission to concentrate on other areas of public administration. One area I would like the new commission to increase investigations in is local government. Some of the horror stories I have been hearing about local government indicate the need for a concentrated effort to clean up administrative processes and dispel the myths surrounding local government. Local government candidates seem to be the worst proponents of making baseless accusations and then calling in the CJC. Their opponents then have the cloud of a CJC investigation hanging over their heads despite the fact that the CJC has an obligation to investigate all complaints. Thankfully, the

warning issued by Brendan Butler about vexatious accusations before the last council elections seemed to curtail this unsavoury practice.

One grey area in the CJC's misconduct investigation powers has been to do with misconduct within its own ranks. The suggested step to give legislative power to the protocol whereby the commission reports alleged misconduct to the overseeing parliamentary body is sensible. It negates the need to set up another body to investigate the investigators but must be strictly adhered to by the chair to ensure that commission officers are above reproach.

One suggested change which has drawn criticism from the opposition has been the move to transfer the criminal justice research capability to a unit within the Premier's Department. That proposed shift has all the conspiracy theorists on the other side of the House working overtime. The member for Toowoomba South was using peculiar terms such as a 'secret, dark move' and a 'special branch-type' organisation. Of course, in-depth and accurate research and the National Party are mutually exclusive.

Opposition members' definition of in-depth research into the criminal justice system is for them to read the *Courier-Mail* in the morning or the latest press release from the Police Union. Despite the fact that it is one of the few areas that the CJC has overlooked and has done little research in, the opposition thinks this is an attempt somehow to paint the criminal justice system in rosy colours for the benefit of the incumbent government. The member for Southern Downs is a little hysterical in his protestations about politicising the research unit. This is an insult to the independence and integrity of the public service, which already carries out research reports that are not always flattering about the government's performance.

The move to set up a separate research capability into the criminal justice system is also sensible, because the CJC was part of the criminal justice system. Having a separate unit means that it can report on the impact of the new commission and all of the other agencies within the criminal justice system.

This bill marks another step in the growth in public administration in Queensland. It is an important step built on the hard work started by the Fitzgerald process. The aims and ideals first written down in the CJC's charter will be strengthened by this legislation. As I have outlined today, this bill both tightens and improves the accountability mechanisms in our public administration and tightens and improves the investigative capabilities of our law enforcement agencies to tackle major crime and paedophilia. It deserves the full support of the House.

Mr ENGLISH (Redlands—ALP) (5.30 p.m.): I rise to speak in this debate with a unique perspective on this bill. I joined the police department in 1989 and lived through the Fitzgerald commission from the inside. It should be highlighted that only a very small percentage of the police who were working in the Queensland Police Service at that time were identified as corrupt or as having any involvement in corrupt practices. Despite this small percentage of corrupt police, the public confidence in the Queensland Police Service was very, very quickly and correctly eroded. The Queensland Police Service has worked extremely hard over the past 10 years to rebuild public confidence. The CJC, which was created as a result of the Fitzgerald inquiry, was an important tool in rebuilding public confidence.

It has taken many, many years of hard work by the Criminal Justice Commission and members within the Queensland Police Service to get the Queensland Police Service to its current status of a highly respected organisation, both nationally and internationally. The increasing credibility of the Queensland Police Service can be seen in the creation of the Ethical Standards Command and the fact that a lot of accusations of misconduct are being handed back to the police. The Queensland Police Service has proven itself trustworthy to the Criminal Justice Commission, proven itself to have the ability to objectively and independently investigate allegations of misconduct.

The member for Glass House mentioned the streamlining of the complaints process. Having worked in the Ethical Standards Command for some time, I can attest to delays being caused by complaints having to go to the Criminal Justice Commission for assessment. Delays occurred there, in some cases, of one or two days and sometimes longer before the complaint was handed back to the Ethical Standards Command or a region for ongoing investigation. This process of combining the Queensland Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission should help streamline some of those matters. The Queensland Crime Commission was born for a number of reasons. Some people allege that it was an attempt to undermine the Criminal Justice Commission.

Ms Male: It was.

Mr ENGLISH: I will take that interjection. It also did have the ability to focus a high police presence on organised crime—something that may have been neglected up to that point.

The member for Gladstone made the point that this combining of the Queensland Crime Commission and the CJC will dilute the effort towards proactively investigating paedophile activity in Queensland. I cannot see how she comes to that conclusion. Whether paedophilia is or is not a standing reference, I see the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Crime Commission as being highly motivated to track down and proactively pursue paedophiles. I would like to draw the attention of the member for Gladstone to Task Force Argos within the Queensland Police Service that has a standing reference. Its entire existence is to locate, identify and charge paedophiles. I was a member of their Internet team for some time. We used a computer and the Internet proactively to locate, track and identify paedophiles using the Internet to procure children and to swap images of children and relate stories in relation to paedophilia. The Queensland Police Service has its own system internally for proactively targeting paedophiles and going after these disgusting creatures.

Another speaker earlier in the debate failed to find any positives in combining the Queensland Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission. Obviously, owing to his limited mental capacity, he is not able to cope with the concept of the pooling of resources. It is something that is quite common in the private sector and the public sector. Why set up two administrative areas when we can cut down the cost involved in administering an investigative arm and spend more money on carrying out investigations? I hope the member is currently listening and I hope that, despite his limited brain capacity, he can grasp that concept and understand that, in combining the Criminal Justice Commission and Queensland Crime Commission, we need only run one administrative section. The resources given to those two organisations can be pooled and targeted where they should be: on carrying out and conducting investigations, not on shuffling pieces of paper.

For many years now many law enforcement agencies have conducted multijurisdictional task forces where investigations involve multiple agencies such as the Australian Federal Police, the Queensland Police Service, the Criminal Justice Commission, the National Crime Authority and the Queensland Crime Commission. This combining of the Queensland Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission is just part of formalising that process. Rather than having five agencies involved in one investigation, it cuts the number down to four. The reason that they use multijurisdictional task forces is that a lot of agencies have particular skills, particular resources or particular powers. This will combine the powers and the resources of those two agencies to fight crime more effectively.

Unfortunately, the member for Toowoomba South has a quite Neanderthal silo mentality and wants to keep the CJC separate from the Queensland Crime Commission for no very good reason other than that he cannot cope with the thought of a multijurisdictional task force. It should be highlighted that, given what is happening in the New South Wales Police Service at the moment, by combining the Criminal Justice Commission and the Queensland Crime Commission—that is, the corruption-fighting body and the organised crime fighting body—there is the potential to exchange information very, very freely in relation to any potential link between organised crime and corrupt police activities. I think we have seen examples of that in the New South Wales Police Service.

If an organised crime investigation is ongoing currently with the Queensland Crime Commission and it identifies some link to corrupt activities in the Queensland Police Service, the process of relaying that information between the Queensland Crime Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission could become a bureaucratic nightmare. I say that from experience. By combining the two agencies we will have a free and full exchange of information which will ensure that the Queensland Police Service maintains its lead as one of the most honest police services within Australia and one which has the highest standards of integrity.

Having worked in the intelligence areas for many years, I think it is important to differentiate between tactical and strategic intelligence. The opposition has made a number of points about politicising the research area. Having conducted both tactical intelligence probes and strategic intelligence probes, again I can attest to the fact that strategic intelligence probes quite often do have policy implications. When we are looking at the big picture issues, of course we need to look at big picture solutions. I think it is quite fair and right that the strategic intelligence assessments that are conducted should be passed on to government for those big picture solutions. Of course, the day-to-day tactical intelligence operations will not be compromised by the relocation of the research arm into the Premier's Department.

The member for Southern Downs also ranted on about the complaint he had about non-conviction of paedophiles. Again, it just harks back to the National Party's limited intelligence and their inability to understand the separation of powers. No matter what the law enforcement body, their job is to investigate allegations. If sufficient evidence exists, then they prefer charges. It is up to the independent judicial process to then convict. So for him to come in here and confuse a debate about law enforcement with the separate, independent judicial process again shows his inability to pull his head out of the 1980s and come to grips with the separation of powers. The fact that a court may not convict a paedophile is not a matter for parliament; rather, it is a matter for the integrity of the judiciary. I find it difficult that after all these years those opposite have not come to grips with that concept. In summary, this bill will result in a more effective law enforcement agency. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr SHINE (Toowoomba North—ALP) (5.40 p.m.): The Crime and Misconduct Bill before the House represents, if you like, a complete overhaul of previous legislation put in place following the Fitzgerald report dealing with the prevention of corruption, the raising of the standards of the public sector so far as matters of integrity are concerned, and the Queensland Crime Commission's role with respect to major and organised crime and paedophilia. The structural change is one uniting the bodies and their roles—that is, the Criminal Justice Commission, CJC, and the Queensland Crime Commission, QCC—into a new Crime and Misconduct Commission, CMC. Broadly speaking, under the current structure the CJC is chiefly concerned with public sector misconduct whereas the task of the QCC is to tackle major and organised crime.

The chief effect of this bill is to place these areas—that is, crime and misconduct—again under the one umbrella, as was the case prior to the passage of the Crime Commission Act 1997. I have a particular interest in the subject matter as a member of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, which under the bill before the House will become known as the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, PCMC. The CMC is to have a full-time chairperson with four part-time commissioners being community representatives. Additional positions created to attend CMC meetings on a non-voting basis are an Assistant Commissioner, Crime, and an Assistant Commissioner, Misconduct.

Queensland Crime Commission functions will now largely be taken over by a reference committee under the CMC to provide references to the CMC for crime-fighting, leaving issues of management and oversight to the full CMC. The office of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Commissioner continues as the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner, as does the office of the Public Interest Monitor, retaining its name under the current legislation. The office of the parliamentary commissioner will continue and together with the PCMC continues its oversight role of the CMC. It will now include the crime functions currently undertaken by the QCC.

The CJC's current important functions with respect to witness protection, misconduct, prevention and intelligence stay. With one exception, the powers of the CMC remain the same, the exception being electronic data surveillance in relation to crime matters. A major change is to enable units of public administration to handle misconduct within their own agencies—that is, the handling of complaints against police, for example, will be the responsibility of the Police Commissioner. The CMC will continue to carry out research to support its functions into crime and its prevention. Any other current research functions are to be carried out by the Premier's Department. I have referred very briefly to the major structural changes and the roles to be performed under the proposed legislation. Other honourable members who have contributed to this debate have made more detailed mention of different significant aspects of the bill. Having regard to the constraints of time, I will restrict my remaining remarks to those relating to the committee on which I serve, the PCMC as it is to be called, and the office of the parliamentary commissioner.

Part 3 of the bill before the House deals with the establishment and operation of the PCMC—that is, the committee. The current members of the PCJC remain the same in the new form of the PCMC—that is, four government and three non-government members. Uniquely, this committee remains in existence after the dissolution of the House. However, in the event of a member being defeated, she or he will be replaced by nomination of the leader of the party from whence he or she comes rather than remaining on the committee until a new committee is appointed, as is the case at the moment. This overcomes a current difficulty which arose as a result of the last election when a member who served on the PCJC was defeated but had to attend meetings for quite a few months until the new committee came into existence.

Under the bill, there appear to be no significant changes to the committee's powers and responsibilities. In relation to the committee's consultative role and the appointment of the CMC

chairperson and part-time commissioners, other than in relation to the inaugural chairperson, the chair and deputy of the committee are members of the panel that makes that choice. There is, however, no role to be played by the committee with respect to the appointment of the Assistant Commissioner, Crime, and Assistant Commissioner, Misconduct, although there is provision for consultation with the Leader of the Opposition.

Under the legislation, it is a requirement on the CMC's chairperson to notify the committee of conduct of a commission officer the chairperson suspects involves or might involve misconduct. Under the current legislation, the chairperson is required to do this pursuant to protocols. Legislative requirement replaces this. The committee is not represented on the reference committee as an example of a lessening of its involvement in the process. On the other hand, as an example of its increased functions it has a new role in respect of the authorisation for the parliamentary commissioner to hold hearings. With respect to the parliamentary commissioner, there is provision for continuity of office. Most of the provisions with respect to his or her role remain the same and reflect the current position. The parliamentary commissioner is appointed under this bill on a part-time basis. Time will tell whether that will be sufficient in the future. There certainly have been instances in the past where the former parliamentary commissioner had a full-time task in relation to the workload concerning the Connolly-Ryan records.

The current functions of the parliamentary commissioner under the Criminal Justice Act and also the intelligence review function, presently conferred by the Crime Commission Act, are in place. There is a reduction of some power, but overall the power of the parliamentary commissioner remains quite wide. The parliamentary commissioner has power to do all things necessary or convenient for the performance of the parliamentary commissioner's functions. The parliamentary commissioner, however, will not have the powers of a commissioner under the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950. Therefore, he or she will not have the powers of compulsion. Evidence can no longer be obtained by him or her from, for example, journalists and other members of the public at large unless they volunteer such evidence.

The parliamentary commissioner will have the power to conduct hearings, as is currently the case. However, that power will only be exercised if the parliamentary commissioner has used all reasonable means to obtain the information sought without success. Also, the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee will have to give its authority and, of course, that will require bipartisan support. In other words, the parliamentary commissioner will not be able to hold any hearings without the approval of both sides of the House in the sense of their representation on the parliamentary committee.

Under the bill, reports of the parliamentary commissioner are confirmed to be subject to parliamentary privilege. This is a clarification of a recent court decision involving the Criminal Justice Commission and the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Commissioner. It is a worthwhile inclusion to ensure that in future there is no confusion on this point and no unnecessary litigation. Overall, the bill reflects a move in the right direction and I commend it to the House.

Ms BOYLE (Cairns—ALP) (5.50 p.m.): It is 12 years since the Criminal Justice Act 1989 was introduced. The act arose from the reforms recommended by commissioner Tony Fitzgerald. This had been preceded by an inquiry which rocked Queensland. I am reminded of my own years in Queensland prior to the Fitzgerald inquiry. I had moved to Cairns from Canberra in 1978. The daylight savings joke in those days was that as you crossed the border into Queensland you turned back your watch one hour and 10 years. I brought with me the backwards, redneck perception that many in the southern states had of Queenslanders, and I discovered that many Queenslanders themselves were embarrassed by the limitations on their freedoms and the smell of corruption that hung about government, the police force and even business transactions in the Sunshine State.

Even in faraway Cairns stories abounded about how public servants dared not express a contrary view or they would be posted suddenly to the remotes. I heard about how police monstred and violated indigenous people and those at the bottom of society. I was told about how expressions of protest about government policies or decisions were not allowed publicly and were not even wise privately as you never knew who might be listening.

Then in the late 1980s came the Fitzgerald inquiry, which confirmed that corruption was endemic in the police force. The National Party government was swept away and a new era dawned with the election of Labor and the premiership of Wayne Goss. The social and democratic reforms that followed, including the establishment of the Criminal Justice Commission, opened the door in Queensland to integrity and accountability, to democratic debate and

expression, and to, albeit at a moderate pace, social progress. Since then I have been proud to be a Queenslander.

Little did I guess then that I would have the privilege of being a member of this honourable House and in a position to argue for the changes which underlie the Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001. It is time to move the imperative for public integrity and the fight against major crime and official misconduct to the next level. Nonetheless, my understanding of the changes needed and the likely impacts of the Crime and Misconduct Bill arise substantially from my recent experience as a member of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee.

I recall how during the last term of government—my first term—I had only a general understanding of the workings of the CJC, the Crime Commission and the duties of the PCJC. Previous to that I held what I suspect is a common attitude amongst people in Queensland; that is, the Criminal Justice Commission is there to protect us against corruption in the public sector, and this is a very good thing.

I knew of the CJC as a watchdog. I also, however, had memories of my only direct dealings with the CJC. These were tinged with frustration and even, to a small degree, resentment at the damage that can be done to people's reputations by prolonged investigations. In 1991, when I was deputy mayor of Cairns City Council, accusations of embezzlement were made against the town clerk. Unsurprisingly, questions were raised by the public about whether the elected representatives of the council were in some way connected or even responsible through dereliction of duty. Neither of these were shown to be true—eventually. And that is what has stayed in my memory: the harm that was caused to many at the council by the CJC's investigation taking such a long time—more than a year. I think it took 18 months. Members will understand, therefore, that I bring to my position on the PCJC—and will bring to the new PCMC, should that be one of the outcomes of this debate—a strong desire to assist the CJC towards improved efficiencies and thereby improved effectiveness in the management of its business.

The Crime and Misconduct Bill will assist the government to achieve improved effectiveness in a number of ways. First, the major crime and official misconduct investigation bodies will be amalgamated under the new Crime and Misconduct Commission. This in itself will result in efficiencies. The mandate of the Criminal Justice Commission will be refocused towards enabling and educating public agencies, the police in particular, to minimise, investigate and manage misconduct within their own domains. While the commission will retain primary responsibility for investigations of official misconduct, it may choose to refer a particular matter to a public agency to investigate, whether solely or in conjunction with the commission.

While on the one hand the commission retains firm control, it can, as it is confident in the capacity of other agencies, hand over the functions of the investigation to whatever degree it considers appropriate. This is actually a very significant reform, using a sophisticated method to gradually transfer the responsibility for preventing, properly investigating and managing official misconduct to the agency from which the complaint originated. Only when we have confidence that there is a strong culture of integrity in all public sector agencies may we regard the Fitzgerald reforms as having been fully implemented.

The bill combines the separate research and intelligence resources of the Criminal Justice Commission and the Crime Commission and results in the sharing of expensive and limited surveillance resources where appropriate. This latter area is the only one in which the powers of the Crime Commission are increased, through allowance for surveillance of serious criminal activities on computers. We have been made aware that paedophile networks are frequently conducted via the Internet. It may be that in this new age, in which computers are essential items for communication, other serious criminal activities will require investigation using this expanded power from time to time.

It is important to reassure the general public that, while greater responsibility for investigation of police misconduct will be delegated to the police force, the CMC will retain its responsibility to be fully informed about all charges of misconduct, to oversee and audit all investigations, to ensure timeliness and efficiency of investigations, and to require cooperation with other agencies. The CMC will have the power to review or take over investigations if necessary. Additionally, the commission chair will be required to notify the parliamentary committee of suspected improper conduct on the part of a commission officer.

One other change in the bill is the better targeting of the responsibilities and the work of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner. The commissioner will act only at the direction of the PCMC. Powers to compel the production of information will only apply to

commission officers, and hearings will only be conducted with the bipartisan support of the parliamentary committee.

There has been some concern about the changes that will be made to the research function of the CJC. The first point to make is that the new body will retain a strong research function. This is borne out by the expectation that only between four and six of the existing research staff complement of around 28 will be required to form the new government unit. Further, the CMC will still be requested by government to conduct significant independent research projects from time to time. The only research function that will be relocated is research into the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. This has not been a strong area of activity for the CJC, yet it is important. Research into the effectiveness of the criminal justice system may well raise issues bearing on health, education, employment or housing, for example. Resiting this research function under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet will allow for this broader perspective to be taken.

However, all the structural changes—notwithstanding improved effectiveness—also fall to the staff of the CMC and, in particular, the chair of the Crime and Misconduct Commission and the assistant commissioners. The Premier has said that when this bill is passed into legislation there will be quick action to fill these positions. But for a moment, step back in time to one of the mistakes made by the Borbidge National Party government. It introduced the Criminal Justice Legislation Amendment Act 1997, which removed the powers of the CJC chairperson to make many basic managerial decisions. This created an inefficient process whereby even minor managerial decisions had to be decided by the commission as a whole. The Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001 restores to the chair the power to make day-to-day management decisions. Further, except for the positions of chair and the two assistant commissioners, the internal structure of the commission will not be defined by statute. This will allow the chair the flexibility to structure the commission to most effectively manage its operations.

The criminal justice sector has been characterised—albeit with the help of Hollywood—by secrecy, by goodies and baddies, right and wrong, power and punishment. It therefore sounds somewhat anathema that the new Crime and Misconduct Commission should be charged with building a strong client focus. One of the important ways in which this will be demonstrated is through communication protocols to respond to complainants advising them of the action taken, the reason why the action is considered appropriate in the circumstances, and updating them from time to time on the result of action to date. Consideration should also be given to ensuring that public figures against whom allegations are made are not left with unsubstantiated smears against their characters for prolonged periods.

As important as it is for the chair and the assistant commissioners to have expertise in the law, I suggest that is not enough. Too often in times past we have been keen to appoint people pre-eminent in their professions to such high-profile, important and I might say well-paid positions. Such people have achieved their success through hard work over many years to develop their high standing. They have not, it is no surprise, put their time into gaining credentials in organisational management or into human resource or financial management. The hard facts are that effective management requires expertise. Being a good lawyer does not necessarily make one a good manager. The same can be said in hospitals, where it has been discovered that being a good surgeon does not make one a good director of, say, a 30-bed unit with staff from diverse professional backgrounds.

For the structural reforms in the Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001 to work, it is essential that the people who get the top jobs are not only eminent in their professions but also have knowledge and experience in crime organisation management, otherwise I fear that the structural changes in the Crime and Misconduct Bill 2001 will not be translated into the increased effectiveness and efficiency that is an essential purpose behind the changes. I am pleased to support this bill before the House.

Ms STRUTHERS (Algeria—ALP) (6.03 p.m.): There is a view that corruption flourishes in conditions of underdevelopment. We know that countries such as Nigeria, Mexico, Indonesia and many others have been riddled with corruption. But let us not be blind to the reality that corruption is equally prevalent in many developed democracies. Democracy is not a panacea for controlling corruption. If corruption is a phase that countries go through before they reach maturity, much of the developed world seems to be experiencing a second childhood. Take the revelation of serious drug-related corruption in the New South Wales Police Service as an example.

It is essential that we remain vigilant in our support for anticorruption and anticrime institutions and processes in Australia and within Queensland. I support the Premier in bringing the two anticrime, anticorruption bodies together in Queensland through this Crime and

Misconduct Bill. While none of us in this House are anticrime experts, I am sure that none of us would doubt that the clout of these bodies will be strengthened with combined intelligence and investigative resources. And that is exactly what we want: the clout to wipe out paedophilia in Queensland, the clout to make it extremely difficult for the grubs who trade in illicit drugs to do business in Queensland, and the clout to make people think twice before they grease the palms of any public official or law enforcement agent in this state.

The Beattie government has proudly put Queensland on the national and international map as the Smart State. There is growing recognition among the developed and developing countries that the fight against corruption advances their national and economic interest. Queensland is no different. If we are to advance ourselves as a significant trading and business partner in the global business club, we must continue to advance our post-Fitzgerald reputation as a reformed, open and accountable state.

Mr Bredhauer: The opposition cares so much about this bill there's not one in the House—only one Independent.

Ms STRUTHERS: That is right. They are not here at all to listen. It is an important topic and they are not here. Anticorruption measures are good for business and good for the economy. Research has shown that corruption is negatively linked to the level of investment and economic growth. The more corruption, the less investment and the less economic growth.

The president of the Kuala Lumpur Society for Transparency and Integrity, Mr Aziz, stated this year that good governance, like integrity itself, is no longer the luxury of the virtuous; it is a global business necessity. He urged countries in Asia that want to remain in the mainstream of the globalised economy and benefit from foreign direct investment to review and, where necessary, reform their political and economic governance, including measures to increase transparency and accountability, to guarantee freedom of information by an act of parliament and establish an independent anticorruption agency to deal with issues of national integrity and corruption.

In the pre-Fitzgerald years under the coalition government Queensland endured a closed system of government riddled with corruption, and no Queenslanders should ever forget this. The National Party government and coalition governments pre-1989 treated the Queensland public with contempt. There was no freedom of information system, there was no anticorruption system. In fact, there was no true democracy in this state. What we had was a police state where the Special Branch and corrupt elected and public officials ruled. This was little more than 10 years ago, but I think the member for Toowoomba South has forgotten this and, in fact, does not even care about it. He is not here. None of his colleagues is here in the House to debate this bill at this time.

Mr Horan came into this chamber earlier and alleged that the shift of some criminal justice research functions from the CJC to the Premier's Department was akin to the Special Branch. I cannot see provisions in this bill that give police unfettered powers to intimidate, harass, arrest, photograph or invade the privacy of members of the public. This is what the Special Branch did under the coalition government. I cannot see provisions in this bill that give the Premier unfettered access to a corrupt Police Commissioner. This is what happened pre-1989 in Queensland. It is an absolute insult, and it is totally irresponsible for Mr Horan to liken the extended research unit to a corrupt Special Branch.

I do not want to see any dilution of the important criminal justice research activities of these bodies, and I certainly have put this question to the Premier and he has given assurances that the extended research functions in his own department will, in fact, allow a much more targeted area of research that is consistent with government policy. I support that. I think that is an important initiative.

I am a firm supporter of a well-functioning anticorruption system. Bodies such as the CJC have been vital to our reforms in this state. They need the full support of government as well as close scrutiny. They need the scrutiny to prevent any protracted investigations, any misuse of their powers—their very wide-ranging powers. The CJC, over the past decade or so, has been under siege from a number of quarters in this state, including mainly the National Party and many of its deposed colleagues. It is my hope that the new body, the Crime and Misconduct Commission, will move ahead in Queensland with multiparty support to be a significant force in combating crime and corruption in this state.

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (6.08 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. There are a number of matters to which

I feel it appropriate to reply, and I will deal with a number of members who have made contributions on issues that need to be corrected or answered. I thank those members who have made supporting contributions. I do not intend to go through those. And if I have dealt with one member's point, it may well cover what some other member has said. So I will endeavour, through that mechanism, to respond to everything that members have raised.

As a matter of courtesy, I will start with the Leader of the Opposition, who made a number of points, but there were four key ones. Firstly, he said that joining the Crime Commission and the CJC together would make them less effective. I do not share his view about that and I will explain why. In my view and in the government's view, joining the two bodies together will enhance rather than reduce their effectiveness for the reason that they will work together. The bill carefully crafts an arrangement to preserve separate and distinct characters, each accountable to its own assistant commissioner. It was designed that way to make certain that the current structure of the CJC and the current structure of the Crime Commission continue to work. In other words, it contains the best of both worlds: a new structure which takes the strength of the current arrangements without the duplication and the waste of resources. We end up with a sharing arrangement which means a better outcome.

I have made it clear from the outset that this bill is not about reducing the budget of either the Crime Commission or the CJC, which together cost taxpayers about \$30 million. However, as mentioned in the second reading speech, this is about ensuring that there are savings in the long term. Where there are two bodies operating under one umbrella—and most likely under one roof—and sharing certain units and facilities, of course money will be saved. In the long term it will reduce the demand for increased funding. The Criminal Justice Commission, under Brendan Butler, and the Crime Commission, under Tim Carmody, have both been quite responsible in their budget requests to the government. I want that maintained for the future and bringing them together is a long-term frugal arrangement to save taxpayers money.

Accountability in this state costs Queenslanders a lot of money. On a regular basis, the Cabinet Budget Review Committee and the cabinet consider, on the one hand, the competing interests of providing services in health, education, police, fire and ambulance—the list goes on—and, on the other hand, the cost of accountability. Questions were raised today by the opposition in relation to the quite legitimate issue of leukemia sufferers. There are costs associated with that. With respect to the opposition, issues about the cost of leukemia cannot be raised on the one hand and then suggestions made on the other hand that there should be two separate bodies which in the long term would cost us more money. That money for accountability has to come from somewhere. This is a long-term frugal arrangement to ensure that we get the best from the current CJC and Crime Commission in terms of accountability and work, at the same time having a long-term strategy to ensure that that is done at the best possible cost to the community.

The bill keeps the functions of the bodies and maximises the use of shared supporting resources, intelligence, research and surveillance, but eliminates duplication. That is the core of this and that is why there will be long-term savings. I will mention that again. The bill keeps the functions but it maximises the use of shared supporting resources. Think about that. Sharing intelligence, research and surveillance has got to save money. If both organisations are doing it, of course it is going to cost more. However, if they are doing it together, it saves money in the long term and there is a better outcome. It eliminates duplication.

The crime function under this bill is given a central role as a core function of the commission. Crime and misconduct functions will have equal prominence and each function will be appropriately resourced within the commission. That answers very clearly the point made by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Opposition Leader made an allegation that the bill was rushed. I can tell members that if this bill is rushed, I would hate to see a bill that moves slowly. The bill took over two years in development. The legislation development process was informed by a consultant's report and the parliamentary committee has received public submissions on the CJC legislation over several years and has itself reported on law reform in several reports. The bill was thoroughly consulted on with the chair of the CJC and the Crime Commissioner.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Both the Crime Commissioner and the CJC are on record as having supported this legislation. Why? Because there was detailed consultation! We went back and forth, we consulted, we worked on the model and we came up with a bill that is in the best interests of not just the CJC and the Crime Commission, but the new body and the people of Queensland in fighting crime. Both those bodies supported it because it is a good

outcome for Queensland. As the minister responsible for this, I can tell the House that we spent ages on it, considering it, looking at models and working on it. It is a very complicated and difficult marriage when two organisations are brought together, but this is a marriage that will sustain itself and survive over time. That is why this bill has not been rushed. I totally reject that suggestion out of hand. Members know how long this process has been going on. Over a period of time, I have been asked by a number of media sources, 'What is happening?' And I have been saying, 'We are consulting. We are working it through.' It took all that time to get it right. It is very important to reiterate that it has not been rushed, and the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

The third issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition is the criminal justice research unit. With all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition, he has simply misinterpreted the bill and the second reading speech. There is no kinder way of saying that. I could be unkind, but I won't be. He has simply not understood what is being done here. He sees some nonexistent underlying agenda. Clearly, that has been invented because there is nothing else to criticise in this bill; it is a strong and sensible bill. It is a research unit, it is not an investigation unit. The suggestion that this government would reinvent the special branch methods perfected under the National Party is offensive and is a ludicrous suggestion. They are not police officers, they are researchers; they do not have those powers. It will have access to statistics across the criminal justice system, not operational databases, and that is all it will have.

Although the Opposition may still be in the pre-electronic age, governments should make decisions based on evidence and facts that reflect the picture across the criminal justice system, not considering the perspective of only one agency. One of the things this government has successfully done is bring together, as much as we can, a whole-of-government approach and that has produced better outcomes and better results for Queenslanders. The researchers will not have access to sensitive information or information on individuals. Nothing in the legislation and nothing in the second reading speech suggests otherwise. Besides which, my government is committed to protecting privacy and will never allow a unit to access personal information, as suggested.

In terms of researchers, I am advised that the CJC has 28 researchers. I said in the second reading speech that this matter had not been resolved yet but that there would probably be five or six researchers going into this unit. David Brereton from the CJC says it could well be even three or four who will come across to the Department of Premier and Cabinet. That is a tiny fraction of the current number of researchers. They are researching in areas which are properly matters for government decision. Frankly, I think this is a sensible outcome. There have been exorbitant exaggerations about this unit, 99.9 per cent of which have been absolute rot. Frankly, from anybody's point of view, anybody assessing this in the future will clearly determine that this decision is sensible, logical and workable. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, with respect, that any suggestion that this is the re-creation of a special branch has got to be defined in anyone's language as nonsense. There is no basis for it. It is just garbage.

I turn to telephone interception powers. My government's commitment to empowering law enforcement bodies is beyond question. Measures include having enacted special witness protection legislation and protection for undercover police officers. I ask members to just think about what we have done. My government is currently considering civil confiscation measures. This bill extends the power of the current Crime Commission to conduct electronic data surveillance, a powerful tool to track the computer activities of paedophiles and organised crime.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Telecommunications (Interception) Queensland Bill. One of the obstacles that the 1998 bill struck was the question as to whether the state can impose safeguards on Commonwealth legislation. Safeguards through the Public Interest Monitor have served Queensland exceptionally well—in the surveillance provisions of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, the CJC and the Crime Commission acts. The Leader of the Opposition proposed telephone interception subject to the safeguards of the Public Interest Monitor, or perhaps even further enhanced it. He does not seem to realise that this proposal raises serious constitutional issues. Clearly, we would have been prepared to provide that advice. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, we arranged appropriate briefings for him in relation to the amendments that I will refer to later. I rang him this morning and have tried to consult with him on this matter. But I say to the Leader of the Opposition that there are constitutional issues that make it impossible. The all-party PCJC recognised in its 1999 report that the safeguards of the Public Interest Monitor could not be provided. That is absolutely clear. In my view, that is the answer.

The member for Southern Downs, Lawrence Springborg, said that the government will politicise the research function by filtering or tempering it. The CMC retains the majority of its

research functions. I have already indicated the staff numbers of that division, and overwhelmingly they will keep them. That independent role remains. The commission's research will focus particularly on its crime and corruption functions, on prevention, criminal activity and the exercise of powers by the police; in other words, its core business. That is what it should be researching. The government will still ask the commission to conduct independent research on specific issues. For example, the commission will still report on the Prostitution Act 1999. That will be done by the independent section—David Brereton's section—in the CJC.

Lawrence Springborg, the member for Southern Downs, also said that the chair would be too busy to run two public hearings at once. It is highly unlikely that two public hearings will have to be run concurrently. If the need arose, the longer running inquiry could be held over temporarily while the secondary hearing was conducted. I make the point that in the legislation we have given the opportunity for a number of people to conduct private hearings. So there is wide discretion in private hearings. In public hearings, the commission has the full powers of a royal commission. People's reputations can be damaged and destroyed. Those powers need to be used sparingly. Up until the emergence of the CJC, the only body that could set up royal commissions was executive council which, obviously, needed the approval of cabinet. The CMC will have very, very powerful powers when conducting public hearings. They are a full royal commission. We cannot use those powers willy-nilly. They have to be used sparingly. As I have said, the CMC has wide opportunities to use its private hearing powers. We believe, quite rightly, that if there are going to be public hearings, they should be conducted by the chairman. That is not unreasonable; that is sensible and constructive.

I should say that the *Courier-Mail*, with which in these matters we have had our differences and our agreements, supports this position fully and for some time has campaigned for it, in my view, quite correctly. The arguments that the *Courier-Mail* has editorialised on this matter are quite strong and correct. I have to say that they were convincing in terms of my considerations. I give them credit for putting forward those arguments.

The member for Southern Downs also said that the QCC works well as it is, but could have done with some additional tools. I agree, but its operations are maintained in the bill. The crime function is provided with the additional tool of electronic data surveillance. So as I said in my second reading speech, the CJC powers and the Crime Commission powers are maintained. There has been one enhancement, and that relates to data surveillance in relation to computers.

The member for Gladstone raised the issue of the transfer of the research function to the DPC. I have talked about that. The member for Gladstone also asked why a civil libertarian will be appointed to the commission. That was set out in the Fitzgerald report. It was done to ensure that there were community representatives on such a powerful body. I want to make the point again that we are talking about a very powerful organisation that can force people to appear before it and answer questions. The rules of evidence go out the window. That means that people are compelled to answer in a public forum. It does not matter how we feel about civil libertarians—and I have my share of arguments with Terry O'Gorman as well—but I say to members that I want one of the people sitting as commissioners to be a civil libertarian, as Tony Fitzgerald recommended in 1989. This proposal is not new; it was proposed in 1989. I want a civil libertarian to sit on the commission to ensure that the commission thinks about the community—that there is some consideration in the commission's deliberations about protecting the rights of the individual. That is what is important. I am talking about one civil libertarian being appointed to the commission. I am not talking about any more than that. That one person could be outvoted, but at least that person could put the argument to protect the community. I stress again that the hearings of the commission will not be usual court hearings. Somebody could be forced to give evidence without the rules of evidence applying and could be forced to answer questions. I stress again that, up until the creation of the CJC, this very, very potent power was granted only by executive council when it established royal commissions or commissions of inquiry into particular matters. It is not a power that we allow to be used widely.

We have to remember this: in a democracy, this body is the most powerful body in the state. In essence, this body determines who the government of the day is. It then determines how the executive council applies. That is why this body is the source of the power for royal commissions. That means that the will of the people determines who governs, because they determine who is elected to this place. When the power is given for a body to conduct an ongoing royal commission—that is basically what we have with the CMC or the CJC—we have to have checks and balances in place. That is why that fundamental position is very important.

The member for Nicklin, Peter Wellington, raised a number of issues. He sought assurances that the effectiveness of the CJC and the CMC will not be reduced. The bill consolidates, and I believe strengthens, both the crime and misconduct functions and, in bringing them together, enables them to work together better. I have stated specifically that cost savings are not a priority of these amendments, but longer-term savings are expected to result from the elimination of duplication. I genuinely believe that will be the case. I have been sitting on the CBRC for four years and in that time the chairmen of the CJC and the Crime Commission have come before that committee. Although both of the current chairs have been very responsible, because of growth in various areas I can see that they will continue, over time, to seek increased funding. There will be inflation factors and so on. The best way to ensure that we have our priorities right in terms of education, health and so on, as well as accountability, is to bring the two bodies together to save duplication.

The member for Nicklin raised the issue of research. I make the point that the commission will continue its core research functions. The functions that will be relocated to the DPC relate to the broader criminal justice system, which has not been the focus of the CJC research division. In my view, that should be a matter for the will of the people. David Brereton indicated that he thought about three or four out of about 28 would go across to the DPC. In my second reading speech, I said about five or six would go, subject to consultation. So we are talking probably about three or four people out of about 28. That is yet to be finalised but, in rough terms, I am just giving the member an update of the situation. This research unit will have access to statistical data and not operational information on any individuals.

The member for Nicklin also raised the issue of the appointment of civil libertarians to the commission. The civil libertarian part-time member of the commission is a provision that dates back to the original establishment of the CJC in 1989. It does not reflect any shift in policy. I have just continued the current position. I do not intend to appoint more than one civil libertarian or people with civil libertarian expertise to the commission. There would just be the one person appointed, as Tony Fitzgerald recommended, as basically a check and balance.

The member for Nicklin raised the issue of telephone interception. If we could provide the safeguards of the Public Interest Monitor to telephone interception, it would be a good outcome. However, those safeguards cannot be provided because it comes under Commonwealth legislation and constitutionally we cannot do it. Basically, that is the reason why. As I indicated before, we have extended the powers in relation to access to computers, because the Crime Commissioner indicated to me that paedophiles operate on the Net. It is a key way of passing information and, I understand, photographs. Therefore, we need to crack down on that and we have agreed to do so. I think that answers the questions of the member for Nicklin. The member for Gladstone raised an issue about paedophilia. It is now reference based. I think we have answered that question.

I wish to deal with the response of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. The document that I received today covered a number of things. The three most substantial issues raised included: the statutory requirement for a lawyer with a civil libertarian background to be a member of the commission; financial detriment through the abolition of the former offices of the Crime Commission and the CJC chairperson; and the extensive scope of the transitional regulation-making power, that is, the Henry VIII clause.

Firstly, I turn to the issue of the civil libertarian lawyer. This is an historical requirement. It ensures that civil liberties are taken into account in an organisation with extensive powers like the commission. The appointment mechanism also allows the Bar Association and the Law Society to have input. I have dealt with that in response to answers to the member for Nicklin, so I will not go on with it any further. I have answered the issues that the committee raised.

The potential financial detriment relates to the current chair of the CJC and the Crime Commissioner. The Scrutiny of Legislation Committee said that the committee seeks confirmation from the Premier that the appointment arrangements for both those persons provide for an appropriate degree of financial compensation or the statutory abolition of their offices. This clause merely prevents double dipping. We agonised over this for a while. When we were bringing it together, obviously we had to work out a process. This clause prevents double dipping if the chair or the Crime Commissioner accept an appointment as either the chair or as an assistant commissioner. Therefore, if either the Crime Commissioner or the CJC Chair was appointed to the new body as the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner, they would not receive a redundancy payment. That seems like a given, but clearly if either of them takes the top spot, we have to ensure that they do not get a redundancy payment as well, because they will hold ongoing

positions. Their contracts were to run out next year. We have worked that through. However, if they are not offered or do not accept an appointment, they will still be entitled to any applicable termination payment.

When the process for the selection of the new chair has been undertaken, it is likely—although I do not know this—that both the Chairman of the CJC and the Crime Commissioner will apply. Clearly, this provision covers what will happen if they do. It is fair to both. If they win, they get the position and they do not get redundancy. If they lose and they want to go, they go and they get some payment. If they want to, one can be the chair and the other can be the Assistant Commissioner of Crime. Through this mechanism we have provided for both to take positions if they want them. That is a matter for them. They have to make that decision. I am not trying to force them to do anything. That decision will be made following an independent selection process that will involve the government, the opposition and a whole group of independent people.

In relation to the transitional regulation-making power, the Henry VIII clause, the committee asked whether the bill allows the delegation of legislative power only in appropriate cases to appropriate persons. An extensive transitional regulation-making power is justified in a bill of this complexity. It is imperative that the commission is not impeded in any way in its fight against crime and misconduct. The clause has a limited life span of only 12 months.

I arranged for my departmental staff to brief interested parties on the amendments and the explanatory notes that have been circulated well in advance. There are a lot of minor technical things that do not amount to anything substantive. However, there are a number of amendments that deal with the complexity of bringing both of these organisations together. In the detailed consultation there had been discussions on those things. When the final legislation was drafted, we took another look at it and a number of minor suggestions were made to improve the bringing of the two organisations together. That is why I have circulated a number of amendments. That occurred as a result of the responses of the CJC and the Crime Commission. All of those amendments are quite sensible. There is no radical change in policy. They are simply straightforward and logical. I have agreed to them. I have been through them with my staff. They have come from the CJC and the Crime Commission. They help put the organisation together in a much smoother way. If we can achieve that and they can get on with their job, everybody will be happy sooner.

The Scrutiny of Legislation Committee also commented on other aspects of the bill. However, it has not expressed any specific concerns. It has merely commented on them for parliament's information.

I have made reference to the amendments. As I have said, as soon as they were finalised with the Crime Commission and the CJC this morning I had a meeting with my staff and I arranged for them to be confirmed and circulated along with explanatory notes so that nobody was surprised. I asked my staff to brief as many people who were interested as possible. As members can see, they are not major changes of policy.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I do not like doing that, but those came from the bodies involved. It is about putting it all together. I did not want anyone here to be surprised, because there is nothing in here that is untoward.

In conclusion, this has been a long time coming. Putting both these bodies together is in the interests of fighting crime and good public administration in the state. There will always be an argument about some of the detail. However, I think that this is the best possible model. In a sense, this represents two years of heartache and hard work for me as the minister and for my key staff. We have worked out what I think is the best possible model. This is like any evolution. When Tony Fitzgerald brought down his report, he established the CJC and then EARC. Progress was made and things moved on. The CJC came into existence in April 1990. After 11 years, it is appropriate for us to have a revamp. We have done that. This is a better model than we had initially. This is a very effective working model.

When we go through the committee stage of the bill I will be happy to respond in detail to any issues that members want to raise. We will not rush off or finish this tonight. We will move the adjournment debate at 6.55 p.m. tonight to allow other matters to be dealt with. If any member in the House wants to raise a matter that comes to light overnight, my staff will be here tomorrow and we will respond to any questions that members may want to ask. This has been around for a while, but we will not finish it tonight. If members want to raise any technical matters, we will be

happy to go through them. I thank all honourable members for their contributions. This is a very important commitment to ongoing reform, ongoing accountability and ongoing mechanisms to make sure that we have the honest state that we all want. I commend the bill to the House.

Question—That the bill be read a second time—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 53—Attwood, Barry, Barton, Beattie, Bell, Bligh, Boyle, Bredhauer, E. Clark, L. Clark, Cummins, J. Cunningham, Edmond, Fenlon, Foley, Fouras, Hayward, Hopper, Jarratt, Keech, Lavarch, Lawlor, Lee, Livingstone, McGrady, McNamara, Mickel, Molloy, Mulherin, Nelson-Carr, Nolan, Pearce, Phillips, Pitt, Reeves, Reilly, N. Roberts, Robertson, Rodgers, Schwarten, C. Scott, D. Scott, Shine, Smith, Stone, Strong, Struthers, Welford, Wellington, Wells, Wilson. Tellers: T. Sullivan, Purcell,

NOES, 18—Copeland, E. Cunningham, Hobbs, Horan, Johnston, Kingston, Lee Long, Lingard, Malone, Pratt, Quinn, E. Roberts, Rowell, Seeney, Sheldon, Watson. Tellers: Lester, Springborg

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Committee

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) in charge of the bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Mr HORAN (6.45 p.m.): This clause concerns how the legislation's purposes are to be achieved. In the second reading debate I spoke about the fact that one of the key reasons we are voting against this bill is that we believe the bringing together of these two organisations will not achieve this purpose as well as it could be achieved were they to be kept separate. In his reply, the Premier spoke about how they will work together and concentrated on the costs. He said that by bringing them under one roof there would be some administrative savings and so on. I agree that it has the potential to have administrative savings.

The point I make is that the most important thing we should be considering as a parliament is how we can best achieve the public watchdog role of the CJC and the investigation of major crime and paedophilia in this state. If by bringing those two functions together we lessen their ability to do that and we save some money in the process, we have really missed the key purpose. It is not a saving well made, because that saving could be lost many, many times over in the major crime that may not be found, the cost to government, and through the distress that paedophilia causes and so forth. We are very strong in our view.

The Premier spoke about trying to move on. We did move in the mid-nineties when we separated it, because together they were not working, and for the following reasons: firstly, the CJC did not discharge its duties and responsibilities regarding the investigation of major crime and paedophilia and it seriously lacked performance in that area. We have seen a real improvement since the Queensland Crime Commission was put in place to undertake a specialised single operation, that is, the investigation of crime.

The other reason is that when we have one organisation that has the multiple functions of investigating the Queensland Police Service, and in particular any claims that are made of official misconduct, and at the same time it is supposed to work hand in hand—in close partnership—with the Queensland Police Service in investigating paedophilia and major crime, we have an underlying current of mistrust and dislike; we are asking them to work together but, at the same time, one is investigating the other. To us that does not make sense. It is not logical. After the CJC had been in operation for a number of years, we moved on to an improvement. We moved on to two specialised organisations. Yes, it might have cost a little more to have separate administrations. However, most importantly, we were highly focused on the two separate roles with two specialist organisations. That was one of the reasons we voted against it.

This clause indicates how the bill's purposes are to be achieved. That the Premier mentioned only the saving of some money was to neglect the most important principles. We should have the best watchdog over corruption and official misconduct that it is possible to have. It can do that only if it is on its own; if that is what it does and what it specialises in; if it is not endeavouring to get involved in all sorts of crime and paedophilia investigations and it just concentrates on one business. And likewise for the QCC.

The Premier stated that there would be a sharing of intelligence, research and surveillance. Again, that does not make sense when there are separate operations that they should be undertaking. The sort of research, intelligence or surveillance that the CJC wants to do in

undertaking its duties of investigating official misconduct and corruption would be totally different from the sort of investigation, research and surveillance that we would want to do through the crime division, which might be looking into a major drug racket, a paedophilia network and so on. That is where they got it wrong the last time: they were concentrating too much on one aspect and not concentrating on the investigation of major crime and paedophilia. In order to do that, we had to move forward and separate it into two organisations.

In relation to clause 5, we strongly believe that the legislation's purposes will not be achieved through this bringing together of the two organisations, and that we will have a lessening of ability and potential to undertake these most important tasks for the sake of saving some administrative funds. We would be the first to support it if we thought that we would get savings and also a better result. In our mind, there is not a better result. They are not going to be focused. They are to be mixed in together. There is a proven track record that that did not work before, yet the government is going backwards after we moved forwards.

Mr BEATTIE: Let me respond by saying three things. First—and I say this with respect—I think the Opposition Leader has not come to terms with exactly what the model provides. Each function of the current CJC and the Crime Commission is kept separate under an assistant commissioner, which is why there is the chair and two assistant commissioners. Nothing is lost in that at all. It means that each is given the same emphasis. They will get on and do the same job. Nothing is lost at all, which is why they will have exactly the same powers, but they are enhanced.

Let us deal with the issue of intelligence to which the member referred earlier. It all goes into a database. Unfortunately, over a long period organisations in this area—and I am speaking generally now—have not always shared database information. If there is one database, it is available to both bodies. That is a better outcome. Instead of having one organisation over here and another over there with different databases, if we have one then we get a better outcome. If they are both collecting information for the one database then again we have more information and a better outcome, which means that they can do their job better. I want to make that point about the structure very clear. That is why it has been designed that way.

Let us talk about what happened last time. As all members would know, I was the first chair of the PCJC. I understand what the issues were. I am not trying to be political here tonight. As members would know, there was an attempt by the Borbidge government to do various things to the CJC. I am not going to dwell on that tonight because I want this to be a constructive debate. The problems that the CJC had previously related to limitations in the act. They were limited to the definition of 'organised crime'. They were limited in many senses by legislation. Members may also recall that they were the subject of an extraordinary brawl that existed between the Borbidge government and the then head of the CJC. Again, I am not going to go there because, frankly, I want this to be a positive debate. There were very clear reasons why the separation was made when it was made by the Borbidge government, but it was not a good move at all. We ended up with duplication. Surely if we have intelligence gathering or we have a number of those organisations and we can share various organisational units, then we get a better outcome.

The Leader of the Opposition made some point in relation to police. The point is that police are seconded over there to do certain work. There are different units. I just make this point: the different units that exist currently in the Crime Commission under the assistant commissioners are designed to overcome the issue raised in relation to police. To be perfectly frank, I do not understand his opposition to this particular clause or to putting them together. It is not just an issue about money. I made that clear. If it was an issue about money then we would be reducing the \$30 million budget. We are not doing that; we are maintaining both budgets. I have indicated that, because we are reducing duplication in the long term, yes, I do expect there to be a saving of money. But that is not the purpose and that is not why we are doing this. The proof of that is in the fact that we have not reduced the budget.

I make this point very clearly: this will enhance the role of the CJC and the Crime Commission. It will be a better outcome. I do not accept the arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not believe that they have any substance or credibility at all.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. D. BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (6.56 p.m.): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Tall Poppies in Flight Education Project

Mr COPELAND (Cunningham—NPA) (6.56 p.m.): Last Thursday I attended the Tall Poppies in Flight Education Project when it visited the Darling Heights State School. This project is one component of the Tall Poppy Campaign, which was established in 1998. It aims to create an environment and culture in Australia that recognises, values and supports achievement in science so that intellectual achievement is as valued by Australians as achievement in sport and artistic endeavours. It is for children in upper primary school levels in all states and territories. It promotes science heroes, both past and present, by touring the tall poppy hot air balloon.

The project comprises four components: an educational resource package about Australia's science heroes, a science competition for students, a supporting teacher professional development program and the tall poppy hot air balloon tour. The content of the educational resource material relates to Australia's proud scientific heritage and educates our community about the life and work of our eminent scientists, both living and past. There is a strong emphasis on presenting schoolchildren with the opportunity to see that science can be fun and a worthwhile and rewarding career and is not just another boring school subject. The hot air balloon plays its part by providing an event on tour that will excite the students. The visit to Darling Heights State School is one of more than 20 to take place around the eastern states over the next two months. It will then visit all of Australia before the end of next year.

Another very important facet of the Tall Poppy Program is to recognise up-and-coming achievers in science around Australia through a Young Tall Poppy Program. These awards have been well received by the research community, government agencies, the biotechnology industries and higher education bodies. Part of the role of these young tall poppies is to go to the schools visited by the tour and address the children, bringing a face to scientific achievements, promoting research and the relevance of studying science and perhaps, most importantly, becoming a role model for the school based program.

One of the eight young tall poppies attending Darling Heights was Dr Alfio Parisi, who is Senior Lecturer at the Centre for Astronomy and Atmospheric Research at the University of Southern Queensland. Alfio is a physicist with a national and international profile in research on solar ultraviolet radiation measurements.

This is a very valuable program that will have a long lasting effect on our young people and will hopefully convince more students to study science. It deserves our support. It is currently funded by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care and the Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs. The Victorian leg is funded by the Victorian Department of Education, Employment and Training. I would urge the current Queensland government to consider the opportunity for us to sponsor the Queensland leg of this very worthwhile program and promote the idea state wide.

Mackay Meals on Wheels Association

Mr MULHERIN (Mackay—ALP) (6.59 p.m.): Recently I had the pleasure of participating in a Meals on Wheels delivery as part of Meals on Wheels Day celebrations. Tonight I will speak about the huge impact that the Mackay Meals on Wheels Association Inc. has on the Mackay community and extend my gratitude to all those involved in the organisation. I accompanied two of the regular volunteers, Shirley Bowyer and Jan Thompson, and I thank these women for showing me the ropes. The experience of delivering meals on wheels has shown me the true value of human contact. It is amazing the difference a visit from some kind people willing to have a friendly chat can make to someone's life, especially if that person is housebound or unwell. This is not to mention the benefits that are received from a tasty, nutritious meal.

The Mackay Meals on Wheels Association delivers approximately 300 meals a day to infirm or elderly residents. Many of the volunteers are also older people, and I am impressed by their compassion and vigour. There are about 300 Mackay Meals on Wheels volunteers involved in both delivery and kitchen duties. There are also two paid staff members, a chef and an office and delivery supervisor. People who receive meals pay a reasonable \$4.50 for the service. I must add that the association caters for vegetarians and people on special diets, such as diabetics. Funds are received from Home and Community Care services, which supplies \$1.40 for each meal. Other funds are received through donations from community groups.

The association secretary, Mrs Joyce Moye, tells me that in the association's 34-year history in Mackay it has never needed to do organised canvassing for donations. She praised organisations like Mackay Sugar that donate annually, as well as service clubs like Rotary that

provide wonderful support. She also extends her admiration to all the association's volunteers, without whom the service would be severely crippled. She said that the volunteers were happy and enthusiastic people, and that was certainly my experience. It is also interesting to note that an equal number of men give of their time to assist the association. Like all non-profit organisations, the problem is finding enough volunteers to fully service community needs. The challenge for this government, especially in this the International Year of the Volunteer, is to foster a spirit of generosity and encourage people to become involved.

The promotion and celebration of volunteering has been very strong this year. Mrs Moye told me that good publicity was generated by a group of community leaders—including myself, Councillor Greg Breckell, Mackay Port Authority CEO Greg Mann, Julie Kimberly of ABC Radio and Mackay Toyota dealer principal John Glanville—taking part in deliveries. She said that the Mackay public answered the call for new volunteers, and I commend residents in my electorate for getting involved in such a worthy cause.

Time expired.

Savannahlander Trip

Ms LEE LONG (Tablelands—ONP) (7.02 p.m.): If one comes to far-north Queensland, a must-do activity would be the train journey on the *Savannahlander* to the outback town of Forsyth, a former goldmining centre south-west of the Atherton Tablelands. The trip of 423 kilometres leaves from Cairns and travels up Kuranda Range and takes in some beautiful scenic views of the Barron River, rainforests and waterfalls. After leaving the picturesque village of Kuranda, the train heads in a southerly direction, where the terrain becomes much drier and rugged. The *Savannahlander* passes through Mareeba, the largest town on the route, once noted for its prosperous tobacco industry. Very little tobacco is grown these days and other crops are now taking its place. The rich fields are watered from the Tinaroo Falls Dam irrigation system. Before the dam was built by the Labor government in 1956, this country was virtually useless.

The train begins to climb over the Great Dividing Range and passes crops such as coffee, mangos, avocados and tea-tree and the township of Mutchilba. The train arrives at Almaden, the small township known as 'Cow Town', in time for lunch. It is called 'Cow Town' because there are no fences to keep the stock from roaming the streets. It is around this section of line that a lot of maintenance is being done. White ants are rampant in this area and are known to be seen clapping their hands with glee when the thousands of new wooden sleepers arrive to be replaced. At Almaden, once renowned for its country race meeting, one can choose to join a bus to Chillagoe to take in the various attractions on offer, such as the famous limestone caves, old smelters and the museum, among other things. There is an overnight stay and the next day the train journey continues west to Mount Surprise, a gem-fossicking town which is on the edge of the massive Undarra volcanic lava field. The trip then moves on to Einasleigh and the impressive Copperfield gorge, where the population of 25 increases to about 500 each Easter when it holds its annual race meeting. After billy tea and scones, the train journey continues to Forsyth and then people can either choose to return the same way or continue on by bus to the Undarra caves.

Kuralboo Creek Bridge

Mrs REILLY (Mudgeeraba—ALP) (7.04 p.m.): The Department of Main Roads is currently undertaking an environmental impact study and consulting with local residents and interest groups in an attempt to find the safest and most environmentally sound option for rehabilitating the crossing of the Kuralboo Creek bridge on Springbrook Road. In short, the government is seeking the best solution for all concerned. A proposed culvert option, work on which was due to commence soon, raised the concerns of environmental groups and many residents and uncovered a raft of conflicting opinions regarding the benefits of a culvert versus a bridge. Therefore, the project was postponed while further investigations, study and consultation was carried out, and this is currently under way. This is the process of good, responsive government. This is what happens and what should happen when government listens to the community and when constituents make representations to their local member, as was the case.

I have insisted that safety be the paramount consideration of this study and that any work required to protect the bridge from possible flooding during the upcoming rainy season is carried out, and I have assurances that that will be the case. But ultimately a long-term solution—the right solution—is needed to repair this bridge crossing and to rehabilitate the creek if we are not to

see further flooding, further expenditure and further repairs in the future. In fact, I look forward during this consultation period to working with my local councillor, Councillor Ted Shepard, who has taken a deep and personal interest in this project despite it clearly being a state government matter. So concerned is he in fact that he took the federal member for McPherson, Margaret May, to Springbrook to show her the bridge, I can only imagine to garner her support.

I hope that he took the opportunity to ask the federal member for the funding which this regional community rightly deserves, because I want to know: where is the commitment from the federal government for this project, the rehabilitation of a creek which supports a World Heritage listed national park? Where is the federal government's promised support for regional Queensland when it comes to Springbrook Mountain? Why should Springbrook Mountain miss out on federal government support just because it is in the Gold Coast hinterland and not the back of Bourke? The truth is that Springbrook Mountain has missed out and has been neglected by a federal government and a Liberal federal member who is big on promises but cannot deliver. She is short on delivery, does not deliver for the Gold Coast and certainly does not deliver for the Gold Coast hinterland.

Centenary of Federation Celebrations

Mr SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—NPA) (7.07 p.m.): October was Centenary of Federation month for the Darling Downs. I was very privileged to be able to attend a number of Federation events in the eastern part of my electorate. Tonight I take the opportunity to elucidate on a couple of those for the benefit of members of parliament. I had the opportunity last Friday to attend the famous egg throwing re-enactment at the historic railway station in Warwick. For those honourable members who do not know, I state that in 1917 then Prime Minister Billy Hughes came through Warwick on his way south to Wallangarra and then further south to try to garner support for the second conscription referendum. At that time he met with some degree of resistance, and that resistance happened at the Warwick Railway Station.

I commend all those people who were involved in this very authentic, historic re-enactment, including those from the Little Theatre, the Southern Downs Steam Rail Association and the Warwick Shire Council. At the event there was also representation from the Federal Police because, as honourable members may be aware, it was during this historic event that a local constable and other police would not move to arrest the perpetrator who threw the egg that caused Billy Hughes to go out of his tree and subsequently led to the formation of the Commonwealth police. Of course, that was a precursor to the current Federal Police. We also had the opportunity to re-enact the historic Federation speech by Sir Henry Parkes at Wallangarra. The Premier was there. I commend all of those involved in making that event so authentic, including the Stanthorpe Shire Council, the Border Highlands Rail Co. and the economic development officer from the Stanthorpe shire, Tom Noble, who has done an absolutely wonderful job in garnering significant funds from the state and federal governments to develop that historic and significant railway station. It has come up an absolute treat and will now be developed into an entire precinct. It is an example of money well invested and money that will generate a real return.

Queensland Rail has also been extraordinarily helpful. It has helped to re-sleeper that line. Hopefully there will be at least some semi-regular tourist trains travelling that line. A federation steam train was there for a couple of days. It took people to various functions at the Wallangarra Railway Station. Also, I had the great privilege of travelling on it with the Premier and other dignitaries, including the Chief Justice, to attend the re-enactment.

It was an absolutely fantastic day topped off by a flyover, which happened absolutely to precision at the end of the national anthem, as the flag had just been hoisted up the flagpole. When the flag had reached the top, a RAAF F-111 flew past. It was a magnificent day and it was great to see the number of locals who turned out to celebrate Federation at a most significant place such as the break of gauge railway line.

Time expired.

Celebrating the Whitsundays

Ms JARRATT (Whitsunday—ALP) (7.10 p.m.): On Saturday, 27 October local residents of the Proserpine-Whitsunday area had cause to agree that life is indeed a beach. On this day an estimated 2,000 local residents were shipped, boated and ferried from the mainland and nearby

islands to the magnificent Whitehaven Beach on Whitsunday Island for a day of community celebrations and festivities. The event, known as 'Celebrating the Whitsundays', was the first major event in the region's Centenary of Federation celebrations and marked the beginning of the Whitsunday Reef Festival 2001.

Planning for this unique beach party began many months ago as a project funded by the state government to the tune of \$25,000. The event was initiated by the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service at Airlie Beach, under the resourceful leadership of Artie Jacobson and his able assistant Melissa McMahon. I was amazed and delighted at the way local businesspeople came to the fore, donating time for the planning process as well as offering services in order that the event could be a truly memorable occasion. I was in attendance at the first planning meeting and, while there was no shortage of creative suggestions for ways to entertain the masses on the day, it soon became apparent that the major task for the planning committee would lie in coordinating the plethora of subtasks in order to make the vision a reality.

I sincerely congratulate those individuals representing local business, industry, community and volunteer groups who stepped forward to coordinate the variety of subcommittees necessary to bring the event to fruition. I am very proud of the efforts of this community, which has made possible the movement of over 2,000 people to Whitehaven Beach.

To Whitsunday Transit, who bussed people to Abel Point and Shute Harbour, I say: what a great effort. To the many boat owners and operators, including Fantasea Cruises, Prosail, Oz Sail, Club Atlantic Classic Cruisers, Sail Away Whitsunday Cruisers, Southern Cross Sailing Adventures, Derwent Hunter Charters and Flying Cloud, who comprised the fleet that transported over 1,200 people across the water, I say: well done. To the barge owners and operators who provided transport for performers and volunteers as well as the huge volume of infrastructure required, I say: congratulations. To Hamilton Island and Castlemaine Perkins, which catered to our culinary needs, I say: it was the greatest barbecue ever. To the Whitsunday Shire Council, which assisted with provision of waste management facilities, I say: well done. To the Gudjeda Reference Group and Girra Dala Council of Elders, which provided advice and a welcome on behalf of traditional owners, I say: thank you. To the Didjada Mogarah Mitha Barma and Cultural Encounters dance troupes: thank you for providing such a fine example of indigenous and traditional culture. To Tourism Whitsunday and local schools, police and ambulance groups I say: your efforts were appreciated.

Most of all, I want to say a collective thank you to the host of volunteers, including Volunteer Marine Rescue and Whitsunday Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service volunteers, who donated their time and energy to ensure the safety and comfort of so many people. Celebrating the Whitsundays on Whitehaven Beach was a remarkable event, but it was only the first of a great many Centenary of Federation activities that will be enjoyed by the Whitsunday community over the month to come.

Subcontractors

Mrs SHELDON (Caloundra—Lib) (7.13 p.m.): Tonight I wish to raise in the House an issue of considerable concern in my electorate and on the Sunshine Coast. On Friday, 5 October a major building company, ImaMaster Constructions, fell over. Because of that, a large number of subcontractors have been very adversely affected.

I refer to a letter I received which highlights a very typical example of the problems faced by the contractors themselves. This letter is from the owner of Applikote. He is a painter of some note, vice-president of the Master Painters Association and a board member of the Building Industry Group Apprenticeship Scheme. He is well informed on the correct procedures for business management and he runs his business very well. His name is Rod Crossley. I know that he has written this letter to the Premier, but he also sent me a copy. In it he says that his life work since he took over from his father in 1976 has been this business. He is an employer of 15 dedicated, mostly long-term employees—up to 21 years. As I said, he really is an established businessperson. He currently has three apprentices and has trained over 20.

When ImaMaster fell over, it owed Applikote \$90,000. Overall, it owed subcontractors across the board well in excess of \$3 million. Mr Crossley says that he feels this is going to tip him over the edge. He has put up his own personal security and it now looks as though his wife and children will be without a home. His letter states—

My employees have their entitlements protected in accordance with the EBA we have with the CFMEU.

He raises a very valid point when he says—

When fire wipes out communities governments step in to help. The same applies with drought and flood.

I am not saying that that should not happen—I guess he is not, either—but very viable businesspeople and subcontractors who employ and create jobs out there in the community are left to fall over through no fault of their own.

I know that this is a very difficult issue. I am not making this issue into any form of political attack. I know of the problems that subcontractors have and I know of the difficulty in trying to sort them out. I am trying to work through a process at the moment. One thing Mr Crossley and a number of other people have raised is the possibility of a government loan for a term of, say, 10 years with no interest to be paid. I did write to the minister about this issue. To his credit, he responded to me very quickly. He said that the matter I have raised is being investigated and that he will reply to me once that investigation is completed. I think we do need to help these people and look at the issues affecting them.

Time expired.

Mrs E. D. Roderick

Mr McNAMARA (Hervey Bay—ALP) (7.17 p.m.): It is with deep sorrow that I rise tonight to inform the House of the recent death of one of Hervey Bay's leading citizens, Mrs Darda Roderick, on 24 September 2001. Elvina Dardanelle Roderick, known to one and all as Darda, was born in a house on the banks of the Burrum River on 5 March 1916. She was a lifelong resident of the region and her sudden death is a source of great sadness to all who knew her.

Darda was born to Oscar and Sarah Ross and, having lived all her life in the Burrum district, had come to personify that district. She married Allan Roderick and together they had two sons, Brad and Ross, who are themselves extremely well known throughout the area. Regrettably, Darda lost Allan in 1986. Allan Roderick had been a councillor on the Burrum, Woocoo and Hervey Bay city councils for a period of 18 years, and the family commitment to the community was fundamental, enormous and continuing.

Darda herself was very closely involved with the coalmining industry and the union movement. She worked with the coalminers union, particularly through the 1960s. She was closely associated with some significant industrial action, including one particularly lengthy action in relation to seeking sick leave for coalminers, which was eventually successful.

Anyone who knew her will tell you that Darda did not generally lose a fight. She was a leader and campaigner in her community, and many organisations around the Burrum owe their existence to her. She started the Howard State School parents and citizens committee, was a foundation member of the Burrum District Respite Centre and was trustee of the successful Burrum Sports and Recreation Centre at Torbanlea.

I had the privilege of working with Darda in relation to legal requirements for the development of a 30-person aged care unit in Howard. However, you never really worked with Darda as much as for Darda. Darda would arrive at my old law firm, look me squarely in the eye and say, 'Now, we have a bit of a problem with these units. Let's fix it.' And fix it you did. Darda never took no for an answer and, whether it was the Premier, the mayor or anyone else, what Darda wanted Darda got.

Darda was a member of the Howard Progress Association for 23 years and was also patron of the Burrum Golf Club. She delivered Meals on Wheels at Howard and Torbanlea and was a member of the Country Women's Association there. She assisted in the application for the Burrum Community Hall. She was honoured publicly for her efforts by being named Hervey Bay citizen of the year in January 1997; however, she never sought public recognition, only community achievement. I recall speaking to her at the time of her being honoured as Hervey Bay citizen of the year and she was totally unphased by it, using the opportunity only to lobby me about the next project that she had on the go.

Darda lived her life as an advocate on behalf of the battler and never forgot where she came from. It was an honour to have known her, and the loss of her drive and enthusiasm is keenly felt, particularly in the Burrum. Apart from her two children, she has five grandchildren and two great grandchildren. On behalf of the parliament of Queensland and the electorate of Hervey Bay I offer my deepest sympathies to her family for the loss of their beloved Darda.

International Year of the Volunteer

Mr MALONE (Mirani—NPA) (7.20 p.m.): In this the 2001 International Year of the Volunteer, I am proud to say that the Mirani electorate was able to recognise a total of 43 volunteers with certificates of appreciation and a badge to mark this very special occasion. Of those 43 very special people, 20 were also awarded the 2001 International Year of the Volunteer medal.

This year in particular it is especially important to recognise the role of the volunteers in our community. There are in Queensland some 85,000 volunteers. And I am pleased to say that in the electorate of Mirani we have great representation amongst these very special people. In an age of hard-nosed economic rationalism when individuals are encouraged to see themselves as their own chief executive officer and price themselves accordingly, we have to ask the obvious question: why would anyone with marketable skills give them away for free? Voluntary service to the broader community is a hallmark of a civilised society, with volunteers the third social pillar alongside government and corporate structures. Volunteering provides scope to work in the management and administration areas but in a more relaxed environment than paid work. Dedication to volunteering was once a way of life, slotted between family and professional commitments in a world that seemed to have far more time in which to do things.

Economic rationalists demand that everyone has to be paid for everything they do, and the need for families to have two incomes is the very reason that there is a reduction in the number of younger volunteers. A large number of our older people who have left paid work bring with them an incredible work ethic and culture, laid down when people worked differently. It is good for young people to see them doing that. It is important to do something within our community that will benefit the community and is also a fulfilling thing to do. It is also part of being a good citizen. Proudly, in the Mirani electorate we are able to rejoice in the achievements of our volunteers, applaud and promote the participation of volunteers and recognise their very outstanding efforts.

Nominees in my electorate came from a diverse area—from Marlborough in the south, Stanage Bay near the Shoalwater Bay Army training centre, St Lawrence, Clairview, Nebo, Sarina, Louisa Creek, Homebush, Bakers Creek and the northern suburbs of Mackay, Walkerston, Marian, Mirani, Pinnacle and Finch Hatton. I would like to name the 20 recipients: Dino Brondello from Walkerston; George Denton from Sarina; Kevin Elliott from St Lawrence; Maree Fisher from Clairview; Peter Griffin from Homebush; Rob Hardwick from Sarina; Alma Hindle from Carmila; Betty Hobbs from Louisa Creek; Nicole Hughes from Sarina; Mel Lowth from Finch Hatton; Olive Prout from Pinnacle; Peter Ribaldone from Walkerston; Bernadette Rewald from Marian; Mick Shew from Marian; Jeanette Whitehead from Nebo; the Marlborough Agricultural Show Society; Sarina Surf Life Saving at Sarina; the QF24 Thirsty Sound Coastguard from Stanage Bay; the Scope Club of Sarina; and the Sarina Tourist, Art and Craft Centre.

Time expired.

Reclaim the Night Rally, Townsville

Ms PHILLIPS (Thuringowa—ALP) (7.23 p.m.): Last Friday night I was privileged to be invited to join a group of passionate, committed and, most importantly, articulate women at Townsville's Reclaim the Night Rally and march. In more than 30 years as a social worker, I became well acquainted with women's determination and capacity for survival but I often regretted our comparative lack of voice. I am thrilled to say that last Friday evening Townsville-Thuringowa women spoke out courageously.

Honourable members would be aware that the idea of being able to walk the streets in safety has been the aim of Reclaim the Night since its inception more than 20 years ago. And while this goal is still as important today as it ever has been, there is now a growing awareness and concern that violence to women is more likely perpetrated in their homes or somewhere that they should feel safe. An alarming number of studies have proven, for example, that most rape victims are attacked by someone they know. Rape and violence are always abhorrent, but when they are accompanied by the violation of a bond of trust and perpetrated in an environment that should guarantee safety, they become unthinkable. But many victims never report the crime. They fear that they will not be believed, and they have concern for the rest of their family. These serve as a virtual gag, depriving them of their voice. Surveys show that a significant majority of people still feel that women are likely to make false claims.

During the rally we heard from courageous women who told their stories of being victims of violence. No matter how well we feel we know and understand, until we hear these personal experiences we cannot begin to know the extent of the violence. I felt humbled to be part of the

group, and I was also honoured to stand there as a member of a state government that I believe is trying to address some of these problems. Last week the Office of Women released its annual action plan for women 2001-02 outlining a range of strategies, many aimed at freedom from violence and better access to justice for women.

I am also proud that we have a coordinated whole-of-government approach. The Department of Families is dealing with child protection issues, and the minister has just announced that a forum will be held in Townsville later this month on eroding the causes of indigenous family violence. Queensland Health has developed a Sexual Assault Support and Prevention Program, and the Queensland Police Service is committed to the young women's safety project. Coincidentally, straight after the rally on Friday night I accompanied Inspector Richardson from the Kirwan Police Station on his rounds. His invitation to do so is an indication of that service's local commitment to this enlightened approach.

I wish to congratulate the young women, volunteers and staff from the north Queensland combined women's services who arranged the rally and the courageous women who were prepared to tell their stories. I hope it becomes part of their healing. For all such women throughout our community, healing means confronting those entrenched truths that many people would rather not hear. It means speaking out on behalf of other women, rejecting stereotypes and blame and educating our families and friends to do the same. It means more of last Friday night every day.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 7.27 p.m.