PROOF ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

Subject **FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT** Page

Thursday, 25 March 2010

J MICKEL
SPEAKER

N J LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

L J OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

THURSDAY, 25 MARCH 2010

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. John Mickel, Logan) read prayers and took the chair.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Parliament House Conservation Plan

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, as members are aware, 2010 is the 150th anniversary of the Queensland parliament. In a few short years we will also celebrate the 150th anniversary of this building. In December 2008, it was approved that a Parliament House conservation plan be developed as part of a wider strategic review of the parliamentary buildings and precinct. The objective of the review was to establish a strategic framework to govern the management of the buildings that would encapsulate building planning, management, maintenance and investment.

One of the documents that has resulted is the Parliament House Conservation Plan. This document is aimed at ensuring the preservation of the significant, historical building. It is an impressive document, revealing detailed historical research and a firm grasp of the current practical usages of the building.

Members will shortly receive an official invitation to the launch of the plan, to be held in the Legislative Council chamber, next sitting Wednesday, 14 April at 4 pm. I trust that members will be able to join me for the launch and mark another milestone in this important celebratory year for the parliament. Honourable members, we must not only celebrate our history but preserve it where we can.

Earth Hour

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I want to advise all of you that Saturday night the parliament will be participating in Earth Hour.

Pyke, Mr P; Actions by Former Member

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, in my absence, it was reported to the Deputy Speaker on Tuesday, 9 March 2010 that during a protest rally outside Parliament House a former member of this House, Mr Peter Pyke, was present on the porte-cochere balcony and held up a large placard in support of the protest rally. The former member has been written to and afforded an opportunity to address this allegation. No reply has yet been received. The former member's actions may constitute a breach of privilege or a contempt of parliament and certainly a breach of trust as a security card holder. If I do not receive an adequate reply, I will revoke the former member's privileges as regards access to the precinct until I or a future Speaker decide to rescind the order.

Standing Orders Committee, Referral

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, yesterday an issue arose in the House regarding the use of a smart phone as a medium to carry documents during question time. I was urged to refer this matter to the Standing Orders Committee which I have decided to do. I have also decided to put before the committee a number of other issues including: the use of computers and other communication devices in the chamber; the matter regarding petitions being able to be directly tabled by the Clerk without a sponsoring member, previously raised with me by the member for Maroochydore and advised to the House; dress standards in the chamber; the current time available for second reading speeches, the length of second reading speeches and opportunities for members to speak about matters affecting their electorates; the requirement for seconders to motions; and the deregulation of aspects of question time and the consideration by the committee of supplementary questions. If members have any other matters that they wish me to put before the committee, I would urge them to write to me as soon as possible.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister, Referral to Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I refer to the matters of privilege raised by the members for Mudgeeraba and Kawana in the Legislative Assembly on 25 February 2010. I have also received correspondence from the members regarding the matter.

The members essentially allege that the Minister for Tourism and Fair Trading deliberately misled the House in his answer to a question without notice on 25 February 2010. The minister in his answer to the question made serious allegations that the members interfered, in a partisan way, in the process for congratulatory letters to constituents.

Recent amendments to standing order 269(5) allow that, in relation to the procedures for raising and considering complaints, the Speaker may request information from the member the subject of the complaint. Accordingly, in my absence, the Deputy Speaker sought further information from the minister regarding the complaints by the members, seeking a submission from the minister, which was duly received.

I also note that on 9 March 2010 the minister rose on a matter of privilege and made an apology in respect of the allegations he had raised on 25 February. The apology was largely directed towards the constituents. The minister stated that in respect of the member for Kawana he had been relying on advice that was incorrect and that there was therefore a misunderstanding.

There are three elements to be established where it is alleged that a member has committed the contempt of deliberately misleading the House. Firstly, the statement must have been misleading. Secondly, it must be established that the member making the statement knew at the time the statement was made that it was incorrect. Thirdly, it must be established that, in making the statement, the member intended to mislead the House.

In this case there were serious allegations made against two members. Both members vigorously denied all of the allegations. In the House, and in his submission to me, the minister has admitted a mistake as regards one allegation against the member for Kawana. This mistake was, according to the minister, because of incorrect information provided to the minister.

While cognisant that the minister in his submission to me states that his apology in the House on 9 March included both members, there remains sufficient lack of clarity around the basis for the allegations raised by the minister which gives rise to an unsatisfactory air and considerable confusion hanging over this matter.

I cannot from the information before me determine the veracity of what has been claimed and continues to be claimed, and where the truth lays. For this reason, I am of the opinion that this matter should be referred to the Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee for consideration.

PETITIONS

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

Bribie Island, Desalination Plant

Mr Ryan, from 44 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that Bribie Island is removed permanently from the list of potential desalination plant sites in Queensland [1954].

Taxi Industry

Mr Wellington, from 138 petitioners, requesting the House to pass legislation which prevents any taxi dispatch company from restricting any legitimate holder of a Queensland Transport issued authority to drive a taxi from accessing any taxi company's dispatch system, without the permission of Queensland Transport [1955].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPER

MEMBER'S PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following member's paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Cook (Mr O'Brien)—

1956 Non-conforming petition from 119 petitioners requesting that the delivery of health services in Wujal Wujal and surrounding communities remain with the Wujal Wujal Clinic and that any other services dedicated to closing the gap for Indigenous health be provided as additional support to the clinic (as part of Queensland Health)

MINISTERIAL PAPER

Queensland Theatre Co.

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.38 am): I lay upon the table of the House the annual report of the Queensland Theatre Co. for 2009.

Tabled paper: Queensland Theatre Company—Annual Report 2009 [1957].

In 2009, more than 114,000 people saw a Queensland Theatre Co. production at one of 433 performances in 54 venues right across Queensland. The QTC brought its brand of quality and inspiring theatre to small venues in Central and Western Queensland and to schools, libraries and Indigenous knowledge centres in Far North Queensland. In Brisbane, the QTC presented 254 performances in its main stage season of nine productions.

Significantly, QTC focuses much of its work on strengthening community development with a focus on regions, young people, and education and artistic development. During 2009, the QTC was the force behind 383 school workshops in regional Queensland and in Brisbane, 17 professional development workshops for teachers, a young playwrights program for three gifted young writers and 36 education performances. The QTC is also one of the major employers in the theatre sector. In 2009, QTC provided 443 employment opportunities, with 401 going to Queenslanders.

QTC also maintained its profile as a theatre of national stature, participating in a groundbreaking Australia Council study on the social benefits that not-for-profit organisations provide to their communities. QTC has also been supported in its aims by a loyal band of corporate sponsors who recognise the value and quality of QTC's work. I commend these sponsors who choose to support the arts in our state.

I would like this morning to also take the opportunity to acknowledge the contribution made by the long-term artistic director of the Queensland Theatre Co., Michael Gow, who leaves the company later this year. For those who have had the opportunity to meet with or in any way work with Michael Gow, they know that Michael's commitment to Queensland's artists has meant that our state's finest actors, directors, designers and technical leaders could find employment here in their home state.

Ms Boyle: And to regional Queensland, too.

Ms BLIGH: I am getting there, but I take the interjection from the member for Cairns. For 11 years, the leadership of Michael Gow has enriched the cultural life of Brisbane and Queensland. He has a deep passion for the theatre that inspires all who work with him and, further, he has a deep commitment to regional Queensland, ensuring that the Queensland Theatre Co. truly is a state-wide company. So I thank him for his contribution to arts and culture in the role he has played at QTC. I understand one of the reasons he has resolved not to seek a renewal of his contract is that he wants to spend time writing. Michael is a gifted playwright and I look forward to seeing the next phase of his working life develop prosperously. I am sure we will see some of the benefits of that here in Queensland as well.

We can be proud of the great work that is being undertaken by our state theatre company in 2009. With this foundation in place, I look forward to the company's ongoing success in the future.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

LNG Industry

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.41 am): At 5 pm yesterday history was made—history for this state's workforce, history for this state's economy and its regions, history for our resources sector, and history for Queensland's significant role as a global player in the evolution of a brand-new and exciting energy industry. Last night—

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Callide will cease interjecting.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr Lucas interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Callide and the Deputy Premier will cease interjecting.

Ms BLIGH: Last night in Beijing the BG Group signed a deal with the China National Offshore Oil Corporation to export 72 million tonnes—

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Please resume your seat, Premier. If there was a complaint or an allegation being made by the Premier against an opposition member, I could understand the outrage. At the moment, all I am hearing—or trying to hear—is a ministerial statement. So I would ask those on my left to desist from interjecting and I would ask those on my right who are not supporting the Premier to desist as well. I call the honourable the Premier.

Ms BLIGH: In Beijing last night, the BG Group signed a deal with the China National Offshore Oil Corporation to export 72 million tonnes of coal seam liquefied natural gas from the Surat Basin over the next 20 years. That is two decades of prosperity for Queensland. It will mean that Queensland has an export resource to rival the North West Shelf in Western Australia. It will mean at its peak 8,500 jobs for Queenslanders and $60 billion in exports over the next 20 years. It will mean revenue into both state and federal budgets, with some $200 million a year expected in return royalties for Queensland taxpayers and more in corporation tax. It also means that the Surat Basin, along with Gladstone, Chinchilla, Miles, Toowoomba and the rest of this region, will be front and centre of a new mining frontier.

It will also mean that this industry—and the coal seam methane industry was only an idea a decade ago; and only three years ago people had no idea what liquefied natural gas was or what it could mean for Queensland—has undergone an extraordinary evolution to become one of Queensland's most prosperous and promising resource sectors. That is history in the making and as one commentator described this morning it represents a seismic shift in the Queensland economy.

Over the next three years in the lead-up to the first planned exports in 2014, QGC has undertaken to spend $10 billion on a massive infrastructure program in the region. That will include a significant coal seam gas development in the Surat Basin, a 540-kilometre pipeline network linking the gas fields near Chinchilla to Gladstone and an LNG plant on Curtis Island near Gladstone initially comprising two processing units known as trains. That is a lot of boilermakers, it is a lot of welders, it is a lot of jobs for fitters and turners and plant operators who are expected to flood the region.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Those from both sides will cease interjecting.

Ms BLIGH: This is a great day for Queensland. It should be celebrated across the political divide.

Additionally, once the plant is operational, we expect a further 1,000 people to be employed on this project alone. Environmental impact statements for this project have been lodged with both our government and the federal government for final approval, and that is expected to be finalised by the middle of this year. This project would not have got to this stage without the active involvement of our government in accelerating the industry.

Mr Seeney: Take the credit for other people's work. You have done nothing.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will now warn the member for Callide under standing order 253A. I have been very tolerant this morning. I have been waiting for some complaint from the Premier about you. It has not been there. This is a ministerial statement and, therefore, I would ask that you respect it in the knowledge that it is a ministerial statement.

Ms BLIGH: I am pleased to have an uninterrupted opportunity to outline to the House what exactly our government has been doing to bring this industry to fruition. We have been actively working to establish this industry. It was one of our election commitments, and we have met the election commitment by putting in place a $30 million LNG superhighway, working with companies like British Gas, Origin, Shell and Santos to make that pipeline superhighway into Gladstone a reality. That is why we declared a state development area on Curtis Island—a dedicated part of this island as a specialised state development area for LNG—to not only accelerate the planning and delivery of an LNG industry but also set aside 75 per cent of the rest of the island as an environmental precinct.

That is why we put in place a strategic 30-year Western Basin Master Plan. It is why we established an LNG industry unit in government as a one-stop shop for industry proponents so they can move their approval processes quickly, and it is why we established an LNG subcommittee of cabinet so we can give the industry the consideration it deserves at the highest level. It is why we released a blueprint for Queensland's LNG industry which gives the industry certainty about royalties and environmental requirements into the long term so they can make investment decisions.

It is why I went into the Surat Basin last week and in Chinchilla announced $25 million of infrastructure into that region, including the upgrade of the infrastructure at the Roma Airport so that this industry can have an airport capable of taking what it needs in and out. It is why that $25 million also included the upgrades of three schools in the area, including two that will be dedicated as energy

industry schools. It is why we recently signed a partnership with the minerals academy so that schools in the Surat Basin are now partners in it. It is why that $25 million included road upgrades in the Surat region. It is also why we launched the $10 million LNG Industry Skills Fund to make sure we have the skilled workers we need to deliver. For all of those reasons, this industry is now being born.

As I said earlier, just a decade ago this industry did not exist, but our government saw the potential and we are making it happen. It is an indication of just how quickly this industry is growing that this one company just two years ago had three employees in this state. Two years ago it had three employees. That is when we were sitting down with the company for the first time. Today there are 700 workers employed by this company. We are now front and centre and are a global player in this rapidly emerging sector in the energy industry.

In addition to the massive undertaking announced last night, there are several other LNG projects on the drawing board at this moment. That will mean even more jobs, even more investment and even more economic benefit for Queensland and for Queenslanders. I table a letter from Catherine Tanna, the Executive Vice-President of the BG Group, which confirms the signing of this agreement in China yesterday afternoon and this company's commitment to the industry. It also congratulates and thanks the Queensland government for the role that we have been playing with the industry.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 24 March 2010, from Catherine Tanna, Executive Vice-President, BG Group to Premier Bligh relating to the LNG contract with China National Offshore Oil Corporation. [1958]

Full credit to this company. This company has done the hard yards. It is this company's determination to be a player here that has made this happen, but we have been standing beside this company every step of the way and we intend to keep doing so.

SEQ Futures; People's Question Time

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.50 am): During the last sitting of parliament I announced a new interactive tool that will allow Queenslanders to glimpse the future of this state under different growth scenarios. The 'SEQ Futures' application on the growth management website allows Queenslanders to nominate their own priorities for future growth. The program lets people tell us what they value most about the region such as environmental protection or quiet neighbourhoods. The program then uses this information to offer the user a snapshot of what that future would look like depending on the choices they have made.

Today I can report to the House that more than 1,000 people have used the tool since it was launched two weeks ago. That level of interest shows just what an important issue growth management is for Queenslanders. The ranking of the community's priorities on this issue has thrown up some interesting results. The top five ranking of priorities so far has good public transport as the No. 1 priority for people in the south-east region. That means that those Queenslanders who used the online tool nominated good public transport as their No. 1 priority to better manage growth. They placed environmental protection at No. 2, and vibrant city and town centres at No. 3. Jobs close to home came in at No. 4, and walkable local centres are currently the No. 5 priority for users to date. Large houses came last on the list of priorities at No. 15. As the Queensland Growth Management Summit of 30 and 31 March approaches, I encourage more people to use the website and to use the 'SEQ Futures' application.

I would also like to take this opportunity to report back to the House on the success of yesterday's people's question time at QUT. These forums give people right around Queensland the opportunity to have their say on important topics affecting the state. Yesterday's topic was the challenges and opportunities of growth, and I received questions from Mount Isa and Kingaroy to the Gold Coast and Ipswich. In total, 164 questions were submitted and the live webcast was viewed a total of 1,115 times. That means there were 1,115 logins to watch the stream. I think that shows the high level of interest in the debate that is occurring in the general community about these issues.

Some of the questions I was asked were about how we can fund the infrastructure we need to support population growth and how we can keep housing affordable. These are all legitimate questions, and they are the sorts of issues we need to be talking about as the growth summit approaches. Between us, the panel and I were able to respond to 18 of the questions during the hour. I thank those people who participated, and I thank the members of the panel.

Population Growth; Cross River Rail

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.53 am): As I have just outlined, the early results of the 'SEQ Futures' tool show that good public transport is a No. 1 priority for Queenslanders. Our government recognises that a world-class public transport system is essential if we are to manage the population growth that we are seeing in South-East Queensland. We are investing $7 billion in new infrastructure this year to improve public transport and reduce congestion on our roads.

Before Labor was elected, there was not a single kilometre of busway in South-East Queensland. Today there are more than 24 kilometres of busway including the $366 million favourite of the member for Mansfield, the Eastern Busway, and the $198 million Northern Busway. Work is currently underway on the next stage of the Northern Busway, which will take it from Windsor to Kedron, and on the Eastern Busway from the South East Busway at Buranda to Main Avenue at Coorparoo. But we are not resting on our laurels. We are working to deliver more infrastructure for the people of this city.

Yesterday the Cross River Rail project was declared a project of state significance and detailed on-site surveys for the project began. I also released the Cross River Rail study corridor, which outlines for the first time the final route the project will take. Cross River Rail will double the number of rail lines in the CBD from four to eight tracks. It will not just service the CBD. While the project has been built within the city centre, it will facilitate a transformation in the way rail services operate right across the South-East Queensland network—from the Gold Coast right through to the Sunshine Coast and all of the suburban networks in between. It means that we can use existing rail infrastructure better and contemplate new higher capacity trains. It will mean that we can revolutionise passenger rail by reconfiguring the network to allow us to run new inner-suburban, high-frequency services. It will also allow us to introduce new outer suburban express services to slash travel times for commuters.

The project will give us the capacity to increase the frequency of intercity services between Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast, between Brisbane and the Gold Coast, and between the Sunshine and Gold coasts. It will introduce additional freight capacity between Salisbury and the Port of Brisbane, allowing more freight to be carried on rail, helping to keep trucks off suburban streets. It is not an exaggeration to say that this project can revolutionise public transport in SEQ. The public are telling us that what they want is good public transport and that it is a key tool for better growth management. This government is responding and delivering.

Epilepsy

Hon. PT LUCAS (Lytton—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health) (9.56 am): Tomorrow, 26 March, is World Purple Day, a worldwide day dedicated to increasing awareness about epilepsy. About one in 50 people live with epilepsy. Epilepsy can manifest itself in many different ways and there are many different types—

Mr Messenger interjected.

Mr LUCAS: Epilepsy can manifest itself in many different ways and there are many different types of epilepsy. Whilst for a long time—

Mr Messenger interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Burnett will cease interjecting.

Mr LUCAS: Whilst for a long time epilepsy was a disorder mostly associated with young people—

Mr Messenger interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member for Burnett to cease interjecting. Let me make this statement. If the member for Burnett was being maligned in a ministerial statement by the Deputy Premier, I could understand the interjection. At the moment I am listening and I cannot hear where the member is being maligned. I therefore call the Minister for Health.

Mr LUCAS: Whilst for a long time epilepsy was a disorder mostly associated with young people, according to Epilepsy Australia those aged over 55 are being increasingly identified as vulnerable.

Mr Messenger interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member under standing order 253A, and I will take action if there is another interjection. I call the honourable Minister for Health.

Mr LUCAS: Mr Speaker, I am not going to—

Mr Messenger interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Burnett to withdraw from the chamber until 10.30 this morning—until the start of question time.

Mr Messenger: If you spent half as much time caring for patients as you do on your hair colour, you would have a better health system.

Interruption.

NAMING OF MEMBER

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I regard that as a contempt of the parliament. I therefore name the member for Burnett.

Whereupon the honourable member for Burnett withdrew from the chamber at 9.58 am.

MOTION

Suspension of Member for Burnett

Hon. JC SPENCE (Sunnybank—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.58 am): I move—

That the member for Burnett be suspended from the services of the House for one week.

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

AYES, 48—Attwood, Bligh, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Cunningham, Dick, Farmer, Finn, Foley, Fraser, Grace, Hinchliffe, Hoolihan, Jarratt, Johnstone, Jones, Kilburn, Lawlor, Lucas, Male, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nolan, O'Brien, O'Neill, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Reeves, Roberts, Robertson, Ryan, Schwarten, Scott, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Watt, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Keech, Kiernan

NOES, 33—Bates, Bleijie, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Langbroek, McArdle, McLindon, Malone, Menkens, Nicholls, Powell, Pratt, Robinson, Seeney, Simpson, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Wellington. Tellers: Horan, Sorensen

Resolved in the affirmative.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Epilepsy

Resumed from p. 1142.

Mr LUCAS: Whilst for a long time epilepsy was a disorder mostly associated with young people, according to Epilepsy Australia those aged over 55 are being increasingly identified as vulnerable. Whilst there may be a number of causes of epilepsy, Epilepsy Australia estimates that in around 50 per cent of cases the cause is unknown. Seizures can be severe or mild, regular, episodic or rare.

In a nutshell, despite the inroads modern medicine has made in many areas of health, there is still a lot about epilepsy we do not know. It does not discriminate in terms of age, gender or race. Whether it be epilepsy or other medical conditions, if one made a list of world leaders, authors, actors, scholars and sportspeople, there would be very few, if indeed any, who did not have, at some stage during their lives, a medical condition of one sort or another. Indeed, one of my favourite lecturers at university, ironically a Liberal, had quite a severe physical disability and yet was an inspirational lecturer.

I was invited by Dr Karin Borges from the University of Queensland's School of Biomedical Science to attend its Purple Day celebrations today. Patron of Epilepsy Queensland Wally Lewis will be signing his book, *Out of the Shadows,* that details his 20-year struggle with epilepsy with all funds to go to Epilepsy Queensland. Wally has well and truly earned his title as 'The King'. His accomplishments, both as a player and an ambassador for rugby league and sport in general, and now as a patron of Epilepsy Queensland, have made him a much respected man. Unfortunately, this is happening now, but in the House today I would like to acknowledge Dr Borges for her fundraising efforts.

I would also like to acknowledge nine-year-old Canadian Cassidy Megan for founding World Purple Day to, in her words, 'Tell everyone about epilepsy, especially that all seizures are not the same and that people with epilepsy are ordinary people just like everyone else.' I would also like to thank organisations like Epilepsy Queensland for their dedication in providing support to epilepsy sufferers and their families, their commitment to raising awareness and their dedication to raising funds for vital research. It is through the efforts of organisations such as their own that we will gain a better understanding of this disorder.

In November last year I was pleased to attend Epilepsy Queensland's 40th anniversary. Queensland Health has had a partnership with Epilepsy Queensland since at least November 1998 and has a service agreement in place for the provision of the information and education service. I would urge people to wear purple tomorrow or look for an Epilepsy Queensland fundraising badge to show their support for World Purple Day.

Road Trauma

Hon. AP FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Employment and Economic Development) (10.09 am): The Motor Accident Insurance Commission in this state oversees our compulsory third-party insurance scheme. Part of its commitment to the community involves funding programs that support research into preventing accidents and in enhancing medical care and treatment for those injured on our roads. Last Friday I launched with the member for Brisbane Central an Australian first—the new advanced driving simulator at QUT. This 1½ million dollar investment—which includes not only funds from the Queensland government but also the University of Queensland, the Australian Research Council and the RACQ, with QUT—will provide researchers with the ability to look at the effects of tiredness and driving under the influence, from the safety of a simulator, amongst other driving factors.

Today I can announce that the government will extend its partnership with the Centre of National Research on Disability and Rehabilitation Medicine with $6½ million in funding over the next three years. CONROD was formed 13 years ago as a partnership between the University of Queensland and the Queensland government through the Motor Accident Insurance Commission. The commission's funding has enabled both CARRS-Q and CONROD to leverage millions more from external sources.

CONROD's research regarding whiplash has improved the assessment and management of these injuries, which account for 55 per cent of all compulsory third-party claims. CONROD's 10-year management of the Queensland Trauma Registry has also led to increased clinical research and improved hospital policies and practices resulting in better outcomes for trauma patients.

I congratulate CONROD and CARRS-Q for their commitment to road safety and to injury trauma rehabilitation. Their world-class work is reducing the consequences of road crashes and making the roads safer for Queenslanders. The support for these and other initiatives was possible because of the foresight shown in running our CTP scheme. Our CTP scheme was last reviewed in 1999 to invite competition in the setting of insurance premiums and to give motorists choice between insurers. Our premiums today are lower than they were in 2003. However, the competition that has characterised premium setting in recent years has recently reduced. Insurers in the last two quarters have filed at the ceiling, reducing choice and competitive tension. In the past two years, the most variation in premium price amongst insurers has been $10 for cars and station wagons.

Given the substantial tort law reforms that have been introduced in recent years, I want to ensure that the compulsory third-party system in this state is providing the best value for money for Queensland motorists. That means that it is time to look at the model to ensure that premiums can remain as low as they can be. The government will consult with the insurance industry to achieve that goal. The government will be inviting consultation on this review, which I expect to be completed by the middle of this year. The scheme review is about looking at improving efficiency in the delivery of CTP insurance by ensuring administration and delivery costs are as low as possible, which will in turn benefit motor vehicle owners. This review will not impact on claimant benefits. Claimant benefits are outside the scope of the review.

Our scheme is one which has delivered the goods in terms of delivering premiums which are today lower than those in place in 2003. It is timely, though, to ensure that it is operating to the best benefit of motorists and taxpayers alike, and that is why we will undertake this review. If premiums can be driven lower through further reforms or changes to the way in which our scheme is structured then the government will pursue these reforms. That is what we have delivered in the past, and this review will ensure that we deliver that into the future.

State Schools of Tomorrow; Building the Education Revolution

Hon. GJ WILSON (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Training) (10.12 am): The Bligh government is building a better education system for Queensland students. We are investing in giving them access to modern, top-quality teaching and learning facilities. We are building new schools in growth areas, including seven new schools under the $1 billion PPP project. Last year we opened four new schools, including three in the Gold Coast's fast-growing northern corridor and one north of Brisbane where the population is booming. We opened another this year on the Sunshine Coast and yet another on Brisbane's bayside. Our $850 million investment in Queensland schools through the State Schools of Tomorrow program is modernising and rebuilding some of Queensland's older schools, giving students and staff access to top-quality teaching and learning environments.

We know that investing in education is an investment in Queensland's future, and that is why we have taken the tough decisions to ensure that we can continue to provide and upgrade these vital community assets for our state's growing population. It is also an investment in keeping Queenslanders in jobs. The SSOT program has created around 6,500 jobs. We are also working closely with the federal government to deliver the historic Building the Education Revolution program. This is a $2.1 billion investment in Queensland schools.

We have already seen great benefits in Queensland from the BER program. New halls, libraries and science labs are popping up all over Queensland. Our schools are getting great new resources, communities are gaining valuable public assets and jobs are being created in local areas as a result of this program. We have already seen over 249 projects valued at $297 million completed in 145 Queensland state schools, including 126 libraries, 112 multipurpose halls and a Land and Sea Management Centre at Innisfail State College—the first project in Australia to be completed under the Science and Language Centres for the 21st Century Secondary Schools element of the BER program.

So far throughout Queensland we have seen 13 official BER openings, with over 20 more scheduled to be held over the next few weeks. It has also created approximately 2,200 jobs to date. We want to make sure Queenslanders are getting the best out of these investments, and that is why we have a BER steering committee of stakeholders which meets regularly to discuss the delivery of the program in Queensland. We also want to ensure that our schools are getting value for money, which is why I directed the department to engage PricewaterhouseCoopers to assess the administration of the program by the Department of Education and Training and the Department of Public Works, and I thank my honourable colleague for the support that his department has provided to our efforts.

The PricewaterhouseCoopers report found that the BER program in Queensland will achieve value for money, that the design standards are based upon current best practice, and that the coordination of the BER program by the Department of Education and Training means that schools are better able to maintain their focus on teaching and learning. I would urge all members of this House to attend BER openings in their local area to inspect these new facilities which are being so eagerly received by teachers, students and their local community.

Shared Services Initiative

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Public Works and Information and Communication Technology) (10.16 am): As part of the government's original shared services initiative, a long-term program aimed at consolidating and rationalising whole-of-government finance and human resource systems has been undertaken. This is an ambitious program, and I am pleased to report that substantial progress has been made. Between September 2005 and September 2009, CorpTech implemented 10 SAP finance systems for Queensland government departments including JAG, Corrective Services and the Queensland Police Service. One SAP human resource system was also implemented during this period.

CorpTech has continued the good work in 2010, reaching two significant milestones already this year. On Monday, 8 March a new SAP finance system was successfully deployed in the Department of Community Safety. This new system caters for all of Community Safety's financial management and processing. In total, 800 Community Safety users and 120 Shared Service Agency users benefit from the new system. This project was completed on time and under budget thanks to the efforts of the Department of Community Safety, the Shared Service Agency and CorpTech. Further, on Sunday, 14 March the Queensland Health payroll replacement project went live. The implementation of this new SAP payroll system was a critical priority for the Queensland government. Queensland Health, CorpTech and IBM have been working together on the project since 2008. It replaces not only an outdated payroll system but also dozens of ancillary, disparate systems and manual processes.

Last year IBM advised that this is one of the largest and most complex payroll systems ever seen in Australia. IBM said that the planning and implementation of such a comprehensive payroll system would normally be a three- to five-year project. I am pleased to advise that this project was delivered in just 27 months. That is a great achievement given the scope of the project. This system is designed to provide payroll and rostering to around 74,000 Queensland Health employees on a fortnightly basis. Over a 12-month period, this equates to more than 1.9 million payroll deliveries. Employees of Queensland Health were paid this week from the new system. I am advised that any payroll errors—and there have been some—were related to data entry and not to the new system. In other words, the system is working to the scope that it was provided for and the data system entries are the reason that some nurses have, regrettably, not got the correct pay.

I am extremely proud of the outcome of the combined Queensland Health, IBM and DPW project team in delivering such a good outcome in such a complicated environment. My congratulations go to all concerned with this significant achievement. CorpTech is clearly a key player in the Queensland government's Toward Q2 through ICT strategy, which helps deliver improved services at reduced costs for the people of Queensland.

Freight Rail Infrastructure

Hon. RG NOLAN (Ipswich—ALP) (Minister for Transport) (10.19 am): The Queensland government is planning for future freight rail needs in South-East Queensland and improving national freight rail connectivity. With freight movement across the state expected to double by the year 2020, it is vital to act now to preserve corridors for future use. The southern freight rail corridor study will identify

and preserve a freight rail alignment connecting the western rail line near Rosewood to the interstate standard gauge line north of Beaudesert. The preliminary alignment for this rail corridor, associated impacts and land requirements was released for public consultation in October 2008.

The government listened to feedback from landholders, conservation groups and community groups. The Department of Transport and Main Roads also took advice from the Department of Environment and Resource Management about the significance of koala habitat in the Ebenezer-Willowbank area. As a result, I announced a revised alignment for this corridor on 26 November 2009. Approximately 12 kilometres of the original alignment in the Ebenezer-Willowbank area was relocated to ensure important koala habitat area is not fragmented, while maintaining freight capacity. We have met with existing and newly affected property owners to inform them of the revised alignment.

I am pleased that we can now provide a further opportunity for the whole community to comment by releasing the *Southern freight rail corridor study revised assessment report* for public consultation. The report summary will be available online at www.tmr.qld.gov.au later today. More detailed information will be sent to landholders and other interested parties shortly.

The formal consultation period will commence after the school holidays on 12 April to ensure that we are not restricting the community's opportunity to comment. Further information will be provided to the community through information sessions held in the region during April. Formal submissions will close on 14 May.

Cyclone Ului, Ergon Energy

Hon. S ROBERTSON (Stretton—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy and Minister for Trade) (10.21 am): Early on Monday morning 60,000 homes and businesses were without power after Cyclone Ului unleashed its fury on the Mackay-Whitsunday region. We all know and understand what the community is going through. It is a massive clean-up and at the end of the day some of them cannot even sit down to a hot cup of tea. Rest assured, Ergon is working hard to help them get their lives back to normal. They have been working around the clock to repair powerlines and restore power. They have been out there in that bad weather, battling the elements to bring power back on. It has been a difficult task.

As I mentioned earlier this week, some crews have even been stranded by floodwaters. As soon as they received appropriate safety briefings, Energex crews headed to the region to help their country cousins. There are now 350 power workers on the ground in the cyclone damaged region. Together, they have restored power to approximately 54,500 homes and businesses. Fifty generators have arrived in Mackay. They are currently being distributed to Midge Point north of Mackay and inland to Eungella, the worst affected areas. Because Ergon crews have struggled to gain access to damaged high-voltage conductors tangled in fallen forests, a helicopter with specialist lifting attachments is engaged in raising conductors into position while wind conditions allow. This is particularly the case around Shute Harbour, where five super generators have also been brought in to restore an interim supply to key facilities. Field crews there will undertake repair work on up to five spans of powerlines that have been damaged. Repairs are expected to take up to three days. In the meantime, those five super generators will provide temporary power.

The 5,500 households and businesses still to be reconnected to mains power are in the Pioneer Valley and a small number are around Sarina. Ergon have advised me this morning that they are working on a revised generation strategy; that is, where Ergon is having trouble restoring power because of extensive damage to the network's high-voltage lines, they are bringing generators in to support those local communities. Ergon expects to have more than 2,000 homes in the worst affected areas reconnected by the end of the day.

I understand the frustrations felt by people who are still waiting to be reconnected. Power crews are working as fast and as hard as they can to get their power back on, so I ask them to please be patient. Unfortunately, it is a fact of life, living in the tropics, that when cyclones strike it is not a matter of if you lose power, but when. We have invested more than $740 million this year to maintain and strengthen Ergon's electricity network. The fact that power has been restored so quickly to so many in the cyclone affected area shows the importance of that investment.

Housing, Energy Efficiency Ratings

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (10.24 am): Today I announce that the government will implement another of its election commitments by increasing the energy efficiency rating for new houses and town houses from five stars to six stars on 1 May this year. This six-star rating will recognise and reward the uniquely green features of Queensland's tropical and subtropical homes. These include the affordable and environmentally friendly features that have been cooling our homes for more than a century, such as suspended timber floors, wide doors and hallways, verandas and outdoor living areas. With the introduction of a six-star equivalent to the

Queensland Building Code, these features will be acknowledged and accredited. Importantly, development applications submitted before a new or amended building code begins do not need to comply with the new or amended code. Similarly, building certifiers have a discretion to not apply new or amended codes in cases where the planning of a building was well advanced before the new or amended code began and it would take more than minor changes to make the application comply.

Queensland is growing by around 115,000 people every year. That growth is equal to a city the size of Darwin. That is why there is a real need to protect Queensland's lifestyle and landscape which we know and love. The six-star equivalent will award, for example, one star to outdoor living areas, which will help reduce household energy use and meet the Q2 target to reduce the household carbon footprint by one-third.

Earlier this month I hosted a tropical design forum in Cairns to discuss the six-star standard with industry, academics and local representatives. As the member for Mulgrave can attest, the forum participants overwhelmingly supported the six-star standard, provided it continues to encourage tropical and subtropical design principles and promote innovative solutions. We could not agree more. The six-star standard will recognise and reward Queensland house design features and work with Queensland's unique regions, not against them. We understand that Queensland has a unique climate, which ranges from the tropical north to the subtropical south and beyond the range. We acknowledge the shortfalls of house design requirements that have been developed for southern climates and which are not appropriate for Queensland. That is why we will continue to consult by holding an energy efficiency forum in Toowoomba on 9 April to further discuss the unique design features of our many and varied homes in our regions, including draft amendments to the Queensland Development Code that will introduce those measures. The government is committed to sustainable housing standards for a prosperous and well-planned Queensland.

MOTION

Referral to Law, Justice and Safety Committee

Hon. JC SPENCE (Sunnybank—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.27 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That in light of the government drafting a new local government electoral act, the Law, Justice and Safety Committee undertake a review of the local government electoral system for all local governments except for Brisbane City Council.

2. In undertaking this inquiry, the committee should consider and report on the application of different electoral systems to local government elections in Queensland, including but not limited to postal voting, divided/undivided councils and proportional representation;

   - consider local government systems in other jurisdictions in Australia;
   - conduct public hearings and consultation with stakeholders; and
   - provide recommendations as to the content of the proposed new local government electoral act.

3. The committee will report to the Legislative Assembly by the end of November 2010.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

INTEGRITY, ETHICS AND PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

Reports

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (10.28 am): I table two reports of the Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee: report No. 103, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 25 November 2009 relating to an alleged unauthorised release of committee documents* and report No. 104, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the registrar on 25 February 2010 relating to an alleged failure by a member to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests*. I commend the reports and the committee's recommendations to the House.

Tabled paper: Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee Report No. 103 titled 'Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 25 November 2009 relating to an alleged unauthorised release of committee documents' [1959].

Tabled paper: Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee Report No. 104 titled 'Matter of privilege referred by the registrar on 25 February 2010 relating to an alleged failure by a member to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests' [1960].

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LNG Industry; Sale of Public Assets

Mr LANGBROEK (10.30 am): My first question without notice is to the Premier. The Premier has claimed that a new gas deal will generate between $200 million and $800 million annually in royalties for the government. If these projections of a revenue bonanza are true, does that mean privatisation is now off Labor's agenda or is the debt Labor has left Queenslanders so large and so out of control that privatisation must proceed?

Ms BLIGH: I thank the honourable member for the question. Let me outline a couple of things about the development of the gas industry and the expected revenue from royalties. As outlined by the company last night, if all of the milestones in the decision-making and approval process are met and the construction time frame proceeds as currently planned, they expect to have their first LNG exported some time in 2014. That means that the first full year of royalty returns to Queensland taxpayers, anticipated to be around $200 million, will be in 2015. In 2015 we will see some $200 million come into our budget, which is currently around a $40 billion budget. It is very welcome, but the first year of royalties will not be for five years.

Under the plan being proposed now by those opposite, we should do nothing for five years; we should sit back and wait for $200 million to come our way. The second point that is very important to make, because it goes to the heart of the government's decision making on this issue, is that between now and 2015 the Queensland Rail coal business requires $7 billion worth of investment.

Mr Johnson: Because you let it run down, that's why.

Ms BLIGH: I take the interjection, because the member for Gregory could not be more wrong. Why does it need $7 billion? It is because the industry is doubling and it will need to grow. We need more coal wagons and coal track. It seems that those opposite are suggesting that $200 million from royalties that start in five years time can somehow fund $7 billion of investment now. No wonder those opposite do not want to outline an economic strategy. What is proposed by the opposition is that those royalties should be used to prop up the coal industry transport system. I want those royalties, the royalties from LNG—a business that is building its own infrastructure, not asking the taxpayers to build a pipeline for it—to go to Dalby, Roma, Chinchilla, Toowoomba and Gladstone. The ludicrous suggestion is that we should take those royalties and use them to prop up the coal industry instead of building communities and giving the community benefit.

We now have the first plank of the economic strategy of the member for Surfers Paradise. Under his proposal the royalties from LNG will go to the coal industry. Under us they will go to the communities of the south-west, they will go to Gladstone and they will go to the Darling Downs.

QRNational

Mr LANGBROEK: My second question without notice is to the Minister for Transport. I refer the minister to the privatisation of Queensland Rail and the comments made by her Labor colleague and federal resources minister Martin Ferguson that 'the Queensland model, in my opinion, is a recipe for disaster'. I ask: is there now a divide between state and federal Labor or does the minister agree with Martin Ferguson that the privatisation of Queensland Rail is a recipe for disaster for job security, export competitiveness and the economy?

Ms NOLAN: The proposed public listing of QRNational is a recipe for growth in Queensland rail jobs. Although this might be unknown to the member for Gregory, in the coming years the size of Queensland's coal industry and therefore the size of the railway that is needed will grow. In the coming years we will see more jobs in rail because QRNational will have the capacity for private investment in order to make that growth possible. In the coming years we will see jobs growth in QRNational.

How do we ensure that? This government has searched the world for the best model for QRNational going forward. We found that the best model in the world appeared to be the Canadian model. Its railway, which was not unlike QR, was privatised some years ago and expanded to become one of not just North America's but the world's great railways, providing jobs for more Canadians and moving more freight and bulk going forward. That is the model that this government has adopted and is sticking to as we move forward.

We are utterly convinced that our railway is sufficiently mature to take this step forward. It is sufficiently efficient, having been reformed by a Labor government for nearly 20 years now, that it is now ready to take that step. What do we hear from the opposition? This opposition has not even kept up with the commercial reforms that have been going on in our railway for the last 20 years. We consistently hear from the opposition this idea that the railway cannot manage in the modern world. We hear this idea that the railway should exist purely as a mechanism to subsidise the coal industry and to subsidise agricultural coal freight. This is a modern, efficient railway that the Labor government has already reformed and which is well and truly ready with a strong model to go forward and grow in the future.

LNG Industry

Mrs KIERNAN: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the House what efforts have been made to ensure that Queenslanders have the skills they need to harness the opportunities of the new LNG industry?

Ms BLIGH: I thank the honourable member for her question. Over the next decade this industry has the potential to create some 18,000 jobs. Our government is absolutely determined to make sure that Queenslanders have the skills needed to take up those opportunities. That is why last month we launched an expansion of the Queensland Minerals and Energy High School Program. We now have schools with students totalling a little over 4,000 in the Surat Basin, all of whom will have an opportunity, should they wish to work in this industry, to take up an educational option during their schooling years to be part of the coal seam gas industry.

Last month we announced a $10 million program to start training thousands of workers for the new CSG and LNG industries. That training program is targeted at upskilling present mining industry workers and equipping newcomers with the new skills that will be needed. Last week I announced nearly $24 million in funding for the Surat Basin for projects to manage the growth in that region. Part of that was $4.5 million to establish a trade training hub to provide students with high-quality training specialising in coal seam gas production skills. It will be a whole new skills centre in the Surat Basin.

Today I inform the House that a dedicated LNG team has been established within the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation to help the public get on board with the LNG juggernaut. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity and I want young Queenslanders to have every chance of being a part of it. I want Queenslanders to get a slice of the action here. From today, members of the public can call Training Queensland on 1300369935 and register their interest. All Queenslanders who want a slice of the action in this industry need to do is call the hotline or go onto the Queensland government or the Premier's website and they will be given information about what is available and how they can get a slice of the action.

When it comes to talking about this new industry we need to remember that it is because of the coal seam gas industry that we now have an LNG industry. Why do we have a coal seam gas industry? It is because this government set a gas target of 13 per cent. That secured investment and exploration and development. Who opposed the gas target? It was opposed by those opposite. They said it would never work. They had no vision, no idea. The opposition was led on this by the member for Callide. His comments on this are on the record.

Mr SPEAKER: It is a bit hard: the member for Callide is on his last warning.

Ms BLIGH: I am sorry for the provocation. It is a matter of record that it was Labor that set the target and Labor that developed the gas industry.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, I do find that you are at a singular disadvantage but that is not of my making.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr SPRINGBORG: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the myths and facts flyer in relation to the privatisation of Queensland forestry that specifically states that the sale will be the trees and not the land. Is it a fact that the sale of Forestry Plantations Queensland includes 33,169 hectares of state owned freehold land?

Ms BLIGH: As I understand it, the land on which, by and large, is the bulk of the forestry business is crown land and it will be remaining in state ownership. There are some assets, a small part, that are freehold that will go with this asset. Once again—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Premier.

Ms BLIGH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We saw the Leader of the Opposition in here last night. Those members who had the benefit of enjoying his speech will know that he came in trying to hum a few bars of *The Internationale*, trying to paint himself as the workers' friend, the socialist from Surfers Paradise, followed up by 'Big Red' Tim.

In the previous question to the Minister for Transport, they tried to make something of the issue about how coal companies should have a slice of this action. What we have now is the bizarre situation where the coal companies themselves are saying that it is time for this industry to stand on its own two feet. This industry wants to build and invest in its own infrastructure. This industry wants to stand on its own two feet, and what do we get from those opposite? They say that that industry should stay locked into government subsidies.

Mr Seeney: You said no land.

Ms BLIGH: I think you've been warned.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It would help, Premier, that the question was about timber.

Ms BLIGH: And I did answer the question, Mr Speaker.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms BLIGH: I have answered it, Mr Speaker, and I am making a related point which I believe I am entitled to do.

We have the bizarre situation where these industries are actually wanting to stand on their own two feet, wanting to invest in their own infrastructure, and the old agrarian socialists over there are saying, 'Hold them back. Keep them tied to the apron strings. Keep them on government subsidies,' even when they are trying to invest themselves and free up the budget for all the things that every single one of the members opposite want in their electorates. As we come up to the budget, we will hear them all get up one after the other saying what they want and they will not be able to fund it.

Bligh Labor Government

Mr WATT: My question is to the Premier. Could the Premier please update the House on how the Bligh government has been working and delivering for Queenslanders over the past month?

Ms BLIGH: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am very pleased to advise him and the rest of the House that, firstly, we as a government have been busy building Queensland's regions. I joined the member for Keppel to open the new Yeppoon Hospital. It is a magnificent example of regional health service delivery—one of the best in the country. We announced the commitment of $11 million to underpin the Commonwealth Games bid. That means growth, development and opportunity for the second largest city in our state, the Gold Coast. Further north we have approved the Townsville marine project, which means $110 million worth of investment going full steam ahead to grow the marine industry in the northern part of our state.

Mr Wallace: Plus boat ramps.

Ms BLIGH: And boat ramps for recreational activity. We have announced an upgrade of the new Carrara Stadium that will make it the most solar friendly stadium in Australia, generating electricity back into the grid. We have secured an additional six-laning of the Gateway all the way from Nudgee to Carrara and a new Port Access Road.

We have been building new industries. We have this week seen the development and the real birth, if you like, of the liquid natural gas export industry here in Queensland. That means jobs, it means prosperity, it means investment and opportunity, not just here in the south-east but in the south-west where those communities have been in decline and also in the Gladstone, Rockhampton and Central Queensland areas.

We have also been busy building infrastructure—for example, putting in place the arrangements and declaring as a state significant project the Cross River Rail project. We have been building stronger communities and developing community capacity. We have released a drink driving discussion paper in our efforts to bring down the road toll and slow the progress of drink driving. We have introduced new laws on alcohol interlockers and we have started a six-month trial for trucks on the Brisbane urban corridor, requiring those trucks to stay in the left-hand lane so that we can streamline vehicle traffic in those peak hours. And we have done all of that in the middle of a cyclone and the worst floods we have seen in recorded history across the largest section of the south west of our state.

Of course we know that, while we have been doing all of that and getting on with the job, nothing has been happening on the other side. As we get close to 11 o'clock on a Thursday, you can almost start to see them winding up for the next fortnight, Mr Speaker. You know that at about this time on a Thursday the feet are going up on the desk, the pina coladas are coming out, the hammock is being hung and the lights are being switched off one by one. The lights have gone out and if you listen carefully you hear them saying, 'Good night, Jim-Bob. Good night, John-Boy. You all go and grow me some big vegetables now, won't you?' That is what we know they will deliver for Queensland in the next fortnight.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr SEENEY: My question without notice is to the Premier. Despite the assurances that the Premier has repeatedly given the people of Queensland, it is now apparent that the Labor government is going to sell 33,169 hectares of state owned freehold land, an area equivalent to 70,000 football fields. Given that some of that land is in the corridor between Caloundra and Gympie, can the Premier guarantee that this land will continue to be used for forestry and that the trees will not be bulldozed to make way for concrete jungles and other development projects?

Ms BLIGH: Let me make this absolutely clear. Firstly, there is nothing new about this.

Mr Springborg: Yes, there is.

Mr Seeney: No land; just the trees.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms BLIGH: Thank you. The Treasurer announced this when he announced the structure of the sale. What he said—

Mr Seeney: Just the trees.

Ms BLIGH: There is nothing new about this. It was announced by the Treasurer when he announced the structure of the sale. So there is nothing new here today. 'Speedy' over there has caught up after about 4½ months. Secondly, this is land that was never crown land; this is freehold land and it is being sold as freehold land. So I say again: nothing has changed from our original assertions on this.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms BLIGH: I do not know what they are on about, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Just resume your seat. I will wait for the House to come to order. The honourable the Premier.

Ms BLIGH: This has been on the public record repeatedly and there is nothing new about it. I know it has taken a long time—because you do so little work in the time between parliamentary sittings—for you to keep up with what the Treasurer has already said. What I will say—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Both sides!

Ms BLIGH: One of the key issues here is that on this particular land, which is freehold, there are no rates being paid. When this goes to a private owner, rates will be paid on this land and that means benefits to the councils in all of those areas. So if you do not want those councils to get those rates paid, if you do not want those rates, you tell them. You go up and tell the Sunshine Coast council that you do not want rates paid on that land. You do not have what it takes to do that. You do not have what it takes—just like he does not have what it takes. You have got nothing this morning, and you are about to go to sleep for another two weeks.

Dental Services

Mrs SULLIVAN: My question is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the House what actions members of parliament can take to support dental services across the state?

Mr LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for the question. In 2008-09 Queensland funded public oral health services to the sum of $150 million. That is the same amount of money, broadly, as New South Wales funds dental services in its state, with its much greater population, and it is in fact more than Victoria funds public dental services in its state, even though it has a bigger population. On any day in Queensland, Queensland Health funds 1,948 adult dental health appointments and 2,210 child dental health appointments, and 953 school aged children complete dental treatments.

Between 1 October 2009 and 31 December 2009, there were 220,838 patients treated and 111,264 patients waiting. The issue of dental waiting lists is a big issue for people in this House. The median wait for acute emergencies is one day. Ninety-six per cent of patients waiting were in the bottom two of eight categories—I repeat: the bottom two of eight categories—for routine check-ups.

In March 2009 and again in September, the Commonwealth government sought to make up for years of Liberal neglect and tried to introduce a $290 million Commonwealth dental scheme. Members might remember that Howard pulled all federal money out of dental services and left the states to make up the gap. Why does Queensland spend more than other states? Because we actually kept the funding in out of the state taxpayer. That Commonwealth scheme has been twice blocked by the Liberals and Nationals in the Senate. It would mean one million extra appointments across Australia over four years, $52.8 million extra to Queensland over four years or an extra 187,000 treatments. That is 73,000 more than are on our waiting list.

Let us look at the number of times that we have had questions on notice on this issue in this place. In March, the Senate blocked the Commonwealth dental scheme. On 22 April 2009, the member for Toowoomba South asked a question on notice; on 3 June, the member for Caloundra asked a question on notice; on 16 June, the member for Surfers Paradise sent me an email from his electorate office and I replied personally, I might add; on 18 August, the member for Bundaberg asked a question;

on 1 September, the member for Caloundra asked a question; on 17 September, the member for Caloundra asked a question. The Senate blocked the passage for a second time, and then we had questions from the member for Burnett, the member for Dalrymple and the member for Toowoomba South again. Those opposite have done nothing to stand up to the Commonwealth opposition in relation to this.

Even when it came to issues such as fluoride—which was one of the single most important public health initiatives—the Leader of the Opposition jumped out of the boxes saying that we all need flouride but as soon as it came to talking tough, as soon as it came to tough initiatives, he wanted to have a referendum on it. This government will take the tough decisions. When will those opposite stand up to the federal opposition for once? The only member of the opposition in this place whom I have ever seen stand up to his federal colleagues is the member for Gregory who did it when he was transport and roads minister. I have never, ever seen the rest of you people do it.

(Time expired)

Sale of Public Assets

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is to the Premier. In light of the deceit and deception revealed in her taxpayer funded myths brochure revealed today about the sale of 33,000 hectares of Forestry Plantations Queensland freehold land, why should Queenslanders believe anything she says about asset sales and her botched implementation of them?

Mr SPEAKER: You will rephrase the question.

Mr NICHOLLS: Why should anyone believe the Premier when she talks about the botched sale of assets in Queensland?

Ms BLIGH: Well, I am certainly not talking about that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is impossible to hear the answers this morning. I know we are all a bit on edge because it is Thursday. I ask the House to at least respect the speakers on their feet so we can hear the proceedings. I remind the honourable member for Callide that you are on your last warning.

Ms BLIGH: I am very pleased to take a question from 'Big Red' Tim, the comrade from Clayfield, who can barely speak about this issue with a straight face.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That is quite clearly unparliamentary and unbecoming for a Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier, I want you to call the member for Clayfield by his correct title. He is entitled to that respect.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Gregory will cease interjecting. I have asked the Premier to call the honourable member for Clayfield by his correct title.

Ms BLIGH: It is very touching to see the member for Callide taking offence on behalf of the member for Clayfield. I think we know that the member for Clayfield now has one more vote in the pocket; he is keeping it in the back pocket. He has got Callide signed up.

Mr Lucas: That's two.

Ms BLIGH: I think he has got a few more than two.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms BLIGH: They are actually very excited and animated for a Thursday. They will have to have a big nanny nap this afternoon to make up for it. I have answered this question and I have made it clear that all of the land that has been crown land will remain crown land—

Opposition members interjected.

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

Ms BLIGH: Again, we see the member for Clayfield trying to prosecute an argument in direct contradiction of everything that he has ever said on the subject of asset sales, in direct contradiction of everything that he and his party have ever stood for. It is barely plausible. This is a question from the member of this House who has said on the record in this chamber in relation to electricity, 'Why not sell the poles and wires? Why not sell the distribution network?' The member for Clayfield's appetite for privatisation is the largest in this parliament. It is implausible that he stands in here and tries to pretend that he has any other view. On this subject, he is implausible, unbelievable and deceitful.

The deceit on this resides with the member for Clayfield. The member for Clayfield, along with the member for Moggill, have repeatedly come into this parliament on numerous occasions and said that they want to privatise assets way beyond anything that this government contemplates.

M1 Upgrade

Mrs KEECH: My question is to the Minister for Main Roads. Can the minister advise the House of the next steps for the projects that are being delivered on the Gold Coast section of the M1? How are these projects benefiting motorists in the region, particularly my constituents in Albert?

Mr WALLACE: I thank the member for Albert for her question. She is a very good advocate for road infrastructure in her area. Indeed, I thank the member for Albert for joining with me last week to pick up some rubbish on the side of the M1. We gave it a good clean-up; it was very, very good. Too much rubbish costs us too much money. I am pleased to report to the House that work is progressing apace on the various projects that my department is delivering to upgrade the Gold Coast section of the M1. We are spending around $450 million, jointly funded by the Bligh and Rudd governments, to upgrade key sections of this vital link.

I know that my colleague the member for Albert is closely following progress on the $30 million upgrade of the Coomera interchange. This upgrade is well underway, and the completed project will significantly improve travel times and ease congestion for motorists from the northern Gold Coast who use this very busy interchange. The project is progressing rapidly and is expected to be completed by the middle of this year, weather permitting. I am also pleased to announce today that work will start after the busy Easter period on the next section of the Pacific Motorway upgrade on the Gold Coast, widening the motorway from four to six lanes between Pappas Way at Nerang and Gooding Drive at Worongary.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr WALLACE: I take the member for Mudgeeraba's interjection that she supports this project. This $158 million project, expected to be completed late next year, will help address a number of key local concerns. It will improve safety, reduce travel times, reduce congestion and provide jobs to the local community—in fact, 739 local jobs as a result of the actions of this government.

Ms Croft: Hear, hear!

Mr WALLACE: I take the interjection of the member for Broadwater. These are jobs for her community. It will improve safety, reduce travel times and make that road much safer. This busy section of the motorway carries about 100,000 vehicles per day and will be widened in the centre median strip with an extra lane in each direction. As part of this project, noise barriers will also be built along sections of the upgraded motorway.

The issue of growth and how we are planning to cater for it has been gaining significant momentum as an issue of state and national interest, and this government will host a two-day growth summit next week. This is the next step in gaining a shared vision of the Queensland of tomorrow and how we will manage growth across our great state.

My department is committed to catering for population growth not only in the cities but also in regional towns. I thank the member for Albert, who has been a fine advocate for the M1, as have the members for Broadwater and Burleigh. They are out there battling for extra funds for our M1, and I am sure that as they drive home they will see those works underway and they will welcome further works after Easter. Good on you, Gold Coast members! Good on you, member for Southport, for doing the right job in fighting for that road and in getting better infrastructure for the Gold Coast.

Magic Millions

Mr STEVENS: My question is to the Minister for Tourism and Fair Trading. The Gold Coast lost the Indy thanks to Labor mate Terry Mackenroth. The Gold Coast lost the A1GP thanks to Labor mate Terry Mackenroth. Today it is reported that the Gold Coast is about to lose the prized racing carnival Magic Millions thanks to Labor mate Bob Bentley. Will the minister give an undertaking that he will personally step in and guarantee that the Magic Millions will proceed?

Mr LAWLOR: I thank the honourable member for the question. As he is well aware, the government does not intervene in relation to race dates. However, I have had a discussion with the chairman of Queensland Racing and I have been assured that the Magic Millions will proceed. By the way, the Queensland government, as you are well aware, has allocated $80 million over the next four years to support the racing industry. Compare that with what you guys offered—nothing, absolutely nothing.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable minister will direct his comments through the chair.

Mr LAWLOR: The Queensland government has allocated $80 million over four years to the racing industry for the purpose of capital works in the racing industry which obviously are needed. The catalyst for that allocation was a submission which the Treasurer received from Queensland Racing. The catalyst for that was the improvements that are required at the Gold Coast Turf Club to support the Magic Millions event.

The Magic Millions event is an important event for Queensland and particularly for the Gold Coast. It is estimated that it contributes almost $30 million to the Queensland economy. The government will not see the Magic Millions moved from Queensland. I understand that the Victorian government is holding talks with the Magic Millions, and it would be disappointing if it were successful. The government has allocated the funding that will enable the upgrade that is required to the Gold Coast Turf Club to ensure—

Mr Stevens: Just guarantee it.

Mr LAWLOR: There is an agreement that has to be reached between the turf club and Magic Millions. The member is well aware of that. The Magic Millions is a private enterprise business, and it can take it where it likes. So far as Queensland Racing and the Queensland government goes, we will do everything to ensure that the race stays on the Gold Coast.

I had a look the other day for a policy on racing—or for a policy on anything. The shadow minister has a website with all these media releases. What is his policy on it? We have not heard a thing about that. If you look up any of these media releases which are being passed off as policies on the website, what do you find? 'This page cannot be found' or 'this page has been removed' or 'its name has changed' or 'it is temporarily unavailable'—temporarily unavailable for 12 months. There is not one policy. It is a policy wasteland on that side of the House.

(Time expired)

Local Government Reform

Mr HOOLIHAN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Local Government and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Could the minister please outline how councils are performing post amalgamation?

Ms BOYLE: It is amazing how Queensland's 34 amalgamated local governments are going ahead only two years into the program. Yesterday I spoke in the House of the tremendous successes being achieved by Toowoomba Regional Council. Eight councils have merged into one and it is already reaping the benefits.

Today I take my hat off to the Rockhampton Regional Council, which is an amalgamation of four councils. It is a very difficult job. There are four very different histories and cultures, yet the council is streaming ahead. Some examples of its achievements are establishing a 10-year financial management strategy and rationalising and bringing together four different rating systems. It is looking ahead, and how! It is developing a whole-of-region plan entitled 'Towards 2050'. I take a moment to pay tribute to Mayor Brad Carter, his councillors and the council team led by the CEO who have made such huge achievements in a short period of time.

What is the opposition about? It is out there announcing policies—confusing policies—and disturbing the world of local government and communities, saying that it is going to unscramble the egg. It is going to unscramble the egg, according to the opposition leader, but only in some areas. The opposition leader said in the *Sunshine Coast Daily*—

> We're certainly not going to do it in lots and lots of areas.

However, the opposition spokesperson for local government said only last year—

> If in your area amalgamation hasn't worked or isn't appropriate well then you can approach us as individuals, community groups or as local governments themselves to make submissions ... There are a lot of communities.

Local government really wants to know whether there are lots of communities all over Queensland that are going to be deamalgamated. The member for Noosa said that they will deamalgamate or unscramble the egg for Noosa. And he said—

> While we're at it, we'll have a look at putting some new areas into Noosa that were never there before—maybe Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale—and we'll not give them a vote.

But the opposition spokesperson said that we will have boundaries, commissioners, advisory polls and votes all over the state. This is the policy of unscrambling the egg, but I have a name for this policy. I think they should call it CHAOS: 'CH', community havoc, because that is what they are reaping; 'AO', amalgamation's off; 'S', sort of.

Palm Cove, Social Housing

Mrs MENKENS: My question is to the Minister for Community Services and Housing. Two dates, please, from the minister. On what date did the department decide to acquire land at Palm Cove for social housing? And on what date did the department first advise local residents of its intention so that community consultation could take place?

Ms STRUTHERS: I thank the member for the question. Sometimes a picture can tell much more than words. Let me show the House—and I will table this for the benefit of members of the House—a picture of the contemporary design for housing at Trinity Park which the member criticised in this House yesterday.

Mr SPEAKER: And now you will put it down, thanks.

Ms STRUTHERS: I table that picture for the benefit of members.

Tabled paper: Photograph of public housing estate [1961].

I even say that it is worthy of being hung in this parliament. Look at that design; a wonderful design. This is public housing at its best.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable minister!

Ms STRUTHERS: As I have said in this House before, we have made the biggest investment in social housing this state has ever seen. Do members know what: there are people in Surfers Paradise on the register for housing. There are people in Southport on the register for housing. There are people on the northern beaches in Cairns on the register for housing. Do members know what they want? They want a roof over their heads. They want an affordable roof over their heads.

Everywhere I travel around this state I find that there are people who at times fall on hard times, there are people on low wages and there are people who need housing. We are providing that housing. We have the best opportunity at the moment to provide that housing to people around the state. But what do we face? Nearly every step of the way those on the other side of the House, the opposition in the Queensland parliament, oppose our housing developments, oppose public housing.

Let me tell members something—I will say it for all members in this House—

Mrs Menkens interjected.

Ms STRUTHERS: I will take the interjection from the member for Burdekin, who reckons public housing is a waste of money. Let me tell members something. Guess how many—and members can help me with this—social housing dwellings are already in the Cairns region?

Mrs MENKENS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat. Stop the clock and let us hear the point of order.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I will wait for the House to come to order so I can hear the point of order.

Mrs MENKENS: What the minister said is untrue. I take offence and ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, please withdraw it, and we will get on with it.

Ms STRUTHERS: I withdraw. Let me ask the question again. Do members know how many social housing dwellings are already in the Cairns region? Let me tell members. In the Cairns Regional Council area there are already 3,000 houses. Guess how many are in Port Douglas? There are 34. How long have they been there? Most of those have been there for over 10 years—10 years without a peep out of anybody because they are housing people. They are quality, affordable homes for people who need them most.

What do these jokers—that is your language, Mr Speaker, so it cannot be unparliamentary—

Mr SPEAKER: Not anymore.

Ms STRUTHERS: It cannot be unparliamentary. Everywhere I go people are saying that we need more affordable housing. The member for Stafford, the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, has the very innovative ULDA working on affordable housing initiatives. We are working together to build more affordable housing. We need the support of all members in this House.

(Time expired)

Organised Crime

Ms O'NEILL: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Industrial Relations. Could the Attorney-General update the House on any recent initiatives that will further strengthen the government's battle against organised crime.

Mr DICK: I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest, of course, in community safety. Along with the member for Kallangur, I am proud to be a member of a government that is tough on crime and tougher on the causes of crime. This is a government that follows up rhetoric with action. Last year we passed new laws that will tackle, disrupt and dismantle serious criminal organisations in Queensland. We also put into this House and had passed the Telecommunications Interception Act 2009 which means the state's crime-fighting bodies now have the power to tap telephones while at the same time protect the civil liberties of Queenslanders.

Since those laws were passed, the Crime and Misconduct Commission has been operating on an interim budget. I am pleased to advise the House that the Bligh government has allocated $14 million over five years to the Crime and Misconduct Commission to allow that body to carry out telephone interceptions. More than $600,000 will be spent this financial year to implement the system and to ensure it is fully operational by 1 July this year.

What will that mean for the Crime and Misconduct Commission? It can tackle serious and organised crime—organised crime such as drug trafficking, extortion, fraud and horrific offences like paedophilia and child sexual offences. It will also allow the CMC to conduct its own investigations and interception activities, separate and independent of the police as necessary. This is further proof that this government supports community safety and protects Queenslanders and gives law enforcement agencies the tools they need to do their jobs.

This is particularly important given the information contained in the CMC's report into illicit drugs released just last week. What did that report say? That report highlighted the threat posed by outlaw motorcycle gangs when it comes to the sale and trafficking of drugs in Queensland. That is not our report; it is the report of the Crime and Misconduct Commission—the independent body charged with pursuing serious crime in this state.

There are those in this House who are brave and courageous and will stand up to organised crime and there are those who will turn their face away and against it for base political purposes. That is what we saw last year. We saw a government willing to take on serious crime and those who, for base political purposes, were willing to do whatever they could to avoid tackling difficult issues for the state. This is not just in organised crime; it is across-the-board. Those opposite turn their face away from tough political decisions because it suits their political purposes.

But I am proud to be part of a government that is tough on crime and the causes of crime—a government that has seen a 21.5 per cent reduction in crime rates since it came to power in 1998, that has put more than 3,000 police officers on the beat and that has increased crime clearance rates. The task continues and we will continue that task.

(Time expired)

Varsity Lakes Railway Station

Ms BATES: My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport. I refer the minister to the Varsity Lakes train station where, because of zoning issues, schoolchildren are left to wait up to 40 minutes because bus and train timetables do not coincide. Why has the minister ignored my four requests to meet and resolve this issue? Is the minister also bound by the Labor government's policy of not dealing with not so good news?

Ms NOLAN: I am aware of the issues around Varsity Lakes train station and have asked TransLink to look into what better bus services can be created in this area. But I think the broad point that needs to be understood is that this government has recently spent $324 million creating a railway station at Varsity Lakes and for the first time in more than 10 years extended rail further down to the Gold Coast. The restoration of rail to the Gold Coast is a significant Labor government project. While rail to the Gold Coast was ripped up by the conservative side when it was in government, the restoration of—

Mrs Stuckey interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Currumbin will cease shrieking—cease interjecting. I call the Minister for Transport.

Ms NOLAN: She might struggle, Mr Speaker. Whilst the National Party ripped up rail to the Gold Coast, this Labor government is committed to its restoration and is progressively extending rail on the Gold Coast. Similarly, we are committed to the public transport future of the Gold Coast.

Right now early works are underway on the Gold Coast Rapid Transit project—a project which will extend public transport patronage on the Gold Coast from the current four per cent of trips taken by public transport to over time a full 10 per cent. This government has a vision for public transport across Queensland. Nowhere is that clearer than on the Gold Coast where we have extended rail to Varsity Lakes and where we have preserved a corridor beyond Varsity Lakes to Coolangatta.

We are currently building the Gold Coast Rapid Transit project and have almost doubled peak services on the Gold Coast line since 2005—that is, an 80 per cent increase in morning peak services and a 100 per cent increase in afternoon peak services since 2005. We are also providing better bus services all of the time. I find it quite remarkable that this opposition—which has no plan for public transport and least of all on the Gold Coast, which it regards as a place close to its heart—would be critical of our record and our vision for Gold Coast public transport.

Regional Queensland, Disability Services

Mr PITT: My question is to the Minister for Disability Services and Multicultural Affairs. Would the minister please inform the House how the Bligh government is tackling increasing demand for disability services in regional Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for his interest in what we are doing for children with a disability in regional Queensland. Earlier this month I was fortunate to be in his electorate at Edmonton, where Autism Queensland has expanded its centre. It has doubled its capacity from 32 children to 64 children, giving children the best start in life. While I was there I was also very happy to meet with Fiona and her son Jacob. Fiona told me that one year earlier Jacob could not even communicate. He was non-verbal. After one year with early intervention and the therapy staff, Jacob was able to communicate and next year he will be able to attend mainstream school, which is just wonderful. The Cairns community contributed to this great centre. Tradespeople contributed their time. The Bligh government put in $220,000 and the rest of the money was raised through the community. I want to thank the member for Mulgrave for his consistency in advocating for this centre.

Also last week in Toowoomba I opened the brand-new Cerebral Palsy League facility—a $1.4 million investment. The member for Toowoomba South was in attendance as well. This is a state-of-the-art community day activity facility for 130 people. Some 80 children and 50 adults will be able to attend this service. It was just wonderful to see the community on the day, because we are moving disability services into the modern era.

Unfortunately, those on the other side of the House do not share our commitment. There is no policy when it comes to disability services. In fact, those opposite seem to be far more concerned with practices than policies. What are these practices? It is almost embracing the PPP! We have seen the member for Southern Downs growing pumpkins—a practice rather than a policy. Then we see the member for Burnett playwriting rather than developing policy. We have the member for Callide looking at power lines and not costing that policy—an issue that he has been going on about in this House for about 10 years. In 2006 he was talking about undergrounding. But there is an ideas man on the other side! There is an ideas man. There is an ideas man where you would least suspect it: the member for Condamine! And what does the member for Condamine say? He has an idea. He wants to encourage the public to voice their ideas, share their thoughts and be part of an exciting, proactive time in the history of Queensland.

Ms Jones: What is it?

Ms PALASZCZUK: What is this proactive and exciting time? It is, and I quote from the *Dalby Herald*, 'to attend the Queensland Growth Management Summit', which will be held in Brisbane on 30 and 31 March. So there is no policy but you will embrace our ideas! Well done, member for Condamine. Keep it up! Keep it up!

(Time expired)

LNG Industry

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Premier. With the signing of the BG China LNG contract, will the Premier finally give a clear undertaking to the people of Gladstone to provide funding from government for new infrastructure needed for the projected population increase?

Ms BLIGH: I thank the honourable member for the question. She may have heard me earlier this morning in answer to another question making the point that this government's view is that the royalties that come as a result of this resource being tapped should go to the benefit of all Queenslanders, with a particular focus on those communities—like Gladstone, like the wider Gladstone region and the south-west and the Darling Downs region—which will be seeing increased population growth and increased pressure on their existing roads.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Ms BLIGH: The member for Callide is indicating that he thinks his electorate should get some. He needs to talk to the tacticians in his own group who want to give it all to the coal industry, because our government wants to give the royalties back to the communities of Queensland.

The member for Gladstone is correct: when these plans have been constructed they will provide up to about 1,000 jobs, just for the BG project. I would expect some of those jobs to go to some existing people in the region, but overwhelmingly they will be going to people moving into the region. Some of

those people will have children, and that will require expansions in schools. Any increased enrolments will be managed, as they always are, through the formula in Education Queensland. So where there is population growth that requires additional school infrastructure, whether it is new schools or additional facilities in existing schools, that will be delivered. Where there is need for us to develop further capacity within the hospital system, for example, that will be delivered.

We are determined to not only create this prosperity but also make sure that it is shared and that those people whose communities are affected by it see the benefit of it for themselves in the form of jobs wherever possible. I would also expect to see supply chain impacts not only in the greater Gladstone region but also into Rockhampton. This is prosperity for the entire Central Queensland region, and that prosperity will come in the form of both private investment and a recircling of that investment through the royalty system.

I am very pleased to advise the member for Gladstone that this government has been working very hard to make this project a reality and this industry a reality. What it means is not only great things for the people of Gladstone and further infrastructure for the services and facilities that they need but also good things for the entire state, as it should, because these resources belong to the people of Queensland. That is why we charge a royalty, and it will come back in the form of services and it will come back in the form of infrastructure.

I remind the House again that the coal seam methane gas industry exists in Queensland because we put in place a 13 per cent gas target. That is what drove investment. That is what drove development and exploration, and that is why this industry is here today.

Torres Strait, Police Resources

Mr O'BRIEN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police, Corrective Services and Emergency Services. Can the minister please advise the House what the government is doing to improve policing services in the Torres Strait?

Mr ROBERTS: I acknowledge the member's question and also the strong advocacy role that he plays in representing the interests of the Torres Strait, not just in policing matters but also in a range of other matters. Currently there is a Senate inquiry into issues affecting the Torres Strait, and in the media today there is some level of criticism of policing issues and policing resources in that area. I should point out at the outset that the responsibility for policing issues and indeed border security issues in the Torres Strait is a shared responsibility between the Queensland Police Service and the Australian Federal Police and Customs. The Queensland Police Service does have a significant presence in the Torres Strait. However, quite uniquely of Australian state police services, the Queensland Police Service is the only state service which deals with an international border. So there are some significant challenging environments.

Given the recent and current plans for improved policing resources in the Torres Strait, it is a little disappointing to hear some of the criticism of local representatives from that region in today's media. The Queensland Police Service polices that area through a range of means, principally through state police but also with a unique form of officer called a QATSIP, or a Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander police officer, who helps enforce local laws. There are also police liaison officers. So there is a mixed model of police enforcement in that area.

In recent times the Queensland government has significantly enhanced policing resources in the Torres Strait. To give a few examples, a new aircraft has recently been delivered to Horn Island. That aircraft dramatically improves the capacity of the police to deliver resources, to deliver police and to respond to issues right across the Torres Strait. Recently I visited the area with the Premier and the member. As I have indicated, the aircraft has dramatically increased the capacity of police to respond.

We have given a commitment to build a new $10 million police station on Badu Island—a significant investment in policing resources in that region. Currently we are upgrading the water police facilities on Thursday Island. Again, these are just examples of the significant enhancements to the delivery of policing in that region. Currently, 35 police officers service the regions along with seven civilians, one pilot—obviously to go with the aircraft—five QATSIP officers and four police liaison officers.

With regard to the Badu Island police station—a $10 million commitment—we have entered into arrangements with the local council in terms of paying for the lease. Some traditional owners on that island are now seeking additional financial payments over and above that—$25,000 for 30 years. This has the potential to jeopardise the delivery of this project. We want to deliver it. We have good local support from the council. The local member supports it. We need the local people to cooperate with the Police Service to enable us to deliver a much needed Police Service facility in that region.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The time for questions is over.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (ROAD USE MANAGEMENT—INTERLOCKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 24 March (see p. 1129), on motion of Ms Nolan, and Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill resumed from 24 March (see p. 1129), on motion of Ms Simpson—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (11.31 am): At the outset, may I say that I am pleased to be able to continue my contribution today to this worthwhile debate. Last night before the debate was adjourned I was discussing the historical facts of this legislation and, of course, the government members really did not want to hear it—in fact, so much so that the best interjection that they could come up with was, 'We've heard this all before.' That is right; they did hear it. They heard it from the member for Mudgeeraba earlier in the day. They heard it from me and no doubt they will hear it from many members of the opposition throughout the day as we debate this legislation.

As this debate was adjourned last night mid-speech, I thought it prudent to update the thousands of Queenslanders who are watching this live on the parliament website right now where I left off and that was stating the undisputed historical facts of this legislation. For fear of being accused of rambling and repeating my words and those of other opposition members, so that those opposite in government may understand and comprehend, let me put it another way. In the year 2001, the Labor government introduced a small trial of interlocks. I ask my colleagues on this side of the House: what happened after the trial?

Opposition members: Nothing!

Mr BLEIJIE: That is right: zero, zilch, nil, nothing. In the year 2002, the Labor government in this House promised that interlocks were on their way. I ask my colleagues on this side of the House: what happened then?

Opposition members: Nothing!

Mr BLEIJIE: Nothing. That is right: zero, nil, zilch, zip, nothing. Then, in the year 2004, again the Labor government told Queenslanders—the mums and dads and the working families of Queensland—that it was now considering introducing alcohol interlocks. Again, I ask my colleagues on this side of the House: what happened?

Opposition members: Nothing!

Mr BLEIJIE: That is right. Again: zero, nil, zilch, zip, nothing. The members of the Labor government say that they are reformists. They are progressive as well, because in 2006 the Labor government announced that interlocks were now in the planning stages. After that progressive thought, I ask my colleagues: what happened then?

Opposition members: Nothing!

Mr BLEIJIE: Again: zero, nil, zilch, nothing. Still progressing—

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: They do not want to hear it. Still progressing, but slower than Slowpoke Rodriguez, in 2007 the Labor government announced that it was now working on the legislation. Again, nothing happened. Slowpoke Rodriguez continued on his merry way and in 2007 announced that the Labor government was now working towards the laws. I ask my colleagues: what happened once they started to work on the laws?

Opposition members: Nothing!

Mr BLEIJIE: That is true; absolutely nothing. But Slowpoke Rodriguez had a cousin, Speedy Gonzales—our very own shadow minister for transport. In 2009, the shadow minister introduced a private member's bill that included in it the introduction of the alcohol interlocks. Now, in 2010, following the leadership of the shadow minister and the LNP, the Labor government finally introduced its own legislation—which, I might add, largely copies those provisions that are contained in the LNP bill. Speedy Gonzales was always going to be faster than cousin Slowpoke.

At what cost has this delay been? Twelve thousand of the 29,000 Queenslanders convicted of drink driving are repeat or high-level offenders. It is staggering to believe that it has taken nine years for a government to go from a trial stage to an actual introduction of legislation in this House. I ask the minister: why has there been such a delay? Is it incompetence or is it indecision? Either way, the situation is appalling and the fact that action is finally being initiated only after being prompted by the opposition having to introduce its own legislation enacting the interlocks should be noted on the public record.

I fully support the introduction of alcohol interlocks. To use words to describe those in our communities who drink and drive would be unparliamentary. Once again, Queensland is one of the last states to implement alcohol interlocks as they have already been legislated in Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales and Western Australia. The introduction of interlocks could have been legislated some eight or nine years ago. The government should bear full responsibility for dragging the chain on this issue and not embracing the technology that is available to deter drink drivers from offending and reoffending.

It is a tragic situation when drink driving is the instigator of death or serious injury in any motor vehicle accident. The bill introduced by the opposition serves two purposes: it acts as a deterrent for offenders and repeat offenders and also enforces mandatory rehabilitation and education for all drivers who have an alcohol interlock fitted to their motor vehicle. This process serves to rehabilitate the offenders.

As is often the case, the government's legislation does not have a clear path of consequence and does not serve as a strong enough deterrent. Although it puts the alcohol interlocks in place, the path of consequence needs to be strong and outlined clearly so that those who break the law are aware that, if their behaviour continues, the consequences will be more severe on each occurrence. The LNP's private member's bill has a clearly defined path of consequences for repeat offenders coupled with a mandatory education and rehabilitation program that is an important part of this process. The government's bill does not. Although it finally introduces the alcohol interlocks into Queensland, as is often the case with this government the consequences for repeat offenders are weak and threadbare. As is typical of the Bligh government, it wants to appear to be seen as being tough on crime—and we heard that from the Attorney-General today. But this bill is another example of how it is all spin and no substance.

In summary, I put to the minister that when she adopted the LNP's bill she should have adopted the whole bill, as it is comprehensive and practical. The government's approach is weak in comparison. When it comes to protecting the lives of innocent Queenslanders and reducing the road toll, the punishment should match the severity of the crime, particularly for repeat offenders. In closing, last night I stated before the debate was adjourned that the member for Whitsunday congratulated the minister on this legislation. I submit that the member for Whitsunday should be congratulating the shadow minister and the LNP on forcing this incompetent government to get its act together and finally, after nine years in slow drive, introducing its own bill on this important issue that the LNP and the community have been raising for many years.

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (11.40 am): I rise to make a few comments in relation to the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill introduced by the government and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009 introduced by the honourable shadow minister for transport. The provisions of both bills that deal with interlocks are very similar.

Before moving on to those provisions I will make some comments in relation to the history of the new Queensland driver's licence that is being facilitated by this legislation brought in by the government and the complete and utter incompetence of this government and the transport department under the administration of this government in the introduction of yet another piece of technology.

We had, of course, the complete botched implementation of what is now called the go card. It was promised year in and year out, day in and day out. The then minister would stand up with his hand on his heart and say what a great benefit to Queenslanders this new smart card would be—how it would improve efficiency, how it would make life easier for Queensland public transport users, how it would save money and how it would be introduced in the next couple of months. The next couple of months would pass by and still the card would not be introduced. We all remember that day in January 2008 when the system was to go live and, in fact, all the go card readers around Brisbane completely and utterly failed, leaving commuters stranded at railway and bus stations around the south-east.

Now we have the sequel to the botched implementation of the go card—that is, the driver's licence smart card, a project that was originally announced as a PPP that would not cost the people of Queensland a zac. We would have a card that would have all sorts of information and details on it that would be able to be loaded with credit so that it could be used to buy goods at certain stores. It would be co-branded with a private enterprise supplier and that private enterprise supplier would pay money in order to be involved in the smart licence. It was going to be delivered from various times, from 2006

onwards. Here we are in 2010 and we are still waiting to see what happens with the smart card here in Queensland. We have had discussions about the colours of it, but we have not seen it come through in a usable format. What we are finding out, however, is that the poor old Queensland taxpayer is being hit up again for $85 million worth of development costs.

When this government says that it is managing the economy well and telling Queenslanders what it is doing and asking how it can deliver better services at a cheaper price, the taxpayers of Queensland should understand that a project that should have been delivered three years ago for zero cost when it was announced originally will now be delivered late and for at least $85 million more than they were told it was going to be. How many more people could have been employed with that $85 million? How many hospital beds could have been supplied and how much more road could have been provided for that $85 million that was wasted because of this government's incompetence and its inability to manage its own department?

The history of the smart card in Queensland, like the history of all technology solutions introduced by this government, whether it is this smart card, the go card or the shared services initiative, is a history littered with complete and utter failure paid for by the poor old taxpayers of Queensland as they pay more land tax, fuel tax and electricity fees—just paying more. It is a disgrace and an indication of the incompetence of this government and its ministers.

I turn now to the parts of the bills that deal with interlocks and in particular the bill that was introduced by the shadow transport minister, the member for Maroochydore. This is a well-thought through, well-considered and well-drafted bill. I had some small involvement with the member for Maroochydore in putting it together. This bill responds to the problems that were identified as long ago as 2000-01. When we look at the history of the introduction of interlocks, like other technology solutions such as the smart card, the shared services initiative and the go card, we see a history littered with failure and incompetence.

In February 2006 the Road Safety Summit was held in the old Legislative Council chamber following the increase in the road toll in 2005. One of the recommendations that came out of that summit was that Queensland should impose alcohol interlock conditions. On 22 February 2006, Peter Beattie promised the introduction of mandatory alcohol interlock laws in Queensland. He left government, he left the state and he left the country before alcohol interlocks were even considered. That was over 44 months ago. Labor has dithered, its inaction speaking louder than its words.

One per cent of people whose breath is tested for alcohol are found to be drink driving. In 2006, 91 deaths in Queensland resulted from drink driving. That figure equates to 27 per cent of the road toll for that year. As a result, I think we can say that a quarter of the fatalities on our roads are being caused by those repeat drink drivers. That information has been around for a long time. Still the government dithered. For far too long the government failed to act on its own slogan that enough is enough.

The National Road Safety Action Plan 2001-02 lists alcohol interlocks as a recommended countermeasure against drink driving. Alcohol interlock regimes were introduced in South Australia in 2001, in Victoria in 2002 and in New South Wales in 2003. That was years and years and years ago. Unfortunately, this government still dithers in terms of delivering these outcomes.

In addition to the Road Safety Summit we also had recommendations made by the Travelsafe Committee. We have evidence from programs overseas that have been around for a long time. From 1993 to 1995 in Maryland in the United States they compared the results of drink-driving offenders who had vehicles that had been fitted with interlocks with those who had not. Those in the interlock group were found to have a 60 per cent lower risk of alcohol related traffic recidivism during the one-year program. That is going back now more than 15 years.

In 2005, New Mexico became the first state in the US to require all drink-driving offenders to install an alcohol interlock—that is, all of them. Preliminary results showed that interlocks reduced recidivism by 62 per cent amongst first-time offenders. The study found that the program brought about benefits of approximately $4 to $6 for every $1 spent and that 85 per cent of offenders—that is, those who had the alcohol interlocks fitted to their vehicles—thought the program was fair.

Another study in the late 1960s in Alberta, Canada—we know that the minister is very fond of the Canadian model—used a group of 818 repeat drink-driving offenders. Interlocks were installed for a period of two years. The study concluded that the expected effect of alcohol interlocks being installed ranged from a 28 to a 65 per cent reduction in offences. The long-term effects of interlocks could be clearly observed and calculated.

Queensland's own road safety experts at the Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety in Queensland—CARRS-Q—claimed that it is accepted amongst the road safety professionals that an interlock device is an effective tool in preventing drink driving involving vehicles that have it installed. The Australian Drug Foundation describes interlocks as a useful and practical harm-reduction strategy.

Despite all this evidence going back almost two decades, this Labor government was mystified and unable to appreciate the benefits of alcohol interlocks and the valuable addition they make to road safety. The solutions were available. While this government cried poor with its hand on its heart, people were dying because it was incompetent and unable to introduce alcohol interlocks.

A small voluntary trial was conducted in Queensland from 2001 to 2003. It must have had some results because the then minister, the member for Lytton, who as I have indicated previously is pretty good at making announcements but very poor at following them through, announced that the government was considering alcohol ignition interlock devices. In November 2006 Minister Lucas claimed—

We're working towards legislation for repeat high-end drink drivers.

In July 2007 the minister bragged about our 'mandatory licensing for repeat high-level drink drivers'. They were empty, hollow words not followed up by any action. It seems that to this government alcohol interlocks were merely a subject of perpetual curiosity and boastful empty promises. Real action was far too long in coming forward.

In light of all of those trials and in light of all that evidence, it remained up to the opposition to provide the impetus for the introduction of something that can do measurable good in reducing drink driving and road fatalities in Queensland. That is what the bill introduced by the shadow transport minister last November does. It aims to improve road safety by targeting the hard-core minority—the one per cent of so of people with serious behavioural problems in relation to whom traditional legal sanctions, such as fines and disqualification, have shown to be ineffective. It is modelled strongly upon the Victorian and New South Wales models and contains recommendations from the Travelsafe report No. 46. It takes from those jurisdictions that have successfully implemented alcohol interlocks. The bill targets recidivist, high-level drink-driving offenders.

There are differences between the government's bill and the opposition's bill. Some of those differences are substantial, the most particular being the fact that there is a greater discretion for the imposition of penalties in the opposition private member's bill where the power to impose alcohol interlocks is left to the court's discretion in the first instance for high-level—that is, over .15—BAC offenders. The term of the interlock order is for one to four years under the opposition's bill, as opposed to one to two years under the government's bill. So there is a greater range of penalties to suit, if you like, the offences that are being committed under the opposition's bill, allowing the courts greater discretion in terms of imposing alcohol interlocks.

The other interesting thing to note is that in terms of alcohol interlocks it is not just fitting the device that is important. In fact, all of the studies seem to recommend and to show that education and rehabilitation is as important as fitting the interlock device because the problems of recidivist drink drivers are that they are unable to separate their drinking activities from their other normal activities, one of which is driving. They do not understand that they have to make a difference between drinking and their other activities. Oftentimes their problem is a drinking problem and they are unaware of it and are unable to address that issue.

Education is an important component of any activity. So you have the punishment, if you like; you have the deterrent with the alcohol interlock; and then you have to have the educative and rehabilitative function as well. It is not a matter of being tough or soft on whatever is happening; it is a matter of being effective. The reports all show that the most effective way of dealing with recidivist drink drivers—those who continue to repeat the offence of drink driving—is to educate them to the dangers of what they are doing and to give them the strategies to be able to separate their drinking behaviour from their other behaviours and hopefully to alleviate them of those drinking problems.

A surprisingly high proportion of the drink drivers have alcohol abuse problems. According to the studies quoted in the Travelsafe report, approximately 60 per cent of those convicted drink drivers in Sweden, and 70 per cent in the United States, are alcohol dependent. Approximately a quarter of people convicted of drink driving are expected to reoffend.

The bill introduced by the member for Maroochydore contains provisions for the education and rehabilitation of problem drink drivers based on the recommendations contained in the Travelsafe report, and it is a two-tiered report. Section 91J of the opposition bill provides that offenders must, at their own expense, undergo a consultation with a medical practitioner for the purpose of discussing or giving brief advice to the offender about the risks of excessive alcohol consumption. This is based on both recommendation 4 of the Travelsafe report and the successful Drink-less Program run in New South Wales.

Recidivist high-limit drink drivers who are caught—and this relates to section 91K of the opposition's bill—must, at their own expense, participate in an approved drink driving rehabilitation course. They must do more than just go to see the doctor and get some advice; they actually have to participate in a course. Currently, CARRS-Q runs the drink driving prevention and rehabilitation program

called Under the Limit. The program consists of 11 weekly sessions of 1½ hours taught in local TAFE colleges and costs $750. This package educates problem drink drivers about controlled drinking, rather than abstinence, and separating drinking from driving. Over 80 per cent of offenders successfully complete the course, and the CARRS-Q evaluation showed that the program was able to decrease the drink driving behaviour for the most serious offenders—those recidivist and high-alcohol limit offenders. The evaluation also concluded that an effective approach to combating problem drink driving should incorporate both rehabilitation and alcohol interlocks, and that is exactly the approach that has been adopted by the opposition's bill.

The opposition's bill is a comprehensive approach to the problem of recidivist drink drivers. It was introduced in response to the lack of action by the government—by its failure to act on its own reports, by the failure to honour its own promises, by its failure to take care of Queenslanders on the road. It is a pity that this government has taken so long to act on something which so clearly would be able to offer great benefits. The shadow minister has indicated some changes to some parts of the government's bill that will be sought during consideration in detail and also some parts that we will oppose. But the thrust of the alcohol interlocks bill is supported, I am sure, by both sides of the House. It is a pity, however, that it has taken so long for the government to come to this conclusion. It is a pity that so many Queenslanders have had to pay with their lives in the meantime.

Mr McARDLE (Caloundra—LNP) (11.55 am): I rise to say a few words in this cognate debate but only in relation to the alcohol interlock issue. I also join with other members of the opposition in saying to government members that, although they claim that the accolade and the cheer should go to the minister, it is without doubt the shadow minister who has pushed this debate to the fore, who has made the debate real and who has pushed the government into making a determination to put together a bill that mirrors the opposition's bill in most details.

So why has the government been forced into a cognate debate on what should have been a very simple and straightforward initiative of alcohol interlocks and the saving of lives of Queenslanders, of those who use the roads and of those in vehicles who are on the road? It comes down to one point: the government is lazy—stone motherless lazy. It has run out of ideas. The government is bereft of any idea as to how to assist or save the people of Queensland or to provide safe road usage or safe vehicle usage for them and to protect people either as drivers or as passengers. It comes down to a government that is simply bereft of any idea. It is incompetent. The arrogance that is coming from the government benches is simply wafting across and has been picked up by the people of Queensland, as has their level of incompetence. At the end of the day, the delay in this bill going through may well have cost the lives of a number of Queenslanders, a number of people who would not have died except for the fact that this government delayed taking the initial action to protect the Queenslanders whom the government is in fact charged to assist.

The other point is that it is incomprehensible that the resources available to a government here in Queensland—the magnitude of the resources, the manpower, the technology, the funding that is available to a minister, let alone the whole government—have been put to use between 2001 and 2009 to produce a bill that simply does one thing: it saves Queenslanders' lives. Why? Between 2001 and 2009, after all the issues that were raised, after all the testing that was done, after all the statements that were made, why weren't the resources of a government put to use to ensure that this bill became reality and that people across this state were at less risk of being killed by a drink driver? Again, it comes down to very clearly one point: the government is lazy. It is lazy and it is out of touch. The government should have been attuned to the needs of Queenslanders and to the increasing road deaths that occurred over the last three to four years.

We know that, in the eight years prior to June 2009, 600 people were killed on our roads and, in the 12 months prior to 30 June 2009, 84 people died in accidents involving a driver who had a blood alcohol over the legal limit. I would have thought that in that time the alarm bells would have gone off to ensure that this bill would have hit the parliament a long time ago, but it did not. The question has to be posed: how many Queenslanders have died by way of the incompetence of this government? How many Queensland families are now having to deal with the loss of a loved one? Or how many Queensland families are now having to deal with a loved one serving time in jail because this interlock device was not put in place earlier? In 2009, 29,000 Queenslanders were convicted of drink driving—12,000 were repeat, high-level offenders who would have fallen potentially into the sphere of an interlock being placed on their motor vehicle. How many people between 2001 and 2009 would have been kept off our roads? How many Queenslanders' lives would have been saved if this bill had been introduced well before 10 March 2010?

It was only through the prompting of the shadow minister, who introduced her bill on 11 November 2009, that the government suddenly woke up to the idea that it had again been dragging the chain. Government members had to be dragged into the chamber, but they wanted to ensure that they got the accolades as opposed to supporting the shadow minister's bill back in November last year. If they had supported our bill, more lives could have been saved.

It is not only deaths that have occurred, but the people involved in these motor accidents that occur as a consequence of a drink driver suffer horrendous injuries. The health minister will outline to the House the number of people who present to an ED on Friday, Saturday or Sunday nights with horrendous injuries because they have been involved in a motor vehicle accident caused by a drink driver. Those individuals suffer years of anguish, years of pain and years of suffering. But it is not just those victims who suffer; their families suffer as well because the actions of a drink driver are incalculable.

Significantly, there is a drain on the public health system from treating patients who have suffered an injury as a consequence of a drink driver, and it amounts to tens of thousands of millions of dollars on a yearly basis. That amount could have been reduced significantly if this government had moved earlier to arrest this situation and had put in place legislation that other states and other nations have successfully introduced.

One of the major differences between the LNP bill and the government's bill is that the LNP recognises that a drink driver who is a repeat offender must undertake a rehabilitation and education program. That is part of the process. A person will simply not be punished sufficiently if a fine is imposed on them or if they use an interlock. They have to understand the consequences of their action—that is, if they do it again they could kill someone or they could kill their own family member. That is where the LNP bill is superior to the government's bill. Even though the government discussion paper recommends rehabilitation, the government's bill, as I read it, contains nothing about rehabilitation, and that is an important factor in relation to repeat serious drink-driving offenders.

At the end of the day, it comes down to the point that the LNP by the actions of the shadow transport minister has had to drag this government kicking and screaming to this parliament. She should receive the accolades for what she has done in highlighting the deficiencies in this government—a government which did not take action, despite repeating that it would, and which has cost the lives of Queenslanders, which has caused anguish as a result, which has cost the public health system financially and, more importantly, which has cost the community as a whole across this state. The LNP bill should be supported by every member of this House as it is superior and deals with the issues on a more effective and efficient basis.

Ms DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (12.03 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate on the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010, which was brought into the House by the Minister for Transport on 10 March this year, and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill, which was introduced by the member for Maroochydore on 11 November last year. As the shadow minister indicated in her contribution, the LNP will be largely supporting the government's bill. However, we will be moving some amendments with regard to improving alcohol provisions and we will be opposing two sections—one with regard to smart licences and the other with regard to the removal from the parliament's purview of the reference to MARPOL.

The government's bill amends 14 pieces of legislation and, amongst other things, provides for the introduction of alcohol ignition interlock devices, removes the current distinction made between younger and older licence holders in relation to the permissible level of alcohol concentration in their breath or blood, facilitates the introduction of digital speed and red-light cameras in Queensland and prepares for the introduction of the new Queensland drivers' licences.

In general, motorists are very well aware of the dangers associated with driving under the influence of alcohol, but there are examples where motorists disregard these risks and choose to drive regardless of their own safety or that of other road users. We need to have strategies to deal appropriately with these individuals, because the community rightly expects that those recidivist drink drivers will be appropriately dealt with and that in future these individuals will think twice before turning over their car ignition. If these individuals are not going to think twice, then the appropriate remedy is to act and to place a barrier to ensure they cannot harm themselves or others. That is what both bills seek to do at their simplest levels—that is, to impose structures and processes so that barriers can be erected to ensure those who should not be driving are not driving.

There are too many drivers who think drink driving is an acceptable practice, and I note the statistics in the second reading speech that showed that, in the 12 months to 30 June 2008, more than 29,000 Queenslanders were convicted of drink driving and 12,000 of those were repeat offenders or high-end offenders—that is, with a blood alcohol concentration of .15 or above. Sadly, around 4,000 drink drivers were caught for the third time. That is totally unacceptable, and it is a further sad statistic that many of these offenders contributed to 81 deaths on Queensland roads, or 23 per cent of all road fatalities.

I would like to direct my next comments to the part of the bill which deals with alcohol ignition interlocks. By definition, an alcohol ignition interlock is an electronic breath-testing device connected to the ignition, electrical and other systems of a motor vehicle that measures the blood alcohol content of the potential driver. The vehicle will not start unless the driver passes a breath test. These flexible devices can be programmed to monitor differing levels of BAC and are enabled with various circumvention safeguards. Interlocks are being used across a number of jurisdictions here in Australia and overseas with success, and are generally part of a suite of initiatives to combat drink driving.

The use of interlock devices is widely supported by the general community, and in a recent survey by RACQ 84 per cent of members thought it a good idea to place interlocks into all new cars. Whilst this legislation does not seek to introduce such a widespread scheme, I am sure there is just as much, if not more, support for alcohol interlocks to be installed into the vehicles of known drink drivers. I see from the explanatory notes that the introduction of interlock devices seeks to curb—

Those drivers who commit high-level drink driving offences or who commit repeat drink driving offences have demonstrated an inability to separate the activities of drinking and driving. Alcohol ignition interlocks will play an important role in establishing this separation in their lives.

I could not agree more, but it is a crying shame that it has taken the government so long to realise that this separation needs to occur. It is also a shame that the government had to be dragged kicking and screaming to introduce interlock devices into Queensland after a decade's worth of community support, trials, evidence and announcements in these areas—and, of course, in hot response to the member for Maroochydore's private member's bill.

There was a small alcohol ignition interlocks trial in February 2001 which operated until 2003 in South-East Queensland. This trial was led by the QUT's Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety, and it found that interlocks have the potential to reduce re-offending rates as well as produce a positive impact on other key trial outcomes—that being to decrease levels of drinking. During this inquiry, a Road Safety Summit was facilitated and then Premier Peter Beattie announced interlocks would be fitted to vehicles after a second drink-driving offence blowing more than .15 blood alcohol content before the offender regains his or her licence.

In 2006 we saw the Travelsafe *Getting tough on drink drivers* report made a number of recommendations regarding the effectiveness of drink driving reduction methods, including the provision for the courts to require persons convicted of drink-driving offences, and who are given a restricted licence, or repeat drink drivers returning to driving, to fit alcohol ignition interlocks to their vehicles. Again, there was further talk but little action when the then Minister for Transport announced in the 2006-07 budget that the government was working towards legislation to introduce alcohol interlocks for repeat high-end drink drivers. Again in 2007, the then police minister stated that the Minister for Transport was working on laws for interlocks for repeat high-end drink drivers. For just on a decade now, the government has been talking about interlocks but has been doing very little to actually get these important safety devices into the cars of offenders.

Let there be no confusion: contrary to the minister's comments from yesterday, it is as a direct result of the introduction of the private member's bill that the government has stopped paying lip-service to this issue and has brought its legislation forward. Otherwise, government members would still be talking about doing something. The LNP bill—the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009—seeks to improve road safety by introducing various preventative measures to curb problematic drink driving. The bill establishes a regime of alcohol interlocks combined with drink driving education and rehabilitation. More specifically, the bill does the following: it requires the installation of an alcohol interlock on the second offence within five years where the driver's first conviction was a high-level offence; it allows the fitting of an alcohol interlock where the driver is convicted over .15; it allows the fitting of an alcohol interlock where it is the second offence between .05 and .15; and, importantly, it provides for a 'three strikes and you're out' deterrent, where if a driver is caught over .15 three times within five years they will be disqualified from holding a Queensland driver's licence absolutely. This last provision is vitally important as, tragically, there are some drivers who would not be put off by any of the other measures contained in the bill.

Suppliers indicate that the cost of installation for interlocks would be $150 a month or about $5 per day. Courts can make rulings about cost, and in some hardship cases the judge may take into account the fine paid by the offender. In addition, this bill allows the courts to order that the relevant motor vehicle be immobilised, for example, by wheel clamps. In my opinion, to protect the community from potential harm, our justice system needs to balance deterrence, punishment and rehabilitation, and I am very pleased to say that the LNP's legislation compels a driver under an interlock order to undergo compulsory rehabilitation and education. These practical measures as outlined by the LNP will give the community more confidence that our roads would be a safer place for drivers, passengers and pedestrians.

I would like to touch briefly on other aspects of the government's bill. I am glad to see that the amendments will extend the no-alcohol limit to all learner, provisional and probationary drivers irrespective of age. The consumption of alcohol for any driver can be a recipe for disaster, and potentially increased risks exist when the driver is also inexperienced. Novice drivers need to hone their on-road driving skills and should not do so under the influence of alcohol—at any blood concentration level.

As a mother of two sons aged 22 and 24 and a daughter who has only within the last month become a licensed P-plater, I have had the 'don't drink and drive' discussion with my children. As a parent, I think it is essential to speak to your children about the dangers, stupidity and devastation that can come of drink driving. I can only hope that through our conversations they understand the importance of remaining fully alert and in control of themselves and therefore the vehicle at all times.

In relation to digital speed and red-light cameras, I see from the explanatory notes that this legislation is designed to facilitate the expansion of the Camera Detected Offence Program through the deployment of digital technology and the introduction of new enforcement techniques such as combined red-light and speed cameras and point-to-point speed cameras. I understand these changes are to improve efficiency and effectiveness by providing a greater range of options for infringement detection. I note that the Economic Development Committee, of which I am a member, is to report on the placement, effectiveness, and efficiency of new and existing fixed speed camera technology. I hope that through this legislation and the report of the committee we are further able to reduce the road toll and general safety of the driving public.

The Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill also has provisions that prepare Queensland for the introduction of the new Queensland drivers' licences including allowing for two or more licences to be included on one smart licence such as drivers' licences, proof-of-age cards, tow truck licences, marine licences and passenger transport licences. It is fair to say that the introduction of the smart licence system has been an issue that has been dragging on and on, and I have fielded many calls in my electorate office in relation to the delays in the introduction of this system. Smart licences have been six years in the planning and it is expected to take another five before the rollout is totally complete. Queenslanders deserve certainty regarding their driver's licence, but because of the lack of information provided by the government surrounding this particular part of the legislation I will not be supporting this section. There are a great many concerns regarding privacy protection mechanisms, and I have not been satisfied that these important issues have been addressed.

In conclusion, I support the thrust of the bills. In particular, any measure that reduces road fatalities is to be supported. Thirty years ago I lost a school friend when a selfish, unthinking individual felt he could handle that one extra drink and got behind the wheel of his car, misjudged a corner, crossed the road and killed my friend and her parents, leaving behind her twin brother and an older sister to just get on with their lives. Let Ann's death not be in vain. With that in mind and with consideration to the amendments as proposed by the shadow minister, I commend the bills to the House.

Mr WENDT (Ipswich West—ALP) (12.14 pm): I rise today in support of the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010. Specifically, I would like to discuss the value of this minister's plan to include speed and red-light activated digital camera technology. There is a considerable body of research and evidence that demonstrates the increased risk of a crash occurring when a vehicle is speeding. As a result, it makes sense that speed management should be recognised in Queensland, in Australia and around the world as a significant issue which can always be better managed to improve road safety.

During the period 1 December 2008 to 30 November 2009, there were 77 fatalities recorded which could be directly attributed to crashes involving speeding drivers or riders within Queensland. Unfortunately, this represents about 23 per cent of the Queensland road toll and is nothing short of deplorable. With this in mind, the Queensland government developed the Camera Detected Offence Program as a joint partnership between the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the Queensland Police Service to incorporate mobile and fixed speed cameras and red-light cameras. Since its introduction in the mid-1990s, the Camera Detected Offence Program has become a significant road safety initiative with a proven record of reducing speed and red-light related crashes.

The most recent evaluation of the mobile speed camera program completed by the Monash University Accident Research Centre in 2009 estimated that this program was effective in preventing 2,863 serious casualty crashes which it estimated had resulted in approximately $1.6 billion in social cost savings for Queenslanders. However, as you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Camera Detected Offence Program also has other positives which include things such as photographic detection devices to provide evidence of unregistered and uninsured vehicle offences in conjunction with speed and red-light offences. It is considered that this current legislation before the House will facilitate the expansion of the Camera Detected Offence Program through the inclusion of new cameras incorporating digital technology and the introduction of new enforcement techniques such as combining red-light and speed cameras and an evidentiary certificate for an average speed offence from point-to-point speed cameras.

As you would know as well, Mr Deputy Speaker, in the present situation photographic detection devices used in the Camera Detected Offence Program rely on the traditional wet film technology to capture images. With the arrival of the digital camera technology, wet film cameras and consumables will be gradually phased out. I can advise from experience that the use of new and different enforcement technologies will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this program, and that it will provide a greater range of camera solutions consistent with recognised best practice with the aim of achieving greater road safety benefits.

Following on from this, the combined red-light speed cameras are able to detect either a red-light offence, a speed offence or simultaneously detect a red-light and a speed offence. As we all know, speed is often recognised as one of the contributors to red-light offences occurring, as some vehicles speed to get through an intersection and, as such, the addition of the speed detection ability will provide another disincentive to motorists considering breaking the law in this dangerous manner.

If we turn our attention to point-to-point cameras, many would be aware that they are specifically good for monitoring vehicles travelling along a length of road rather than a single point. I am advised that they have proven to be extremely successful in a number of European countries including the Netherlands, England, Scotland, Ireland, Italy and Austria in reducing crashes and vehicle speeds. For example, in Italy a significant reduction in average speed of 15 per cent was reported during the first 12 months of operation, while in the Kaisermühlen tunnel in Austria it was reported that, on average, speed in the tunnel was reduced immediately from 85 kilometres an hour to 70 kilometres an hour and that since then it has plateaued to 75 kilometres an hour after six months of implementation.

A point-to-point system can be operated over any length of road. For example, in Victoria a 54-kilometre stretch of the Hume Highway is enforced using a number of point-to-point cameras with lengths varying from three to 13 kilometres between the cameras. However, the use of digital camera technology in these ways will also enable us to detect unregistered and uninsured vehicles before an initial speed or red-light offence is committed. As a result, this should expedite the removal of these vehicles from our highways, thus ensuring that the vehicles on our roads and all other road users are using Queensland roads fairly through the payment of registration and compulsory third-party insurance.

Finally, this legislation will also clarify and improve the evidentiary provisions relating to camera detected offences and provide for a more streamlined court process. As such, I think we will find that this legislation is all about improving the safety of all users of Queensland roads and is not about revenue raising. In my book, any motorist who receives a speeding or red-light fine following this legislation has basically chosen to do so.

However, I think it is also important to point out that unlike many other states and territories in Australia, in Queensland all money raised from the Camera Detected Offence Program, after administration and running costs are deducted, will be reinvested into improving road safety and improving the outcome of road crashes. This government is unapologetic about improving the unacceptable consequences of road crashes because everyone has a right to travel in the safest environment possible on our roads and reducing the number of people who continue to speed and put their lives and the lives of other road users at risk. The government is taking another step forward in reducing the road toll. I congratulate the minister on this initiative.

Ms STONE (Springwood—ALP) (12.19 pm): I rise in support of the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 and to speak in this cognate debate before the House. Drink driving continues to be a major cause of fatalities and serious injuries on Queensland roads. In fact, the percentage of all road fatalities that were a result of crashes involving drink drivers has risen. The number of drink-driving offences detected per year also continues to increase.

During the period from 2001-02 to 2007-08, drink-driving offences increased by 25.5 per cent while the growth in the number of recorded licences increased by 21 per cent from June 2001 to June 2008. Over 32,000 drink-driving offences were detected in Queensland in the 2007-08 financial year. Some 29,909 were committed by drink drivers. Some 21,877 drink drivers or 73 per cent were either first-time offenders or no drink-driving offenders in the previous five years. Of these 21,877 drink drivers, 80.4 per cent or 17,586 were first-time drink-driving offenders and had a blood/breath alcohol concentration, BAC, less than or equal to .149. Some 4,291 or one in five or 19.6 per cent of first-time drink-driving offenders had a BAC equal to or greater than .15. The remaining 8,032 drink drivers or 26.9 per cent are repeat offenders with one or more prior offences in the previous five years. These are indeed worrying figures. Research also shows that there is a clear relationship between the person's BAC level and their crash risk. In fact, the risk rises steeply at the higher levels of intoxication.

So what have governments done to reduce the number of drink drivers and the risk of fatal crashes by intoxicated drivers? Governments have lowered the legal alcohol limits; had mass media and education campaigns and skipper or designated driver programs; introduced RBTs, 24-hour licence suspensions, immediate licence suspensions and penalties including licence disqualifications, fines and imprisonment; introduced cumulative disqualifications; introduced offender education programs; and introduced vehicle impoundments. It is obvious from the figures I mentioned earlier that this is still not enough and more needs to be done.

Social marketing campaigns are used for road safety education. They attempt to tackle the behaviour of drivers and will only achieve success over a long period and yet this is still not enough. Road safety research shows that public education campaigns work better at producing behavioural change when complemented with enforcement. It is also recognised that long-term behavioural change can only be sustained with the combination of public education, enforcement and engineering improvements.

The Criminal Code Act 1899 provides a penalty regime, including terms of imprisonment for offenders who are charged with serious offences such as the dangerous operation of a vehicle. I am very pleased to see that severe impairment by alcohol as an intoxicating substance may be the aggravating circumstance leading to the dangerous operation of a vehicle causing the death of or the grievous bodily harm of another person. A magistrate may sentence a driver to imprisonment for a maximum of 10 to 14 years. Even with all these programs and penalties and all this education I have just listed, the number of drink-driving offences continues to increase.

In 1995 licensed venues were banned from advertising drink specials but the same rules do not apply to bottle shops. Every day around Australia our newspapers are full of advertisements like the one I am holding that is from the *Albert-Logan News*. When a pub or club advertises three pots for the price of two or a $5 jug we call that the promotion of irresponsible drinking, and we have banned this type of advertising. Yet this advertisement has three bottles of wine for $20 and a lot of other promotions but apparently that is not promoting irresponsible drinking. I ask members to think about this.

VicHealth Chief Executive Officer, Todd Harper, spent eight years promoting a successful campaign to squeeze the tobacco industry with bans and restrictions. He says that there are lessons to be learnt from tobacco but there are a few differences. Unlike alcohol, any amount of tobacco is harmful but the impact of binge drinking is much more immediate. Someone who smokes a packet of cigarettes today will not be facing the health problems tomorrow. Someone who sculls a sixpack now exposes themself to immediate accident and injury. He said this in 2008. On 16 March 2010, Mark Furler wrote in the *Sunshine Coast Daily*—

Reducing the number of outlets selling alcohol would have a far more significant impact on cutting our road toll than dropping the limit to .02%.

In the past few years, the number of liquor outlets on the Coast—and many other regions across Queensland—has soared.

That is exactly right. But this is happening not just in Queensland but all over Australia. The article continues—

Last week Dr Alex Wodak, director of the Alcohol and Drug Service at St Vincent's Hospital, Sydney, said, 'We should also be putting more emphasis on cutting back on the availability of our favourite drug.

Of course he is referring to alcohol. It continues—

There are too many outlets and the outlets have too liberal conditions.

We can stand in this place and comment on measures to reduce drink driving but the reality is that it starts long before the driver gets into the car. I would be interested to know whether there has been any research done in this area. Where do drink drivers get their alcohol? Are they drinking at home? Does the advertising of discounted liquor have an effect on why they drink and drive? Do they just drive to the pub or club, drink too much and then drive home or somewhere else? I would like to see whether any research has been done in this area. I believe we should be looking at this sort of research as well as continuing to put into place road safety measures like alcohol ignition interlocks.

The federal government has finished the National Preventative Health Strategy. I recommend members have a look at the actions it recommends. In particular 1.6 establishes the public interest case to exempt liquor control legislation from the requirements of National Competition Policy. In the report it states—

The results of this research are clear: liberalising alcohol availability is likely to increase alcohol-related problems.

That means drink driving. It continues—

The results certainly call into question the general assumption behind actions in recent decades that have been made in accordance with National Competition Policy such as the state-led liberalisation of liquor licensing regimes—that the number of a type of outlet should be determined by market demand for the product, without consideration of community amenity or impacts.

I go back to the advertisement in the *Albert-Logan News.* I put on the record that I have spoken to the editor, Mr Ray Goodey, about the matter I am about to raise. Every day we have newspapers running stories on stopping drink driving and reducing deaths on our roads and yet in the same newspapers on page after page after page there are discounted liquor advertisements. In this example we have a liquor outlet advertising and right next to it is an article titled 'Sobering condition' written by Daniel Tang. This is what the bill we are talking about today is all about. The bill is about alcohol ignition interlocks. It speaks about problem drink driving. I say that that is a very mixed message. If I were the family member of someone who had been killed by a drunk driver it would not be hard to be very offended by something like this.

I say to the media that they too need to play a part in this very serious problem. While I understand the value of the advertising dollar, perhaps more consideration could be given to the layout of these advertisements given there are articles on drink driving or alcohol related crimes in the same newspapers. I will be asking the federal government to consider this when examining action 3.1 of its preventative health strategy which is to consider whether there is a need for additional measures to address alcohol advertising and promotion across other media sources.

Crash and offence data clearly shows that more needs to be done to stop drink driving. The interlock program targets high-risk drink drivers. Therefore, I support the introduction of alcohol ignition interlocks in Queensland. They will certainly complement the existing measures aimed at reducing drink driving. Some 600 people have been killed as a result of crashes involving drink drivers in the eight years to June 2009. One life lost is one too many. Six hundred deaths defies description. It is obvious that people are not getting the message and this has to change.

The primary purpose of an interlock is to prevent a person under the influence of alcohol from driving and, in doing so, protect people on our roads. An alcohol ignition interlock incorporates a breath testing device that accurately measures the alcohol present in a driver's breath. It is connected to the ignition of a vehicle and the driver is required to provide a breath sample every time an attempt is made to start the vehicle. If alcohol is detected the vehicle will not start. Interlocks effectively separate drinking and driving. While installed, interlocks are more effective in preventing further offences and alcohol related crashes than traditional sanctions such fines and licence disqualifications.

Research studies on a number of similar interlock programs in operation internationally indicate that while the interlock is installed the average reduction of reoffending is 73 per cent. The interlock program we propose is based on research and best practice adopted internationally and in other Australian jurisdictions. High-risk drink drivers must have an interlock condition. Specifically, it will apply to drivers convicted of the following offences: driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of liquor, and this includes those drivers over the high-alcohol limit with a BAC of .15 or more; failing to provide a specimen of breath or blood for analysis; operating a motor vehicle dangerously when adversely affected by alcohol; or a repeat drink-driving offence in five years. These drivers have exhibited dangerous behaviour placing other road users at considerable risk either due to the severity of their behaviour on one occasion or through their persistent behaviour.

The interlock condition will be imposed on these drivers when they return to obtain their licence at the completion of the full licence disqualification period imposed by the court. This will require the person to only drive vehicles fitted with an interlock for at least 12 months. Interlocks provide convicted drink drivers with the opportunity to drive when they are not affected by alcohol, allowing them to maintain work and family commitments. At the same time, the interlocks provide the public with protection from people who have previously demonstrated high-risk drink driving behaviour. Interlocks mean fewer episodes of drink driving, and this means fewer crashes and more lives saved. I commend the government's bill to the House.

Mr WETTENHALL (Barron River—ALP) (12.30 pm): Most members in contributing to this debate have demonstrated that they have little sympathy for people who drive under the influence of liquor and who put other people's lives at risk, and I share those views. In the 12 months to 30 June 2008, 29,000 people were convicted of drink-driving offences in Queensland and 12,000 of those were repeat offenders who had a blood alcohol concentration higher than .15. Not only do drink drivers put lives at risk; they kill people. Between July 2001 and June 2009, 609 people died in Queensland in crashes involving drink drivers. In 2009 there were 71 alcohol related road fatalities—21½ per cent of the entire 2009 road toll. That is an appalling and avoidable loss of life. Thousands more are hospitalised, many with catastrophic and life-changing injuries.

In Cairns drink driving is a major problem. Drink driving was identified as a major concern at last year's regional road safety summit in Cairns which I convened. In research that was commissioned for that summit, 31 per cent of respondents in a random survey and 15 per cent in a community consultation nominated drink driving second only to speeding as their major concern in relation to road safety. At the time of the summit, conducted in November 2009, 12,796 random breath tests were conducted in the Cairns, Innisfail and Mareeba police districts. By 30 June 2009, the first six months of that year, 1,517 drink-driving convictions were recorded in the region. In fact, in Far North Queensland 36 repeat drink drivers were apprehended in 2007, 50 in 2008 and 32 in the period from January to November 2009. Between January and June 2009 in Far North Queensland there were four fatalities involving drink drivers or riders, representing at that time 17 per cent of the region's road toll for 2009. In the same period for the whole of Queensland there were 37 fatalities involving drink drivers or riders, representing 21 per cent of the road toll. On average, drink drivers tend to be involved in approximately a quarter of fatal crashes on Queensland roads.

No-one who drives a car with a blood alcohol concentration of .15 or higher can claim with any credibility at all that they did so without being aware they were intoxicated. Research indicates that crash risk rises exponentially with increased breath and blood alcohol concentration. Drivers and motorcyclists have twice the risk of a serious crash with a BAC of .05 than at zero, and the risk rises steeply at higher levels of intoxication. No-one who drink-drives at any level after having been previously convicted of a drink-driving offence can claim with credibility that they are not aware of the risks to others and themselves of drink driving and the legal consequences to themselves of doing so. The carnage, trauma and tragedy of road crashes demands the constant attention of government to trial and introduce new measures to improve road safety, and the introduction of alcohol interlock devices is one further step in the evolution of our road safety system.

The bill establishes an administrative scheme that will impose an alcohol interlock licence condition following a period of disqualification associated with convictions for driving with a blood alcohol concentration of .15 or higher, failing to supply a specimen of breath and certain other drink-driving offences, and for repeat offenders. The interlock condition will state that the person may only drive a vehicle fitted with an interlock device to a nominated vehicle or vehicles, and this feature of the bill will allow work vehicles to be nominated, and the condition will remain on the licence for 12 months. Tough penalties will apply to persons who are subject to an interlock condition who drive a vehicle not fitted with a device or who tamper with the device, including extending the period of the interlock condition. All interlock drivers will be subject to a zero-alcohol limit.

Exemptions will be available to persons in rural and remote areas who cannot practically access an interlock installer, for medical reasons or in circumstances of hardship. There will be a fee charged to have the interlock condition imposed and there will be substantial costs involved in having the interlock device installed. It is quite reasonable that drink drivers will pay the price for their past behaviour and to enjoy the privilege of being a licensed driver in Queensland. The bill also extends the zero-alcohol limit to all learner, provisional, probationary and unlicensed drivers regardless of age and to all motorcycle riders for the first 12 months of holding a motorcycle licence.

The bill also brings important changes to the law regarding heavy vehicles. In Far North Queensland between January and September 2009 there were five fatalities as a result of crashes involving heavy freight vehicles. Over the same period state-wide, there were 45 fatalities as a result of crashes involving heavy freight vehicles. Reforms in the bill are designed to reduce pressure on drivers to speed to meet unrealistic or, indeed, impossible delivery deadlines and to reduce the number of road crashes involving heavy vehicles. In conclusion, I commend the minister for introducing these important reforms and acknowledge her departmental officials, who are dedicated to making our roads safer for all who use them.

Mrs SULLIVAN (Pumicestone—ALP) (12.37 pm): I rise in support of the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010. This government is serious about reducing the road toll and protecting people on our roads. Statistics show that too many people are killed or maimed on the roads, and the cost to the ambulance officers, fire officers, medical staff and other hospital resources is staggering. Of the $18 million that this state government spends every day on public health, one has to wonder how much could be saved if there were not these statistics. I therefore support the introduction of alcohol ignition interlocks in Queensland for high-risk drink drivers and the extension of the no-alcohol limit to a broader range of drivers.

The government does not support the interlock program outlined in the private member's Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill. Instead, the government has prepared its own amendments to introduce interlocks and more effectively tackle the continuing drink-driving problem. The private member's bill proposes what has been termed a 'three strikes and you're out' policy. This would mean that a person convicted three times in five years for a drink-driving offence with a blood alcohol concentration greater than or equal to .15 would be disqualified absolutely from holding a Queensland driver's licence. The person would only be able to apply for the removal of the disqualification after five years. This would apply to fewer than 250 people per year and would fail to capture the majority of high-end drink drivers in Queensland—the very group we are targeting in our initiative.

The government does not support this proposal for a number of reasons. Firstly, the current penalties for such offences are considered sufficient. Currently, a person convicted three or more times within a five-year period of a drink-driving offence with a blood alcohol concentration greater than or equal to .15 faces a fine of up to $6,000 or can be imprisoned for up to 18 months. Imprisonment must be imposed as the whole or part of the punishment. In addition, the court must disqualify the person for a minimum of two years. The current offences are tough, especially when imposed in combination with the government's bill, which would also subject such offenders to an interlock condition.

Secondly, disqualifying drink drivers for a very long time is not going to help solve the drink-driving problem. It is likely—and it has been proven in the past—that these people will continue to drive regardless. Imposing an interlock is much better than disqualifying these drivers for an extended period, as it encourages drivers to separate drinking from driving. In addition, interlocks have proven to be significantly more effective than licence disqualification in reducing the commission of further offences and alcohol related crashes.

Unfortunately, we have a disqualified driving problem among drink drivers in Queensland. Drink drivers involved in a crash where a person is killed or hospitalised are much more likely to be disqualified than those who were not drink drivers. A longer period of disqualification, as proposed in the private member's bill, will only add to this problem.

The private member's bill also proposes that drink drivers who have an interlock condition and who drive in breach of that interlock condition may have their vehicle immobilised. The government does not support vehicle immobilisation for those who do not comply with their interlock condition as

Queensland already has a vehicle impoundment and forfeiture program for certain driving offences, such as repeat unlicensed driving and high-level drink driving. Currently, the State Penalties Enforcement Registry is undertaking a 12-month trial of vehicle immobilisation for people with high-value debts who refuse to pay. This trial will provide an opportunity to assess issues associated with the immobilisation before any consideration is given to the broader introduction of vehicle immobilisation. Nevertheless, the government's bill proposes severe penalties for those drivers who do not comply with the interlock condition. These drivers would face a maximum fine of $2,800 and a minimum licence disqualification period of three months.

This government makes no apology for getting tough on drink drivers who continue to flout the law and put other people's safety at risk. Alcohol ignition interlocks will reduce drink driving and save lives. I congratulate the minister and her staff on their efforts in this area and commend the bill to the House.

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (12.41 pm): I rise today to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009. From the outset, I will be supporting the private member's bill introduced by the member for Maroochydore and supporting, with reservations, the government's bill. As the member for Gregory said last night, any legislation that makes our roads safer is good legislation and should be supported.

Rather than list the many amendments contained in this omnibus bill and the private member's bill, I will focus, like others, on the amendments that relate to the alcohol interlocks and those that relate to the proposed new Queensland driver's licence. Although I support the legislation introducing alcohol interlocks, like the member for Maroochydore, I am appalled at the delay. I am appalled, because I know what the cost has been to the community. As the shadow minister identified, the Minister for Transport is well aware of the cost of that delay to the community, too.

The introduction of this legislation has a chequered and lengthy history—a history that began in 2001 when the government undertook a small trial of alcohol interlocks. As the minister stated in the drink driving discussion paper released last week, over 600 people have been killed as a result of crashes involving drink drivers in the eight years prior to 30 June 2009. On average, that figure represents 22.9 per cent of all road fatalities in Queensland over that period. In the 12 months prior to 30 June 2009 alone, 84 people were killed in crashes that involved a driver over their legal alcohol limit. I will repeat that quote—and I know others have read it before—because I find it simply horrifying: while this government has dragged its tardy feet on the introduction of alcohol interlocks, 600 individuals have tragically lost their lives on Queensland roads because someone involved in the accident has been over the blood alcohol limit.

Equally horrifying is that people have continued to be killed in alcohol related vehicle accidents since the member for Maroochydore introduced her private member's bill in October last year. The member for Whitsunday said last night that it is time—enough is enough. I counter that it was time eight years ago. The government has had plenty of opportunity to introduce this legislation. Even the most brief analysis of all bills brought before this House since 2001 shows that every single year at least one of those—if not two, three or even four—was a transport act amendment bill.

It is not like we would have been trailblazers—not that there is anything wrong with setting the pace. South Australia has had a voluntary interlock program for drink-driving offences since 2001, making it mandatory in May last year. Victoria, New South Wales and even the Northern Territory have been quicker to act than has Queensland. Surely we could have learned what worked and what did not sooner.

What is worse, the government could have chosen to debate and support the private member's bill, introduced in October last year. Instead, it chose to continually mislead the broader Queensland community, claiming that the LNP is a policy-free zone when, in reality, it pinches every policy that the LNP puts forward. Heaven forbid, for the benefit of Queensland as a whole, those opposite should support a private member's bill proposed by an opposition member. Heaven forbid those opposite should support the bill put forward by the member for Maroochydore in October last year.

But tardiness is only one failure that can be levelled at the government. Even now, as we debate this legislation, the government's version falls short. As the shadow minister explained, her bill introduced the installation of alcohol interlocks for up to eight years for the worst case offenders. The government sees fit to impose interlocks for only 12 months. The LNP bill includes a 'three strikes and you're out' provision. If a person is caught three times with a blood alcohol content of over .15, that person loses their licence for life. The government will happily let those people back on the roads to have another crack.

But perhaps most disturbing is that the government has ignored its own advice regarding the need to complement alcohol interlocks with education and rehabilitation conditions. On the other hand, the LNP has undertaken more detailed research and has determined that interlocks work only when behavioural change is worked on as well. In Victoria, the court considers the person's pattern of

behaviour in relation to both drinking and driving during the period leading up to the application for the removal of the interlock. In New South Wales, the driver must undertake a medical consultation regarding alcohol use. But still this government refuses to include an educational and behavioural change component in its legislation, which is why I will be supporting the amendments moved by the member for Maroochydore.

That said, I turn to the amendments affecting the new Queensland driver's licence. Like the shadow minister, I am concerned that the development of this new Queensland driver's licence continues to be cloaked in secrecy and this secrecy is also unsettling the constituents of my electorate. The reality is that the longer that cloak of secrecy remains, the greater the concern in the electorate. So I echo the calls from the shadow minister and ask the minister to respond to the questions of what, when, how much, who will have access and how will the government overcome the significant number of privacy issues such a smart card raises.

Just in case the minister missed those concerns, I refer to this week's *Legislation Alert*, which states—

Amendments would be effected to the:

- *Adult Proof of Age Card Act*;
- *Transport (New Queensland Driver Licensing) Act 2008*;
- *Tow Truck Act*;
- *Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act*;
- *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act*;
- *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act*; and
- *Transport Planning and Coordination Act*.

The amendments would allow for:

- a 'smartcard', to be the property of the State, but with a limitation on the State's liability for acts or omissions in relation to the keeping and use of a smartcard by the cardholder;
- the chief executive to keep information taken under one Act with information taken and kept under another Act;
- the authorisation of the use of information which may be collected under one Act and to reciprocally authorise information to be used under another Act, including for the purpose of the investigation of a suspected offence;
- the chief executive to take and retain a digital photo of a person for identification purposes;
- the introduction of a smartcard transport authority, which is a single smartcard evidencing the grant of one or more transport authorities; and
- miscellaneous minor amendments to facilitate the introduction of the new driver licence project.

The explanatory notes do not identify any possible inconsistency of the provisions regarding smartcard driver licences with fundamental legislative principles. Nor did the minister, in her second reading speech, provide information regarding whether the provisions have sufficient regard to rights and liberties of individuals. Indeed, chapter 3 of the bill was not referred to in the second reading speech.

In addition, the committee observes that the explanatory notes do not identify community consultation undertaken in respect of the proposed provisions in chapter 3.

The committee invites the minister to provide information about whether chapter 3 has sufficient regard to rights and liberties of individuals.

Again we will not receive the minister's information as requested by the committee until after the conclusion of this debate, so I ask the minister to respond to these alarming provisions in her summing-up. Here is an opportunity to remove the cloak of secrecy and give Queenslanders some answers regarding the new Queensland driver's licence.

In conclusion, the government's legislation is long overdue and still incomplete. I reconfirm my support for the member for Maroochydore's bill. I support the majority of the government's bill but will further support the amendments moved by the LNP.

Dr ROBINSON (Cleveland—LNP) (12.50 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the cognate debate of the LNP's private member's bill on alcohol interlocks and the government's Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010. I note that the government's bill amends 14 pieces of legislation: the Acts Interpretation Act, the Adult Proof of Age Card Act, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and 11 transport specific acts. I commend the shadow minister for transport and main roads, Fiona Simpson, for her good work in leading the debate and policy formation on alcohol interlocks and in scrutinising the government's legislation. I commend the shadow minister's second reading speech as a more detailed treatise of the government's bill than my brief contribution today.

I support the LNP's private member's bill and much of the government's bill. I join with other opposition members to support the moving of an amendment with respect to alcohol provisions and in opposing aspects of the smart licence and MARPOL convention. This transport bill needs to be considered in light of the government's failure to manage the state's transport system.

In my electorate of Cleveland there are many very significant transport needs, particularly in the areas of transport infrastructure and service delivery. Redlanders spend an inordinate amount of time in cars commuting to and from work, struggling daily with traffic mayhem. This government has let down Redlanders when it comes to planning the road system to and from and throughout my electorate. Further, many intersections, such as at Shore and Wellington streets and Ziegenfusz and Cleveland-Redland Bay roads, are badly in need of signals. The government continues to dillydally on these urgently needed upgrades. Then there is the farce of the school crossing constructed at the new Bayview State School. Then without public explanation it was removed. I call on the government to resolve this dangerous situation that it has created.

The government has also failed to adequately provide a reliable rail service between Cleveland and the city. Breakdowns on the Cleveland line are common and commuters at peak times are crammed into carriages like sardines. We badly need immediate solutions and, in the long term, a plan to duplicate the line between Manly and Cleveland. Then there is the Eastern Busway, which is supposed to be coming to the Redlands some time in this century, put back until 2026.

Having made those brief comments, I will focus the remainder of my thoughts on alcohol interlocks and MARPOL provisions. The transport bill also needs to be considered in the light of the fact that this government has failed to effectively deal with drink-driving offenders. It has been slow to respond to this problem and has been forced to play catch-up with LNP policy to deal with the issue. The LNP's private member's bill deals with serious repeat drink-driving offenders by requiring them to install alcohol interlocks in their vehicles. Our interlock bill has been before the House now for months and it is an indictment on this government that it has taken so long to support our policy initiative.

Anyone who has been the victim of a traffic accident in which the offending driver was a repeat drink driver knows the fear created and the frustration felt toward the system. Such dangerous drivers turn vehicles into wrecking balls that can ruin other people's lives. Having observed closely the terror caused by such dangerous drivers, I agree that something must be done. The LNP has initiated this action to get tougher on such repeat drink drivers.

Not only has the government been slow to respond and had to be led to obvious solutions, it then overreacted by suggesting the barbecue stopper: a .02 alcohol limit on all drivers. In its attempt to play catch-up with the LNP it is now thinking about imposing this .02 limit on everyone.

In relation to the MARPOL provisions of the bill, we need a more effective response to maritime disasters than this government has shown. The independent review of the *Pacific Adventurer* oil spill reveals that Maritime Safety Queensland was not properly prepared for such an oil spill resulting in the failure in the response, particularly regarding response coordination and communication lines. No matter how the government tries to hide on this one, the facts are that it failed to protect Moreton Bay and the marine life of the bay during the *Pacific Adventurer* disaster.

Being the local member for North Stradbroke Island, I advise the House of the angst that this incident and the government's slow response caused in the area. There was great concern that the oil would impact not only on Moreton Island but also on North Stradbroke Island. Further, the condemnation of the government contained in the independent review is amplified by local North Stradbroke Island residents who were among the first to respond to the disaster. Their firsthand accounts were of government incompetence and focus on media management rather than immediately resolving the problem. Many more residents offered their help but were told it was all under control when, in fact, it was not.

Pollution in Moreton Bay from various sources is on the rise, and recent water quality tests show that water quality levels are unacceptably low in some parts of the bay. The government needs to get its act together and stop blaming recreational fishers for everything and start looking at measures to reduce pollution and to protect the bay. The government needs to improve its handling of such maritime disasters to reduce marine pollution. In closing, I commend the shadow minister for transport and main roads for her work in leading the charge on alcohol interlocks.

Debate, on motion of Mr Emerson, adjourned.

PRIVILEGE

Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee Report No. 103

Mr SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12.56 pm): I refer to report No. 103 of the Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee in relation to unauthorised tabling of committee documents in the Legislative Assembly. I thank the committee for its deliberations and its findings and apologise unreservedly.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (ROAD USE MANAGEMENT—INTERLOCKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate

Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from p. 1173, on motion of Ms Nolan, and Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 1173, on motion of Ms Simpson—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 12.57 pm to 2.30 pm.

Debate, on motion of Mr Emerson, adjourned.

HEALTH LEGISLATION (HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW) AMENDMENT BILL

Message from Governor

Hon. PT LUCAS (Lytton—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health) (2.30 pm): I present a message from Her Excellency the Governor.

The Deputy Speaker read the following message—

MESSAGE

HEALTH LEGISLATION (HEALTH PRACTITIONER

REGULATION NATIONAL LAW) AMENDMENT BILL

2010

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, PENELOPE ANNE WENSLEY, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled—

> A Bill for an Act to provide for the implementation of a national law to establish a national registration and accreditation scheme for health practitioners and to amend the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 1945, and the Acts mentioned in the schedule, for particular purposes.

(Sgd)

GOVERNOR

Date: 25 MAR 2010

Tabled paper: Message, dated 25 March 2010, from Her Excellency the Governor recommending the Health Legislation (Health Practitioner Regulation National Law) Amendment Bill [1962].

First Reading

Hon. PT LUCAS (Lytton—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health) (2.31 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for the implementation of a national law to establish a national registration and accreditation scheme for health practitioners and to amend the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 1945, and the acts mentioned in the schedule, for particular purposes. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Tabled paper: Health Legislation (Health Practitioner Regulation National Law) Amendment Bill [1963].

Tabled paper: Health Legislation (Health Practitioner Regulation National Law) Amendment Bill, explanatory notes [1964].

Second Reading

Hon. PT LUCAS (Lytton—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health) (2.31 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the bill to the House. On 26 March 2008, the Council of Australian Governments signed an intergovernmental agreement to establish a single national registration and accreditation scheme for nominated health professions. This single national scheme replaces separate health practitioner registration schemes currently in operation for these professions in each of the states and territories.

COAG agreed to the inclusion of the following 10 health professions in the national scheme from its commencement on 1 July 2010: chiropractors; dental practitioners; medical practitioners; nurses and midwives; optometrists; osteopaths; pharmacists; physiotherapists; podiatrists; and psychologists. The following four professions will be included in the scheme from 1 July 2012: ATSI health practitioners; Chinese medicine practitioners; medical radiation technologists; and occupational therapists.

Queensland, as host jurisdiction, has previously enacted two pieces of legislation for the scheme—the Health Practitioner Regulation (Administrative Arrangements) National Law Act 2008 and the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009. Scheduled to the second of these is the national law, which contains the substantive content of the national scheme. The Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act also applies the national law in Queensland from its commencement.

The COAG agreement contemplates participating jurisdictions each introducing omnibus legislation making those consequential and administrative amendments required to enable the smooth implementation of the national scheme in that jurisdiction. This legislation is known as each jurisdiction's bill C. The current bill represents Queensland's bill C. It is the third and final piece of legislation required to implement the national scheme in Queensland from its commencement.

Bill C repeals nine health practitioner registration acts which will be wholly replaced by the national law from its commencement, and partially repeals and renames two further registration acts dealing in part with the registration of professions transitioning to the national scheme. The bill also repeals or partially repeals those acts establishing the administrative mechanisms which support registration boards in performing their statutory functions. Equivalent mechanisms to support national boards are established under the national law. Bill C also amends 42 acts across government to update references affected by the commencement of the national law.

The national law requires the most serious disciplinary matters to be heard by the relevant jurisdiction's responsible tribunal. The national law also provides for responsible tribunals to review certain disciplinary decisions of national boards and panels. The Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal is Queensland's responsible tribunal. The bill inserts a new part into the Health Practitioners (Professional Standards) Act to prescribe QCAT's procedural arrangements when hearing disciplinary matters under the national law.

With minor adjustments, this new part of the professional standards act mirrors the existing provisions of that act prescribing QCAT's procedures when hearing disciplinary matters in relation to Queensland registrants. This will support the swift and effective resolution of disciplinary proceedings by enabling QCAT to treat matters arising under either the national law or Queensland law in the same way.

This new part also provides for QCAT to further review certain of its own decisions, and for registrants to appeal certain QCAT decisions to the Court of Appeal. Again, to promote fairness and the timely administration of justice, the treatment of these matters in relation to national scheme registrants will mirror their treatment in relation to registrants under Queensland law.

The bill contains other measures intended to promote consistency between the national law and the remaining Queensland registration acts. These measures will allow Queensland boards to disclose confidential information to a relevant public entity if they reasonably believe a registrant poses a risk to public health or patient safety; and create a stand-alone head of power to prescribe continuing professional development requirements for medical radiation technologists ahead of their transition to the national scheme in 2012.

The bill also inserts a transitional regulation-making head of power into the national law act. While the national law contains a head of power to address national transitional issues, all participating jurisdictions—other than the Northern Territory—have identified the need to include a similar head of power in their respective bill Cs to enable them to address jurisdiction specific issues. These include the resolution of outstanding right to information applications and the transition of existing 'area of need' declarations. The head of power will be subject to strict limitations and will be available to address transitional issues only. It, and any regulations made under it, will expire in July 2013—12 months after the transition of the second set of professions to the national scheme.

The bill also effects a minor amendment to the national law as agreed to by participating jurisdictions. This amendment removes the requirement that health complaints entities disclose health, conduct or performance issues about registrants which are identified during statutory conciliation processes. This is consistent with the intent of the national law to promote cooperation between health complaints entities and national boards without undermining the effectiveness of existing statutory processes.

As well as constituting Queensland's bill C, the bill makes minor amendments to the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act, under which the QIMR is established. My department is currently reviewing this act to develop a more contemporary and efficient governance structure for the QIMR. The amendments in this bill are necessary interim measures which will better support the ongoing operation of the QIMR pending the conclusion of the review.

The bill provides greater flexibility in the term of the QIMR director's appointment and allows the chief executive of my department, rather than the minister, to approve agreements and arrangements entered into by the QIMR. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr McArdle, adjourned.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (ROAD USE MANAGEMENT—INTERLOCKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from p. 1174, on motion of Ms Nolan, and Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 1174, on motion of Ms Simpson—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (2.38 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009. These bills address the prevalent and increasingly worrying issue of recidivist drink-driving offenders on our roads. They do so by the introduction of alcohol interlock systems to be enforced by court order on those who have still not yet learnt the dangers of drink driving.

In 2008 nearly 30,000 drink drivers were caught on Queensland roads. Over a third of these had previously been caught drink driving and around 4,000 were being caught for the third time. When we cite these figures we risk divorcing ourselves from the tragic consequences that result from repeat drink driving, not just deaths and injuries but also the fact that we need to have a safe community.

Late last year I saw a report of frightened residents on a Gold Coast street saying that they were waiting for a tragedy to strike. They claimed a neighbour was still getting behind the wheel despite being on a driving ban due to repeat drink-driving offences. Court documents showed the neighbour had an extensive history which includes a two-year driving ban, yet his drink-driving offences led to convictions in four courts—Mackay, Yeppoon, Coolangatta and Southport. His blood alcohol readings have included .19, .091, .076 and .124. He had been convicted on at least two occasions of driving while disqualified. Fortunately, these alert and concerned neighbours contacted police and hopefully avoided a further tragedy.

It was fortunate because thousands of drink drivers are reportedly escaping detection because breath testing has been cut back in six of Queensland's eight police regions. Despite alcohol being attributed to a quarter of all road fatalities, police are conducting fewer random breath tests in these areas. The biggest cutbacks were reportedly in the Metropolitan North Brisbane and Far Northern regions, where police statistics show that there has been a 16 per cent drop in testing. The Metropolitan North region had reduced its tests by almost 70,000 in 2008-09, while the Far Northern region did almost 46,000 fewer tests compared to the previous year.

Between October 2008 and September 2009, 348 people died on Queensland's roads. About 80 of these deaths were caused by drink driving. Each year the statistics are substantially the same. The problem is very real. It affects not just the victims and their families but also those who drink-drive and their families, who are racked with guilt at having caused such a loss.

Despite continual police, government and expert advice, the message still does not seem to be sinking in. More needs to be done to deter drink drivers. Research from the UK shows that there is a low risk of detection of drink drivers in most national jurisdictions and that potential offenders will often exploit that risk. So while nearly 30,000 drink drivers were caught on Queensland roads in 2008, more still got away with it.

A New South Wales study found that more than one in seven drink drivers will reoffend within five years because they do not think they will get caught again. The New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research followed 23,373 drink drivers for five years from 2002. The study found that most drivers did not believe their bad luck would be repeated. As a 24-year-old male originally from a small country town who had been convicted for drink driving told the study, his chances of getting caught by police in his small town were low enough for locals to run the risk. He said—

It's quite common. Back home everyone used to do it. If there's not much chance of getting caught, people will do it.

Since he moved to the city, he had become wary of the increased danger, keeping his drink driving to smaller, less trafficked routes. He said—

I'm not a big fan of drink driving on a busy road.

Think about those words: 'I'm not a big fan of drink driving on a busy road.' He said—

I generally only do it on quiet roads and the police are less likely to be there.

The introduction of alcohol interlocks is proven to be effective. Alcohol interlock laws are already in effect in four other states—Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia and South Australia. There is a related 60 per cent decrease in recidivist offences and, when over a third of drink-driving offenders are caught more than once, we have a real opportunity here to make a difference.

It is disappointing that the government seeks to score political points from the introduction of this system. The government has been saying for years that it will introduce alcohol interlocks. The Deputy Premier even announced it in 2004. When the Road Safety Summit in 2006 included recommendations to introduce mandatory alcohol interlock laws, the government accepted this recommendation. What has happened is years of inaction, with many more lives lost and others destroyed.

It is only now, after the LNP has already taken the initiative to introduce a bill to implement alcohol interlocks, that the government has finally introduced its own bill to achieve the exact same thing. I say that the government is proposing to achieve the exact same thing but there are still important differences. The government intends to introduce a smart card driver's licence. Queenslanders are still reeling, confused and recovering from the last time this government tried to introduce a smart card scheme, that being the go card. I can only hope that this time the implementation will go more smoothly, with fewer mistakes, costs and confusion.

The government is also intending to introduce combined red-light and speed cameras. Such cameras are already in operation in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, the ACT and the Northern Territory. Combined red-light and speed cameras provide increased safety for both pedestrians and other motorists alike. Let us trust that the government's motivation here is safety and not increased revenue opportunities to fund its already out-of-control debt.

The two bills also differ in the alcohol interlock regimes which they propose. It seems to me that the government's proposed regime does not go far enough. The interlock order will apply for a period of only 12 months after the serving of an interlock driver's disqualification period. There may be a possibility of extending this period, but it is left to the chief executive and not the courts to decide.

The LNP bill, by contrast, provides a minimum of one year and up to four years for discretionary orders and eight years for mandatory interlock orders. These time periods will allow courts to make orders which best reflect the circumstances of each case, rather than this one-size-fits-all approach. These potentially longer periods of time for an interlock order to apply represent not only an increased difficulty in starting a vehicle fitted with an alcohol interlock for recidivist offenders but also a cost impact.

The LNP bill leaves the imposition of costs for the court to decide on a case-by-case basis. However, suppliers have indicated that the cost and installation of interlock devices would be about $5 per day, which is roughly two pots of domestic beer. I am sure this is a sacrifice that those subject to an interlock order can afford to make in terms of both their finance and their lifestyle.

The LNP bill also contains a 'three strikes and you're out' rule for drivers caught with a high blood alcohol level three times in five years. They will be disqualified absolutely from holding a Queensland driver's licence. If the message has not sunk in by the time they receive their third conviction for driving with a high blood alcohol level, it is not going to sink in any time soon. These people need to be taken off our roads. This disqualification may not last forever, but they will have to wait five years before they can apply to have that disqualification removed.

Under the LNP's bill, courts will also have the ability to order the immobilisation of vehicles. They may order that a relevant motor vehicle be immobilised for up to one year to prevent a drink-driving offender from operating it. The court may also immobilise a vehicle of a third party if they attempt to assist an offender to pervert the court's ruling. Similarly, there are also appropriate penalties for contravening an interlock order. If a driver contravenes an interlock order, they will be subject to a penalty of 30 penalty units or four months imprisonment. Also, if a person interferes with an alcohol interlock device or a person assists a driver subject to an alcohol interlock order to start or operate a vehicle in a way contrary to the order, that person also commits an offence for which the penalty is 30 penalty units or four months imprisonment. However, the explanatory notes to the government's bill state that a driver subject to an interlock order does not commit an offence where they attempt to start, or are in charge of, a vehicle that is fitted with a prescribed interlock. The belief is that a punitive approach is not suitable during this period.

Not only does the LNP bill propose a more thorough regime with appropriate penalties, it also provides a system of rehabilitation by education for drink-driving offenders. Drivers subject to non-mandatory interlock provisions must attend an alcohol intervention consultation with a doctor before the end of the minimum period of the alcohol interlock order at his or her own expense and provide the chief executive with a certificate of completion, whereas drivers subject to mandatory interlock provisions must attend a drink driving rehabilitation course before the end of the minimum period of the alcohol interlock order at their own expense and must provide the evidence of completion to the chief executive. There is also provision for those who are subject to excessive financial hardship to have their costs met by other means.

The LNP's bill is based on the Victorian legislation which has been in operation and has been effective for a number of years. It is essential that we rehabilitate offenders as well as ensure they understand the consequences of their actions and deter others with appropriate penalties. If the government has decided that it is now going to be serious about road safety, it should get behind the serious alcohol interlocks regime which is being proposed by the LNP.

Mr DOWLING (Redlands—LNP) (2.48 pm): I rise this afternoon to contribute to this cognate debate on the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill, which is a private member's bill, and the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010, which seeks to amend 14 acts. I will begin by addressing the private member's bill—the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009. In so doing, I commend the member for Maroochydore, Fiona Simpson, the shadow minister for transport and main roads, for bringing this bill before the House. I know that road safety and the saving of Queensland lives are paramount in the member's actions.

It is fair to say that over the last nine years Labor have sat on their hands on this issue. We know from the debates we have had in this chamber how well entrenched their hands have been under their posteriors. What an embarrassing display, though, by the minister, the honourable 'Rachel no plan', in her contribution to the debate. 'Our bill was raised before yours,' was her contribution yesterday afternoon. I thought that was an embarrassment to a minister of her ranking within Queensland.

The legislation should have been passed much earlier than this. When we look at the history of interlocking, it has been trialled, it has been recommended, it has been talked about and it has been promised for nine years—in 2001, 2004, 2006 and 2007; all milestones. I think the Labor government should be embarrassed by each of those milestones. In 2009 this private member's bill was introduced. Here we are now in 2010 with another piece of legislation introduced by the minister which seeks to address that. I will use a couple of press clippings to support those comments as to who is on first and what is on second. A press clipping dated 23 November 2009 states—

'Under the LNP's proposed laws, drink drivers will have to install alcohol interlocks and drivers caught over 0.15 three times in five years will be stripped of their licence,' Ms Simpson said.

'If alcohol interlocks start to be rolled out prior to Christmas it must be debated this week.

But, again, the debate was not held. The clipping continues—

'The Labor Government first promised action on alcohol interlocks in 2004. Action was promised again in 2006, 2007 and last month. Enough is enough ...

It is ironic that it is the government's own slogan 'enough is enough' that the honourable Ms Simpson used in addressing that issue. Alcohol interlock devices have seen a tremendous reduction in reoffending—up to 60 per cent and other studies say as much as 70 per cent. When we look at the stats, it is absurd that this legislation has not been introduced earlier. The major difference and the major stumbling block that we see even now with the government's amended interlock strategy is that it does not target high-level offenders, it does not target repeat offenders and it does not adopt the 'three strikes and you're out' principle as proposed by the shadow minister.

The second press clipping I want to quote from is dated 14 December, and it is issued by the minister and the Premier. It states—

Motorists caught drink driving with levels over 0.15 or caught twice within five years will be forced to pay almost $3000 to install an alcohol interlock device on their car.

The crackdown was announced yesterday by Transport Minister Rachel Nolan as part of the State Government's plan to harden up its approach to road safety in the pre-Christmas holiday blitz.

It begs the question: which Christmas are we referring to? The press clipping continues—

Premier Anna Bligh said introducing alcohol interlock devices stopped repeat offenders.

'International research shows that re-offences are reduced by 73 per cent when these alcohol interlockers are used,' Ms Bligh said.

'The bottom line is, that means this scheme will save lives.'

But, again, we have had no action. It has taken all of that time to get to this point that we are at now. Even the explanatory notes detail the long history of the failure of this Labor government going back to 2001. There is significant evidence about how many lives are lost and how many drink drivers, high-level and repeat offenders, are left on our roads annually. Those figures have been quoted time and time again. The explanatory notes mention the *Getting tough on drink drivers* report, which recommended that the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995 be amended to allow the courts to impose alcohol interlock devices, but nothing happened. We have the damning statistic of 30,000 drink drivers caught in Queensland in 2008 and one-third were repeat offenders. I wonder whether the only reason there was not any undue haste in adopting these legislative amendments over the many years is that there was not a dollar in it. Another joint statement of the Premier and the transport minister states that 29,000 Queensland motorists were convicted of drink driving. Of these, 12,000 were repeat offenders or high-end offenders with blood alcohol concentrations over .15. Again, there has been little or no action.

I want to raise some concerns which are touched on in the minister's legislation about heavy vehicle speeding. I wonder on what evidence those items are based. The explanatory notes state that one of the reasons for the bill is heavy vehicle speeding. Previous surveys have found that speeding by heavy vehicles—that is, vehicles with a gross vehicle mass of more than 4.5 tonnes—is ranked as the highest public concern about the road transport industry in Australia. Sure a concern from the public needs to be addressed, but you would hope there was some science attached to it. What research has been done to determine the cause? And how does it compare to other transport groups?

The most comprehensive crash statistics that I have been able to obtain date back to 2004, but I imagine the trends would be fairly consistent, because when you go back from 2004 you see this continual pattern. So I am going to go out on a leap of faith that these stats remain pretty much static. Those stats look at articulated trucks, rigid trucks and road trains or B-doubles and their contribution to the road toll as compared to other vehicle types. Basically it says that heavy vehicle freight made up nine per cent of the road toll in 2004—that is, it contributed to 41 deaths in the crash stats and only four per cent of the total road collision history.

When we look at that, it does not seem to be inordinately high. It does not seem to be an exceptionally significant contribution. Those crash stats do not relate to speed, which is what the focus of this amendment is. I wonder whether there is likely to be any research or any hard data that goes to the heart of those issues. Trucks are scary. The news in recent days showed a car pinned under the front of a truck travelling down a motorway, and so we have reason to be concerned about trucks. I have been a sales rep and have travelled on the road in heavy vehicles—not a lot but a few times—and those large vehicles are very difficult to stop. You have to wonder what contributory causes there may have been in some of those crash stats of people cutting off heavy vehicles or pulling up in front of them. The fact is that some road users do not respect the size and complexity of the heavy vehicles used on our highways. It is also a fact that others actually run into them. If you run into a truck, you will always come off second best. I will be supporting the bills before the House with some reservations.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (2.57 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on both the bill introduced by the shadow minister for transport, the member for Maroochydore, and the bill introduced by the Minister for Transport. It is very timely that as we debate this bill only last week the Law, Justice and Safety Committee tabled a very informative report which inquired into alcohol related violence. That was its final report and it goes to some 85-odd pages.

I note during the debate on these two bills that many members have spoken about the need to get tough on drink driving in Queensland. When I read through that report from the Law, Justice and Safety Committee, it also commented on similar issues involving alcohol. In her opening comments on page 2 of the report the chair of the committee, Ms Barbara Stone, the member for Springwood, stated—

A major change that all stakeholders wanted to see was a strengthening of individual responsibility.

There is no doubt that that is very important. I urge all members to read that report. I look forward in due course to the government responding to the range of recommendations contained in the final report on the inquiry into alcohol related violence. It is very timely that that report was presented only last week and today we are debating two bills that also deal with the issue of alcohol.

It is a bit disappointing that it took so long for the bills to finally come before the parliament. There is no doubt in my mind that the government responded to the introduction of the private member's bill by the member for Maroochydore back in November last year by introducing its bill.

On Tuesday the Speaker spoke in this House of the quandary we now face and how he proposed to resolve the matter. Although the member for Maroochydore introduced the opposition's bill first, the standing orders and the procedures that we have to comply with in this chamber dictate that we are effectively required to vote first on the government's bill which was introduced in March this year. I refer members to the Speaker's ruling where he indicated that after the vote on the government's bill we must ensure that the opposition's issues are raised. It was suggested that the opposition could then present a whole range of amendments. I suppose it is disappointing that that is what has had to happen. I note that the member for Maroochydore has flagged and already tabled a whole range of amendments that we will now debate after the vote on the government's bill.

A lot of members have spoken about alcohol ignition interlock devices. There is no doubt in my mind that it is important that we have this new method to try to better police people who have an alcohol problem getting behind the wheel of a motor vehicle, truck or car or hopping on a motorbike and riding if they are not safe to do so.

I highlight for members one of the recommendations of the Law, Justice and Safety Committee that we really have to look at. That is that all individuals have to take greater responsibility for their actions. The report touched on new powers which would apply the no-alcohol limit to all motorbike riders during the first 12 months of them holding a motorbike licence. I think that is a great step. Too many people, once they get their licence, are out their riding and unfortunately come to grief on our roads for a whole range of reasons.

In my electorate we not only have busy roads but we have a hospital which I think sometimes operates beyond capacity. The staff do the best they can. I believe the reason the hospital is often operating beyond its capacity is that so many people are there as a result of traffic accidents. So many of those accidents are as a result of alcohol.

I share the concerns of many other members with regard to safety on our roads. I certainly share the view of all members that this is an important initiative. I am certainly looking forward to Queensland following the lead of other states in Australia so that no matter where one travels in Australia there are similar laws.

The minister spoke about the opportunity for her department to coordinate the scheduling of passenger services for special events in regional Queensland. My question to the minister is: how is this going to be costed? I know when I was approached by the scout association last year or the year before to organise to schedule some trains to travel to the Sunshine Coast that it seemed to be very difficult. We seemed to have to come up with commitments on numbers. The organising of that really became too difficult, and it did not happen. I am looking for some advice as to who will meet the cost. Will there be a cost associated with this? What is the process that people who may want to schedule passenger services for special events have to go through?

I commend both bills to the House. I look forward to the vote on the second reading. I look forward to the debate proceeding to the consideration in detail stage so we can further consider the amendments that the member for Maroochydore will move on behalf of the opposition.

Ms GRACE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (3.04 pm): I rise to support the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 and to make a short contribution. I welcome the primary purpose of this bill. The purpose of the bill is to provide for the introduction of alcohol ignition interlocks in Queensland for all high-risk drink drivers, to extend the no-alcohol limit to a broader range of drivers and to implement national reforms for heavy vehicle speeding. I believe the three primary reasons for this bill being before the House will hopefully go a long way to making our roads much safer for all of us who have to travel on them.

I believe there is a need to change the culture in relation to drink driving. Compared to when I was young, I have seen a marked shift in how we actually look at the issue of drinking and driving. I remember when I was growing up that this certainly was not a major issue. I am very sad to say that many of my friends really did not take any notice of how much they drank before they got behind the wheel. It is pleasing to see that much has been done in relation to changing that culture which was to go out, drink and get behind the wheel. Obviously we cannot rest on our laurels. This is about continuing that cultural shift and mindset about drinking and driving. There is much more that needs to be done.

Like others in this House, I want to reduce the incidence of road accidents and, in particular, road deaths. Just like in the workplace, one death on our roads is one death too many. Anything we can do to prevent those injuries and deaths occurring should be done. It is sad to see, from the statistics I have been reading, that around one in three Queenslanders who have been convicted of drink driving were either repeat offenders or high-end offenders. When we say high-end offenders—and this has been referred to by other members in this House—we mean people with a blood alcohol concentration of .15 or above.

We have changed the culture about wearing seatbelts. Now people do not get into a car unless they buckle up. This is particularly the case when it comes to kids. I remember when I was a kid we used to ride in the tray of the station wagon. There were no seatbelts. I remember once that we drove all the way to Sydney in that way. We have seen a significant culture shift. I doubt any parent would put their child in the car without putting on a seatbelt.

It is a cultural shift that this bill is trying to address and trying to maintain. There is no disputing that drink driving is dangerous and is responsible for many accidents on our roads. The clear message has to be sent—and that is what this bill tries to do—to those who are repeat offenders or high-end offenders that drink driving will not be tolerated.

When I first heard about alcohol ignition interlocks for high-risk and repeat offenders I must admit that I had no sympathy for recidivists. I believe they do need a very strong message sent to them because it is this group of people that must change their culture when it comes to drink driving. They have to get the message that this is unacceptable. We as a society have to send a very clear message, both legislatively and in the manner in which we act, that repeat offending needs to stop.

When I first heard about alcohol ignition interlocks I had not seen one and I really did not know what they looked like. I was not sure how they worked. I was grateful to read the research conducted by the Queensland Parliamentary Library into alcohol ignition interlocks. I commend them for their work. I thought the research was excellent.

When I read that research I was pleased to learn that the device can be connected to the ignition, electrical or other systems of the vehicle or car. This device actually measures the breath alcohol concentration of the potential driver. The vehicle will not start unless the driver passes the test. That is, they breathe into the apparatus and they have to have a no-alcohol reading. The obvious question came to me as it probably did to others in this House: can you tamper with this device?

For example, can a sober passenger, a child or a family member submit a breath test to start the vehicle? Many people might think that is a way of tampering with the device. However, it was pleasing to read in the report that the device can be tamper proof in that there are various anticircumvention technologies built into the interlock device. For example, I understand there is a hum-tone detection or a breath pulse code. Those technologies mean that the device can identify that the person who needs to use the device is the person giving the sample and therefore it is tamper proof.

There are also mechanisms built in to ensure that the driver remains alcohol free during the journey by requiring regular retesting at random intervals. Obviously the device will not do this in a dangerous way. My understanding is that it gives five minutes for a driver to pull over safely and take the test. However, if they do not do it within the specified time there are mechanisms built into the device such as making the headlights flash or the horn blow which sends a signal to the driver that they have to pull over and undertake the test. Of course, it is very necessary that when interlocks are fitted the driver is trained in relation to how the system works.

Trials of the devices were undertaken from 2001 to 2003. Although there were only a small number of people involved in the trial, the testing showed that interlocks did have the potential to reduce reoffending and drink-driving rates. Early findings of that trial confirmed that there was a reduction in recidivism, and of course that has to be good news when it comes to road safety and good news for us as users of the road in that a person reoffending will have these devices installed which will not allow them to continue to drive on the roads without some form of prevention in terms of them getting behind the wheel. There was also clear evidence that interlocks prevent drink driving while installed, meaning that the culture of the person was changing in terms of their actions before they got back behind the wheel of a car.

I acknowledge that in the bill there are some exceptions to the installation of interlock devices. The exemptions are common sense. For example, a person can be exempt for medical reasons, if they live in a rural or remote area that is not serviced in terms of installation of these particular devices, or any other extraordinary circumstances on grounds that will be set out in the regulations. If someone has a problem with the order being placed on them, there is the possibility of a review by QCAT if necessary. I believe that that is the proper place for that review to take place. Coupled with this are harsh penalties for those who breach interlock conditions.

I welcome the extension of the no-alcohol limit to all learner, provisional, probationary and unlicensed drivers regardless of their age. This currently applies only to those under 25, but I agree that it should be equal and I support the amendment. I also support the no-alcohol limit for all motorcycle riders for the first 12 months after obtaining their licence. I have never ridden a motorcycle. I do not know exactly the mechanisms, but I understand from those who do that the first 12 months after obtaining a licence are probably the most dangerous. Therefore, the no-alcohol limit is another common-sense approach. This legislation will not impact at all on those who do the right thing on our roads, because if you do not drink and drive there will be no change when using our roads.

I welcome the amendments to heavy vehicle speeding in that they recognise that the entire chain of responsibility must be included in controlling this hazard. Parties in the transport chain must be able to show no influence in forcing a driver to speed due to unreasonable delivery times being set. There also has to be a reasonable plan in place to enable a driver in all circumstances to make deliveries between two points—point A and point B—in a time that complies with speed limits. Unfortunately, many in the workplace do not control the manner in which that work is carried out. In particular for heavy vehicle drivers, their workplace is their vehicle. If unattainable demands are put on them to get from one point to another due to pressure being put on them in terms of being sacked or losing income, that is unacceptable and I welcome the fact that that entire chain of command now has a responsibility to ensure a safe workplace for heavy vehicle drivers and at the same time ensure that roads are safer for these vehicles. As we know, accidents involving a heavy vehicle can be quite tragic and quite devastating. This is all about ensuring that there are reasonable targets for these drivers and that we make the roads safer, and I welcome all of the amendments in the bill in relation to that issue.

I agree with the introduction of a smart card and the fact that our current licences need to be more secure, particularly for young people and women who may use their licence as a form of identification when entering nightclubs or other places. At the moment our licences are not that secure in that they contain information that is probably not necessary for identification, and I welcome the introduction of a smart card that is much more secure in that information is stored on the card but is not for the eyes of everyone where identification is required. Smart cards may not be as useful in that they do not have full personal details if they are required, but my understanding is that the smart card will definitely have enough information on it to allow it to be used for identification in all of the different forms that a licence may be used for today. For all of those reasons, I commend the bill to the House.

Ms van LITSENBURG (Redcliffe—ALP) (3.16 pm): I rise to support the government's Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010. This bill is about improving safety in a range of areas but principally by changing the way serious drink drivers and repeat offenders return to driving after a conviction which has included a licence disqualification. I will also speak about amendments to marine legislation.

The number of deaths per capita on Queensland roads has decreased considerably over the last 10 years or so, but it is still too high. One death is too many. The time has come to say no to the family and community tragedies caused on roads by drink driving and speeding. The Bligh government sees it as vital that we do everything we can to protect Queenslanders and ensure that our roads are as safe as possible.

This bill is about encouraging drivers to take personal responsibility for the way they act on roads. This bill puts in place a mandatory condition that drivers who are convicted of two or more drink-driving offences within five years or who have high blood alcohol levels will need to have an ignition interlock system installed in order to regain their full open licence. For the first 12 months after the completion of their disqualification, they will have an ignition interlock system installed in their vehicle which will ensure that the vehicle will not start until they have blown a zero-alcohol reading not only at the beginning of their journey but also at intervals during the journey. This means that, if a person is convicted of drink driving and disqualified for 18 months, at the end of that 18-month period they will have to have an ignition interlock system fitted to their car for 12 months before they can regain their full open licence.

That means from the time of their disqualification it is actually 30 months before they have a full licence returned to them. This is not so much a punitive measure but a measure to enable high-risk drink drivers to change their drink driving behaviour and to develop a habit of safe driving. This bill also extends the zero-alcohol limit for learner, provisional, probationary and unlicensed drivers and all motorcyclists at any age until they have held their licence for 12 months. A driver's licence is not a right; it is a pact with all the other drivers on the road that says that you will uphold the rules that allow everyone to use the road safely.

I would now like to mention some issues that impact directly on the electorate of Redcliffe in terms of the safe use of Moreton Bay. I refer to the amendments to the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution Act) 1995 concerning the penalty provision for failure to display a garbage placard. Currently, ships measuring 12 metres or more in length are required to display a garbage placard. A failure to display the placard can result in a fine of up to $85,000. This penalty was originally set to align with other penalties under the act, such as the penalty for the discharge of pollutants into the marine environment, which is a much more serious offence. However, failure to display a garbage placard is a minor offence and should

attract a penalty of only a maximum of 20 units, or $2,000. This amount will ensure that the penalty for this offence is more appropriate and consistent with the penalties imposed for the commission of similar offences in other Australian jurisdictions. I am quite sure that a lot of boaties will be really pleased to see that, in this case, the penalty has gone down instead of up.

I also wish to refer to the amendment to insert an averment provision regarding proof of age in the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994. This amendment will enable Maritime Safety Queensland to manage marine safety more effectively by ensuring that life jackets are worn by children. This amendment is evidentiary and will not change the existing legal obligations of the boating public. The amendment also ensures that the current requirement for children under the age of 12 to wear a life jacket while travelling in an open boat under 4.8 metres in length is not affected.

Currently, enforcement officers are responsible for proving the age of a person. Following this amendment, an enforcement officer will be empowered to estimate the age of a person and place the onus on that person or their parents or guardians to prove their age. For example, once the enforcement officer has estimated the person's age, it will be the responsibility of the defendant—not the enforcing officer—to prove the correct age of the person by supplying a certified copy of a birth certificate, an 18-plus card or a driver's licence. This amendment will enhance marine safety by ensuring that some of the youngest and most vulnerable members of our society are adequately protected. I believe that it will ensure that, if things go wrong while on the water, children will be much safer. Since many of my constituents spend a lot of time on Moreton Bay, these amendments will increase the safety of many Redcliffe children.

The final amendments that I wish to refer to are amendments to the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995 and the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Regulation 2008. These amendments relate to treated and untreated sewage and are designed to protect Queensland's marine environment, particularly my area of Moreton Bay, from the harmful effects of vessel sourced pollution. Although no additional impositions or requirements will be placed on the master or the owner of a ship as a result of these changes, the amendments clarify the existing discharge requirements for different types of ships and remove any duplication in the current requirements. These amendments will clarify that prescribed ships, such as large trading or passenger ships, visiting a Queensland port from overseas cannot discharge untreated sewage anywhere they wish in coastal waters, including marinas, canals and harbours.

The amendments also clarify that the discharge of treated sewage may be made in accordance with the conditions provided, except in prohibited discharge waters where no discharge can be made. These amendments clarify the implementation of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973—commonly known as MARPOL—and assert that no ship can discharge in prohibited waters in Queensland. The amendments enable Maritime Safety Queensland to undertake appropriate compliance activities to protect our marine environment from ship sourced marine pollution. These are vital provisions that will protect the waters of Moreton Bay when overseas pleasure craft visit our waters and commercial shipping passes through the bay to the port at Pinkenba. All of these new provisions will improve boating safety in Moreton Bay, including in my electorate of Redcliffe, and increase protection for the environment, particularly at locations near the shore and where there are high concentrations of boats and people.

In this bill, the minister has targeted specific road and marine safety issues that will improve the quality of both road use and boating for children. This bill also adds another layer of protection for our marine environment. That is vital at a time when the number of people using Moreton Bay is increasing. I congratulate the minister on her insight in introducing these measured changes. She is sending a clear message that safety is a high priority for her and the Labor government. I commend this bill to the House.

Mrs ATTWOOD (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (3.27 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010. I would like to make a comparison between the government's amendments and the opposition's amendments. Drivers convicted of high-level or repeat drink-driving offences have clearly failed to separate the activities of drinking and driving. Alcohol ignition interlocks directly address this issue. The amendments in the government's bill set out a comprehensive and robust system for the introduction of interlocks in Queensland. The proposals contained in the bill tackle high-risk drink drivers more effectively than the proposal put forward in the private member's bill.

Firstly, under the government's bill, many more drink drivers will be subjected to the interlock condition. All high-level or repeat drink drivers will be required to have the interlock condition. This is justified, because these drink drivers have placed themselves and other road users at considerable risk. As opposed to the private member's bill, this bill treats a first offence of driving under the influence of liquor, which is deemed to be over the high alcohol limit of .15, as a very serious offence that will require the offender to participate in the interlock program. That makes sense in view of evidence that demonstrates that a driver with a blood alcohol concentration of .15 has a crash rate 22 times that of a sober driver.

As opposed to the private member's bill, offenders committing other high-risk offences, such as refusing to provide a sample of breath or blood, dangerous driving while affected by alcohol as well as repeat drink-driving offences will be captured under the government's bill. Simply put, all high-risk offences will result in the offender being required to participate in the mandatory interlock program.

The major shortcoming of the private member's bill is that it does not apply consistently to all high-risk drink drivers. For example, the private member's bill requires that the court must order an interlock for an offender who commits a drink-driving offence with a high reading of .2 over the high alcohol limit followed by an offence with a blood alcohol concentration of .07 over the general alcohol limit. However, if an offender commits an initial offence with a reading of .07 followed by an offence with a reading of .2 it is at the discretion of a magistrate as to whether or not they impose an interlock condition on the offender. This defies reason. The order of the offences does not matter under the government's bill. All repeat offenders within a five-year period are treated the same. They are all required to have an interlock condition.

Targeting all high-risk offenders, around 40 per cent of those detected and convicted in 2007-08, is aimed at delivering a greater road safety benefit and ensuring that all motorists who have failed to separate drinking and driving are discouraged from reoffending. This is ultimately about educating offenders and encouraging behaviour change by preventing them from drinking and driving.

As opposed to the private member's bill, our bill proposes that the interlock program will be managed by the driver licensing authority, the Department of Transport and Main Roads. A court based system would have significant costs to the taxpayer and will impact on the limited and very valuable resources of our magistrates courts.

Finally, the private member's bill proposes that the court has the discretion to impose whether a person with an interlock requirement must have a zero blood alcohol concentration or be subject to the general alcohol limit of .05 when starting or operating a vehicle. Our bill proposes that high-risk drink drivers with an interlock requirement must have zero alcohol in their system when driving under their interlock condition licence. Under other amendments contained in this bill, any person who has demonstrated drink-driving behaviour will be required to observe a no-alcohol limit regardless of their age. As a consequence of these amendments, all drink drivers will be required to observe a zero blood alcohol concentration requirement when they get their licence back. These drivers have demonstrated that they cannot responsibly manage their drinking and driving behaviours. A consistent no-alcohol limit for drink drivers returning to the licensing system will encourage a separation of drinking and driving.

Overall, our bill more effectively targets all high-risk drink drivers and the interlock condition is more consistently applied. These high-risk drink drivers will be required to only drive vehicles with an interlock fitted. This restriction will remain in place for at least 12 months. The proposal contained in this bill tackles high-risk drink drivers more effectively than the model put forward in the private member's bill. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (3.32 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the cognate bills. The bills intend to amend legislation across a number of acts. On 11 November 2009 the shadow minister and member for Maroochydore introduced a private member's bill, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009. That bill could have been debated in the following sitting week that commenced on Tuesday, 24 November. On 10 March 2010, four months later, the Minister for Transport introduced a government bill, the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010.

The bills are designed to achieve the same objective: to establish an alcohol interlock regime. The bill introduced by the member for Maroochydore was specifically designed to enable the courts to impose restrictions on drivers with a view to curbing problematic drink driving. As noted a moment ago, the government bill proposed to achieve the same outcome, in addition to amending a number of other transport related acts: the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, the Adult Proof of Age Card Act 2008 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2007 for various purposes.

The bills differ in such ways as who orders and who administers the alcohol interlock conditions. The bill introduced by the member for Maroochydore aims to have a court ordered mandatory regime for high-alcohol limit repeat offenders and a discretionary court ordered regime for high-alcohol limit first offenders and low-alcohol limit repeat offenders. The government bill provides for a mandatory administrative regime.

The length of time that an alcohol interlock condition applies is also a point of difference between the bills. The member for Maroochydore's bill provides for a minimum of one year with a maximum of eight years for high-alcohol limit repeat offenders and one to four years for high-alcohol limit first offenders and low-alcohol limit repeat offenders. The government bill provides for a one-year period for a person convicted of a drink-drive offence who, as a result, has been disqualified from holding or obtaining a Queensland driver's licence.

The bill introduced by the member for Maroochydore contains two other elements. The first relates to drink-driving education and rehabilitation and the other relates to the 'three strikes and you're out' rule. Education is a cornerstone of all rehabilitation programs. It is logical to include a mandatory education program for repeat offenders and yet this government is silent on the matter. Importantly, to attach a big stick to the equation is also logical. By the time someone is facing the court for a third time in five years for exceeding the .15 level they have sent a pretty clear sign that they are just not getting the message. By then it must be apparent to even the slowest thinker that a mandatory loss of the right to drive on our roads is needed. We do not want them there, do we? By forcing them off the roads for good we are just about guaranteed to be saving lives, pain and suffering into the future.

When compared to the member for Maroochydore's bill, the government bill contains two extra provisions relating to mandatory zero blood alcohol limits for all drivers required to install an alcohol interlock to their car. I have to say that that sounds very logical and the government could easily have moved an amendment of that sort to the member for Maroochydore's bill and had it included. The government bill also provides for a right for an exemption to be applied to not have the alcohol interlock fitted to their car. By the time someone has reached the point where an alcohol interlock has been ordered to be fitted I hope that the chief executive would look very carefully at any excuse. It seems to me that, if someone cannot provide enough breath to be registered on an alcohol interlock device, I wonder if they could provide a breath sample the next time they are pulled up for a random breath test.

As the member for Maroochydore said, the Minister for Transport admitted that over 600 people have been killed as a result of crashes involving drink drivers in the eight years to June 2009 from 2001—almost a quarter of all road fatalities in Queensland and an average of 75 per year over that eight-year period. In the last year to 30 June 2009, 84 people were killed in crashes that involved a driver over their legal alcohol limit—well above the average of the past eight years. This seems to suggest that the problem is on the increase. Why has it taken this government nigh on a decade from the first time the concept was mooted to do something about it? A cynic would say that the government had to be dragged kicking and screaming to this point. Thank goodness the shadow minister and member for Maroochydore had the determination and the resolve to develop a private member's bill that clearly has forced this government's hand. More to the point, why did the government not allow the member for Maroochydore's private member's bill to be debated last November?

Sadly, on the statistics above there is no doubt that by implementing alcohol interlock registration last year before the silly season commenced we could have saved lives. The arrogance of this government and this minister to delay the debate has most likely cost lives on our roads. I hope and trust that government members can see the only sensible course of action for them is to support the amendments put forward by the member for Maroochydore. I commend the bill to the House with the amendments I have just referred to.

Mr DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (3.37 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010. I am pleased to see that the government has finally taken the lead from the LNP to see fit to introduce legislation that will allow alcohol interlocks to be used in Queensland. We know that thousands of Queenslanders are convicted of drink driving each year and many of them are repeat offenders or those with a very high blood alcohol level. There is no arguing the fact that drink driving is a major contributor to the road toll. We need to be doing more to reduce the incidence of drink driving, and that includes using technology that is available. Interlocks have been shown to be effective, especially for repeat offenders. Their introduction in this state is long overdue. It is disappointing that the government has not followed the LNP's lead in its legislation and made it mandatory for drink drivers to also undergo rehabilitation programs.

Experience elsewhere has proven that such programs can lead to longer term behavioural changes, which is what we need to achieve with repeat offenders. The interlocks are effective in preventing people from drinking and driving but once they are removed other measures are needed to keep these drivers from reoffending. For the same reason it is disappointing that the government has failed to take the LNP's lead in implementing the 'three strikes and you're out' clause for alcohol interlocks. Just as rehabilitation and education are essential to help prevent reoffenders, we need to recognise that there will always be a small minority who will not change their behaviour.

By banning such repeat offenders from driving for life, we would be sending a clear message that society does not tolerate those who will not obey drink-driving laws and continue to put others' lives at risk. Taking a tougher stance on alcohol limits for older probationary drivers and motorcyclists is another positive move. Age is no barrier to the impairment caused by elevated blood alcohol levels in drivers.

The explanatory notes to this bill confirm that more than 22 per cent of fatalities on Queensland roads in the 12 months to November 2009 were speed related. In addition to those 77 tragic deaths, many hundreds of other drivers, passengers and pedestrians were injured due to speeding. Many of them will carry the effects of their injuries for life. Added to this is the impact of road trauma on families, friends and communities. It is a ripple effect that often goes unrecognised.

The expansion of the speed and red-light camera program is another essential tool in improving road safety. There will always be those who accuse governments of using speed detection as revenue raising. To them I say that it is very simple: if you do not speed, you will not be penalised. I can point to a very good example of this in my own area. Recently there has been media coverage about crashes and near misses on Buderim-Mooloolaba Road, particularly in wet weather. Some drivers have blamed the road surface, but the Department of Transport and Main Road's statistics show that up to 80 per cent of drivers on that stretch of road are exceeding the speed limit. When you drive too fast on a road like that, the simple fact is that you are at greater risk of coming to grief. Unfortunately, it is often another innocent person who pays the price of a driver's stupidity.

As with the alcohol interlocks, the new speed camera provisions in the legislation will take advantage of technology to improve speed detection. This includes the introduction of point-to-point speed cameras. But technology is not always the answer, and if the government is serious about improving road safety—and we have to wonder how serious it is when it has taken this long for the government to act on alcohol interlocks—it also needs to put in more resources. This includes a bigger investment in driver education and road safety advertising, and particularly more police enforcement. As one of my constituents said recently, there is nothing like a visible police presence as a deterrent to drivers who are speeding or otherwise breaking the road laws.

This bill also provides for amendments that will put responsibility for preventing heavy vehicle speeding on employers and others in the transport industry. These amendments are based on regulations developed by the National Transport Commission, designed to reduce the incidence of speeding by heavy vehicles and the crashes that can occur as a result. As we have seen too often, the results of a heavy vehicle crash can be catastrophic. It is appropriate that we recognise the role that employers and others in the industry play in causing truck drivers to travel above the speed limit.

I note that similar national models have been adopted in relation to heavy vehicle loads and fatigue management. I note also the importance of safeguards in the legislation to protect the rights of individuals in the application of these provisions. But safety must be our overriding concern, and I am pleased that this bill recognises that and allows for the prosecution of people in the transport industry who put profits before lives. This is particularly the case as the number of heavy vehicles on our roads increases.

This bill also introduces legislative amendments to enable so-called smart card licences. There are a number of concerns about the new licences, not least of which is the potential for individual privacy to be breached. The government intends to allow sensitive information, including digital photographs, to be shared by departments and authorities. We need guarantees that this information will be fully protected. We already know that identity fraud and fake IDs are becoming all too common. I understand that thousands of suspect licences are sent to the department of transport for verification by the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation, having been confiscated in licensed venues. If the smart card licences are harder to fake, that will be a big improvement. But we are yet to hear from the government how it will ensure security and privacy. We need to know who will have access to smart card licence scanners and how the information captured on them will be protected.

We have already seen how poorly this government has managed the introduction of the public transport go cards. The smart card could be an even bigger problem. Just look at what happened to three innocent Australians at the hands of the Mossad. I believe we need more consultation on the proposed new licences and a lot more information from the government on how they are to be implemented and safeguarded. It is just not good enough if we push ahead and end up with a 'smart' licence that is not smart at all.

Road safety is an issue for all of us and I support the amendments in this bill that are designed to reduce the incidence of speeding and drink driving. It is just a pity that it has taken so long for this government to act, particularly in regard to alcohol interlocks, which should have been introduced long ago and probably could have saved many more lives.

With regard to speed cameras, earlier I talked about the Buderim-Mooloolaba Road. I ask the minister to take on board that I will have one on that road any time she is ready. The revenue from speed cameras I think should go directly into road safety. If it does not, regardless of who is in government, the government will be accused of making a profit from speed cameras when that money could be utilised for the purchase of helicopters which, in turn, would stop police chases.

Mr Moorhead: Ha, ha.

Mr DICKSON: I do not think it is really funny when we have police chases and people get killed, for those members laughing up the back. If they think it is funny, they have a very sick sense of humour. The money that could be generated from these particular facilities should be put into saving people's lives. It should be utilised to keep people from breaking the law. It should be utilised for education. The minister has before her a great opportunity. I think she should grab it with both hands and utilise that money in a way that could save many, many lives in the future.

I would like to conclude by thanking the shadow minister for transport, the member for Maroochydore, for the amendments she has put forward today. I congratulate her. When this alcohol interlock device is taken on board, I will know that it has come from the LNP.

Mr MALONE (Mirani—LNP) (3.46 pm): I rise to speak on the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the private member's bill of the shadow minister for transport, the member for Maroochydore. There is a very small percentage of drivers in our community for whom it appears it does not matter what legal impositions are put on them. They will continue to drive with a blood alcohol level that is over the limit. I am hopeful that the alcohol interlock devices work, but I am afraid that there will be people out there who will either use somebody else's car or do whatever they can to get around it. I know that the penalties will be very strict but, as I said, there is a very small percentage of people who will try to get around that somehow or other.

This is a tremendous initiative and I support the legislation totally. This will certainly have an impact on the average person who intends to drink to the extent that their blood alcohol level is over the limit and then drive. The more of those people we can get off the road, the better off we will be. As we move forward and the program is put in place, it will be interesting to see, hopefully, the reduction in the number of fatal accidents on our roads. I think every member of this House understands that every car accident has implications for many people way beyond just the people who are in the car. It impacts on families, on police and on emergency services personnel. Just one single accident has a huge impact on a lot of people who come into contact with that accident or who have a connection to that accident.

Mostly what I wanted to talk about was safety on the road, and it ties in very neatly with this legislation. I, like the member for Gregory and others on this side of the House—and all members of the House to a certain extent—do a lot of driving on our roads. In my electorate we have the fatal highway between Sarina and Rockhampton, and I drive that road on a very regular basis. I have to say that it is a waste of time sitting on 100 kilometres an hour and expecting that nobody will pass you. Late at night, if you are sitting on 100, you will have semitrailers and B-doubles passing you one after the other on a regular basis. I am not talking about just one or two; they string out as a convoy of trucks heading up and down that highway. I think I am a reasonably experienced driver after being on the road for a few years, but I imagine that there would be others on the road who do not have that experience. I listened to the member for Gregory's contribution in the parliament. As he said, suddenly you look in your rear-vision mirror and all you can see is a chrome bullbar or an aluminium bullbar sitting on your tail-lights. It can be very intimidating. I know that some people on the road would go into a slight panic with that kind of situation. I think that is beyond the pale. We have to pull that back somehow or other.

Quite frankly, in my view, we have too many trucks on the road. We have a set of rail lines running up and down the east coast of Queensland that should be utilised significantly more than they are to convey general cargo. I recollect when my father was growing fruit and vegetables that there was a steam train called the 290 down. As far as I can recollect, certainly in the early thirties right through until probably the sixties when steam trains were taken off the rail, that train would leave Bowen and within 24 hours, with a change of crew, it would be in Brisbane delivering fruit to the markets. They picked up freight all along the line. They would pull up at our little siding at Koumala and you would have five minutes to get your tonne or so of fruit on to the train and away it would go. It had to pull up every couple of hundred kilometres for coal and to fill up with water. It was an express train. Even the passenger trains were sidelined for this express to go through. The guys who drove those trains were regarded as the kings of the track and they did the job with pride.

I think when you look at where we came from to where we are now—where you cannot get a train to bring freight to your siding anywhere on the Queensland coast; it has to go between major centres—we have not moved very far forward. I think it is a shame that QR and—

Mr Lawlor: Do you want to go back to steam trains?

Mr MALONE: No, I am not saying that at all and the minister knows that. Quite frankly, in terms of our engineering we have moved dramatically forward, but in terms of the way we manage our freight I believe we have gone backwards. We have trucks tearing up and down the road. I am not saying that they are killing people on the road because that is truly not the case. Most of the drivers I know are very professional. But the fact is that the amount of traffic on the road—and trucks included—has increased substantially and it is making it more and more difficult for the ordinary person to travel on the road.

As I said, we have a reasonably good rail network up and down the Queensland coast, but we are not utilising that in the best way to transport our freight. I think it is about time we looked at better ways of transferring freight between centres, even to the extent of delivering to smaller stations along the line. I just want to reiterate that 50, 60 or 70 years ago freight was transported from Bowen to Brisbane in 24 hours, stopping at a number of sidings, and now that is almost impossible. The freight has to be put on a truck to make it happen.

The other issue I would like to raise relates to the blood alcohol limit. The break-even point for alcohol is currently .05. The proposal to move it to .02 is, quite frankly, not something I would support. I think it is a backwards step. I do not believe that most of the people who take a drink with a meal or pull

up for a drink with their mates in the afternoon and stay below the .05 are contributing to the death toll or the accidents in Queensland. I have yet to see any scientific evidence that says that reducing the alcohol limit from .05 to .02 will have any impact whatsoever on the accident rate in Queensland. It would have far wider implications in terms of small businesses, restaurants, pubs et cetera. There are also implications for those who are just participating in ordinary social interaction—be they people with young families or those visiting their friends, neighbours or whatever—and who are not able to have a beer. I think that is beyond the pale. Unfortunately, we are heading towards a nanny state situation in Queensland, and hopefully this is one idea that will not take hold.

The other issue I would like to talk about in terms of rail freight is the fact that we have situations where cattle are unable to be transported by train and this puts huge pressure on our regional roads. We also have grain that is unable to be transported by train, and this also puts huge pressure on and causes damage to our regional roads.

There is a tendency that seems to have become inherent in recent times. The cost of rail freight gets pushed so high that it becomes uneconomical for producers to use that form of transport, and this forces their product to be pushed on to the road. Then of course a survey or a report is done on that particular rail line which says that it is not being used sufficiently to maintain it, and then the line is closed and all of the product goes on to the roads. There has to be a greater analysis of freight movements around Queensland. I believe there is a tremendous opportunity for a government to grab this with both hands and make sure that roads are designated for pedestrian and car traffic to the largest extent possible and that rail lines are used, not exclusively but certainly in a better way, to transport products around Queensland.

Mr HORAN (Toowoomba South—LNP) (3.56 pm): The Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill we are debating today amends some 14 separate pieces of legislation, but probably one of the very important issues in it is the issue of the alcohol interlocks and the various road safety issues associated with that. The government has been dragged kicking and screaming into this parliament with this legislation. The government promised for nine years—nine years—that it would introduce alcohol interlocks. It promised to have reviews and trials. Various ministers and leaders presented major statements over a period of years and still nothing happened. Then finally last year our shadow minister introduced a very sound piece of private member's legislation which would introduce alcohol interlocks and, associated with that, provide rehabilitation and education, which is important for people who are habitual offenders and who continue to seriously offend. That in itself has been the catalyst that has forced the government to bring its legislation into the parliament in a face-saving exercise. It took nine years of not being able to achieve this important measure.

We have heard some of the statistics regarding fatalities during the debate. In particular, almost a quarter—some 23 per cent—of the fatalities that have happened on our roads in recent years have been caused by people who have been over the drink-driving limit. So it is a very important piece of legislation in that regard because we can bring about a way of stopping serious drink driving and stopping drink driving itself. This will not only save lives; it will also prevent injuries. Some people carry these injuries for the rest of their lives and are required to go through extensive rehabilitation. We are always very concerned about the deaths, and rightly so, but associated with those accidents are many more serious injuries, damage to families and damage to people's bodies which affects their ability to work and causes other associated problems.

We have come a long way in trying to bring about sensible, pragmatic and practical alcohol rules for driving. In the history of Queensland some of us grew up in the era where all there was to drink was heavy beer, and the test for drink driving was that you got out of the car and the policeman asked you to walk a straight line along a white line. Thank goodness over the years we have moved towards a system where there is far greater responsibility.

I well remember in my senior year at school the brother in charge of our class telling us that a certain number of us would be killed by age 21, and we all laughed but he was right. Three were killed in very tragic circumstances at different times. We have all seen in our electorates dreadful tragedies caused by drink driving involving young people, in particular, but tragedies for other people as well.

When the drink-driving rules were first brought in, the blood alcohol limit was .08. It was a massive change in the culture of our state. It affected the social lives of people who were going out to have a drink—for example, people who went to pubs on Friday night to sell meat trays for junior footy clubs and so on. It was a huge change. Since then, .08 has been brought down to .05. I think .05 is a sensible level. It is backed up by science and experience that people are still safe under the limit of .05, but it allows all those responsible people to have a reasonable social life. For example, if a woman picks up her kids from school and wants to have a glass of wine with a friend, she can do that. People can go to golf, bowls or various sporting events and have a couple of light beers and safely drive home. For people in country areas who live a long way away from where pubs or events are but who need to drive home because there is no such thing as a cab, it enables them to have a modest social life. Generally

speaking, you would say that people in our communities are very responsible about that. The limit of .05 is a sensible one. I thought that the proposal of .02, which is basically a zero alcohol limit and means you would not be able to have a drink at all, was quite ridiculous. It had no regard for good, decent people who abide by the rules and the normal, modest social needs and demands of our society.

I have had people come to see me who are involved in golf and bowls who have said that they might as well give it up and do nothing if they cannot have a drink and then drive home, because that is part of the pleasure they enjoy. The target we should be aiming for is those people who break the .05 limit. That is what it is about. It is not about all the good people who obey the laws; it is about those who break the .05 limit. What we are talking about in this debate today is people who seriously break the .05 limit. We are talking about blood alcohol levels of .15. We are talking about repeat offenders. Some of the statistics of repeat offenders are appalling, but it makes you realise that there are people in our community who are not worried about being .02 or .05; they are way over .05 and they are dangerous. They are the ones who cause serious crashes, death, maiming and the hurt that goes with it.

It is hard to believe or understand that people can get caught for .15 twice, let alone three times, but it does happen and the statistics show it. That is why we are proposing a system of alcohol interlocks. As I understand it, this is a technology that disables a car when a person tries to start it if their breath has a reading over a certain amount. No doubt it is expensive technology, but I do not think that matters at all because for the people who have transgressed so badly on so many occasions that would be part of the penalty of being not only foolish but also wilful in endangering other people's lives.

The private member's bill introduced by our shadow minister, the member for Maroochydore, as I said earlier, is very sound. It has better regulations and rules surrounding the introduction of the interlock. We are dealing with very serious offences. It is time to stop mucking around. If you get to this stage, then it has to be serious and it has to be backed up by education and rehabilitation.

In terms of road safety and drink driving, there are a number of other very important issues that are creeping into the driving habits of people as we move into new technology. In particular, I mention mobile phones. There is almost an obsession with mobile phones and texting—

Ms Nolan: Only on your side.

Mr HORAN: It was not about yesterday. You were not driving, but you were answering a question. We see people texting while driving and even very actively tapping in phone numbers which some people have to do because they do not have the technology. They might have a hands-free system as their earpiece, but they still need to input the phone number into the phone. It is becoming a problem with driving, particularly in areas where just a very quick distraction can cause serious problems.

The road from Toowoomba to Brisbane, for example, is the heaviest freight-carrying highway in Australia. It goes right through the centre of our city. There are thousands of B-doubles intermixed with small cars, light cars and four-wheel drives. It only takes a little slip for someone when they are travelling at 100 kilometres or coming to an intersection to text or ring someone and they can be in trouble. All of these vehicles are heavily laden, carrying grain, coal or general freight that is going either to the southern states or to Darwin. As part of our road safety and the protection of our young people and drivers, in particular, our driver training should emphasise these matters.

I have been talking to my eldest granddaughter who has her learner's licence and I have been trying to teach her about that. I am trying to teach her that it is not so important to have the CDs up at full bore, particularly when she is learning. I have been trying to teach her about driving in between trucks. I am trying to tell her that when driving at 100 kilometres, which is legal, how quickly something can happen and how you need something in reserve. Our young people need to be taught to drive at night, in wet conditions and in all the sorts of conditions which they will strike. We would like to have the experience of drivers who have been driving for many years passed onto those young people so they can drive safely.

We have 4,000 trucks a day travelling through our city because we have not been able to get the Toowoomba bypass built. It is an absolute disgrace. At the end of the grain harvest there were some 300 extra B-doubles a day going through the main streets of the city, through 16 sets of traffic lights, because Queensland Rail could not carry the grain. Likewise, we see similar problems with cattle because QR cannot bring some of these cattle from the west down to meatworks at Dinmore and Teys Brothers at Beenleigh. They are some of the shortages that are occurring in the transport system under this government.

This legislation also deals with point-to-point cameras and the ability of councils to collect penalties from unpaid tolls. It is amazing that some of these things are already in place but the legislation is not. Again, it shows how rushed this legislation—

Ms Nolan interjected.

Mr HORAN: When I say it is not happening, they are up there but they cannot operate because the legislation has not gone through.

Ms Nolan: No, earlier legislation dealt with that, so they are okay.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms van Litsenburg): Order! Members should direct their comments through the chair.

Mr HORAN: On the matter of point-to-point cameras and speed limits, I think it is important to have sensible speed limits at the right points. I view with some concern not the increasing numbers of speed limited areas that are put in place but the extent back and forward to which that area has been extended. In some areas where the speed limit is 100 kilometres and it is a four-lane highway an 80-kilometre speed limited area is put in place, and it seems to be extended back so far that people almost neglect it because they think the true 80-kilometre speed limit is a lot further along. I see that on a couple of spots along the Warrego Highway.

A fixed camera has been put in place on the lanes going up the Toowoomba range. There are now two cameras on the Warrego Highway—one on the way up the range to Toowoomba and one going towards Brisbane closer to Ipswich. There have been hundreds of crashes on the Toowoomba range due to the movement of these 4,000 B-doubles a day and the height of the range. People have to go from 2,000 feet down a very steep decline. Basically all of the accidents happen on the down section of the range. That is the dangerous part. That is where people have to be doing 60 kilometres an hour. That is where people have to remember as they come around the bends that there could be trucks in front. That is where the trucks can lose control, roll or career down the range or need to try to get up one of the safety ramps.

It seems strange to have a fixed camera on the lanes going up the range. It was always 100 kilometres an hour going up the range. The crashes happen going down the range. Most of it is now 90 kilometres an hour, but then it goes to 70 and then to 60 well away from where we enter Toowoomba.

Great care needs to be taken when deciding where to put these fixed speed cameras. They need to have the respect of the public so they need to be in sensible places and they should not be brought back too far. People need to know that when they see a sign that says '70' or '80', that is what it means. Otherwise we end up with four-lane highways interspersed with different limits. More of this is happening as we see growth along these corridors. The sections where the speed limit is 80 or 70 kilometres an hour are being extended so far that people get impatient.

Toowoomba has been included in the South East Queensland Regional Plan. It would be good to see us included when it comes to proper public transport. I have said before that there needs to be a vision and planning for the future. We need to see high-speed electric train services to Brisbane at some stage in the future. I know that takes a long time and a lot of money. It is predicted that our city will have 200,000 people by 2030. That is the figure just for Toowoomba and the immediate vicinity, not including the places further out. There are also issues like the go card, which people in South-East Queensland are able to access to move around the city. People cannot get them to use when they get on the bus in Toowoomba to go down to Brisbane.

The chain of responsibility is part of this legislation as well. This relates to the responsibilities of loaders, managers and employees when it comes schedules. It is about ensuring that the timetables of truck drivers are not such that they are forced to speed or drive dangerously. I think it has been a good system.

I make a point—and I made the point when this provision was initially brought in—about issues relating to the loading of livestock. There can be problems such as dirt roads, wet weather and so forth. There are issues surrounding mustering cattle into yards ready for the arrival of the road train or the B-double at six, seven or eight o'clock at night. It can be very difficult. Because of this chain of responsibility provision there has been a lot of planning going into how these sorts of operations will work.

If they can, people reserve a nice paddock or have some fresh grass handy to the yard so that they can have their cattle in a day or two before they need to. They can then do the separation in the yards and have the cattle ready. When it comes to animal welfare, these things can be difficult. A lot of care needs to be taken when looking at the chain of responsibility and consideration given to issues involving the animals, the weather conditions or the difficulties traversing gravel and dirt roads or areas that are a way off the bitumen.

Finally, there is the issue of special events in regional Queensland that are addressed in this bill. I ask the minister to explain that a little. I know that the bill widens the power of TransLink in South-East Queensland in terms of major events. Does this mean there will be some additional availability of services for big events? In my area there are major events such as the Toowoomba Royal Show, the Weetwood carnival and the Carnival of Flowers. Is this provision designed to provide regional areas with the ability to have mass transit arrangements in place that suit those occasional events which attract very large crowds?

I would like to recommend to the House the private member's Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill. As we go through the clauses our shadow minister will be pointing out the differences in the arrangements that the LNP has put forward. They provide a far greater deterrent. They are a more practical deterrent. They are backed up by rehabilitation and

education. If we are going to overcome the dreadful scourge of drink driving itself but also excessive and repeat drink driving, it will take strong and resolute measures. I believe that the government's bill falls short in that area. The bill introduced by the LNP will provide the security and safety that will enhance the protection of families on our roads who, through no fault of their own, may be killed by someone who is over the limit, well over the limit or a repeat drink driver.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (4.15 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill 2009. There are a couple of issues that I want to deal with. I certainly believe that there would be general community support for the alcohol interlock provisions in relation to repeat high-end offenders. I commend the member for Maroochydore for introducing this private member's bill last year.

I know that the current Minister for Transport is a woman of great calibre, but I think it is a pity that governments generally are not big enough or confident enough to accept an opposition bill when it addresses a need but instead introduce provisions of their own which almost mirror the private member's bill. This is not the first time this has happened. Therefore, I know it is not an individual minister's perspective.

I think the alcohol interlock provisions in the bill are practical, particularly when we look at the exemptions, which include distance from a provider. In a diverse state such as Queensland that is a necessary provision. Whilst I am not in any way condoning high-end drink drivers, it is important to be practical when it comes to that person's ability to continue with work once their licence is reinstated. When some of our residents live great distances from where these facilities are able to be accessed, it is important that practicality is entrenched in the legislation.

I also welcome the exemption whereby medically it can be shown that the operator of the vehicle is unable to provide a breath specimen for the interlock device. That is not going to be a huge number of people, but it is a practical consideration when it comes to people with bronchial problems—asthma and the like. It can be quite a daunting situation for someone who has been unwell when a random breath test requires a breath sample.

The bill also introduces a zero-alcohol requirement for holders of new licences—that is, those on learner, provisional and probationary licences. I do not know how this is going to be accepted in the community, particularly by older people. I believe that the rationale underpinning it has great merit. Whether you are 50 and you have your first driver's licence or you are 20 and you have your first driver's licence, the only advantage to the 50-year-old is that we could hope for a bit more maturity and life experience when in comes to their driving skills; however, they would still lack the experience. In some of our cities and towns where it is very busy, driving through traffic requires a thousand per cent of our concentration.

Whilst there will be some reaction in the community, the provision is well founded. I also note that it relates to motorcycle riders. The member for Brisbane Central said that she had never ridden a motorbike. I have and I can tell her that there is nothing around you. If a motorcycle rider is going to have an incident, there is nothing around them to protect them except air. If they are not concentrating, that is certainly when problems can occur. To that extent, the zero-alcohol tolerance for new licence holders is very defendable.

The member for Southern Downs and the member for Mirani spoke about the proposal that has been floated in the media—not in this legislation—in relation to the reduction of the blood alcohol limit from .05 to .02. The only people in my electorate who have contacted me about this issue have been those opposed to it, including some medical professionals who see significant difficulty in not only policing it but also some of the difficulties that arise with other substances that may give an alcohol reading.

The LNP in its bill proposes that a person who is apprehended three times with a high-end blood alcohol level greater than .15 would have their licence cancelled for life. The logic to that is there. However, I have great concern about mandatory sentencing on anything. There are areas in the Criminal Code with which I would feel much more comfortable with mandatory sentencing—things like child sex offences. However, even in that circumstance we need to rely on the justice system being able to identify any mitigating circumstances and take those into account.

I believe that currently the court system is able to cancel a person's driver's licence for life, and I would like to think that that opportunity is seriously considered by the judiciary when it is handing out sentencing for high-end offenders. I am not saying that a person caught more than three times with a high BAC should not have their licence cancelled for life; I am not arguing that that is not the situation. I would argue against the mandatory nature of the situation, because there can be circumstances of mitigation and mandatory sentencing of this nature does not allow for any consideration, albeit those in favour of it can argue that there can be no grounds for mitigation for drink driving. Life is funny.

There is another circumstance that I want to mention, and I hope that the minister does not mind my recounting it because I have spoken about this issue with her. It was an issue that she raised with me and I believe it is very insightful—that is, there are people in the community who have had a terrible driving record because of alcohol and alcohol dependency and, as the minister herself stated, have at a point in time come to the realisation that their behaviour is life threatening and stupid—and any other word that you would like to call it—and actually do come to terms with their addiction and are able to manage their life better. Those people could turn from being quite serious alcoholics to being a redeemed alcoholic and quite able to drive without any problem or any concern. The minister quite rightly pointed out that mandatory sentencing in those instances would be a disadvantage to those people who have taken control and charge of that addiction, and I appreciated the minister pointing that out.

I support the LNP's proposal that those who are subject to interlock devices participate in an education and rehabilitation program, provided that education and rehabilitation programs are available and there are programs that they can participate in at the time that the legislation passes. At times in this chamber we require certain actions or provisions to commence when the ability to actually do that has not been put in place, and it is very frustrating for people in the community. As long as the education and rehabilitation programs are able to be rolled out right across Queensland so that people who are subject to those directives are able to access them and they are affordable—that it is not priced out of the reach of people who could be struggling financially—I certainly support that measure.

The Queensland smart licence is an issue that has been around for a long time now—quite a number of years. I retain concerns about the privacy of the information that is to be held by the smart licence. I acknowledge that the smart licence as is proposed will have some of the information that is currently viewable by anyone who looks at a driver's licence shielded on the chip, and I acknowledge that. However, as I was given to understand it, the smart licence will be able to hold quite a significant amount of personal information and therefore there is a privacy issue and I believe that that needs some thought. The cost issue is also significant. People in my electorate—and I probably represent an electorate with a relatively good employment level—commented on the increase in prices for licences and the like, and a significant increase in the price of a licence could be a hurdle for some that they do not need. The other issue with the smart licence is the distribution of reading devices. That distribution must be widespread, and I certainly am not confident that that is the situation at present.

Proof-of-age cards have been very welcome. There are still a number of people, particularly older women, who do not have a driver's licence who use these proof-of-age cards—not to get into the nightclubs but for other purposes. Some might use it to get into a nightclub, but certainly some of the older ladies whom I have spoken to do not. However, they certainly do need it for other purposes. Almost any official transaction now requires proof of identity. I note that the bill allows the chief executive to take and retain digital photographs and digital signatures. I query the security of the collection and storage of that information given that it is my understanding from the bill that digital photos and signatures can be kept for a period of 30 years, although I note that if an application is not granted the photographic information and signature information has to be destroyed within six months. But, with regard to that information that is being held, I would seek the minister's clarification as to the security controls put in place, because it will be a significant databank of information of a very personal nature.

The second last issue I want to raise is the changes to the heavy vehicle driving requirements in terms of extending the chain of responsibility to additional parties. Those directing drivers in any capacity—I will not go through the list because there are a few—are now going to be held responsible if the drivers are coerced, required, lent on, encouraged—any word you like—to drive from point to point more quickly than can safely be done. We have all of the fatigue management strategies in place, but there are still incidents where drivers are put in an invidious position where they are told that they must be at a certain point at a certain time when even the most simple of maths indicates that that cannot be achieved legally. So this extension of the chain of responsibility is welcome.

All of us who have driven the highway any number of times have been in a situation where a dirty great big B-double is bearing down on you from behind where they are so close you cannot even see the lights of the B-double out your back window. Fortunately, there are many very good heavy vehicle drivers—thankfully the bulk of them—but when you come across one who is a bit of a cowboy or irresponsible or time pressured they can be particularly dangerous because of the size of their rigs and the speed and momentum that they maintain. I have driven the Bruce Highway and been off on the shoulder when a B-double or a semi has miscalculated their ability to pass in a passing lane. You run out of road; they do not run out of truck, and you can be in quite a difficult circumstance. So anything that removes the imperative on drivers to push the limits of safety is welcome.

I concur with the comments of the member for Mirani. I think we need to take a backward step and look more at using rail for freight. We have done away with that, because Queensland Rail has gone into bulk commodities rather than freight and that has put a significant amount of additional heavy traffic on our roads. There is nothing more telling than in wet weather, when these heavy vehicles are pushing to get back on to the transport lines, to show that these roads are really not up to taking the weight.

The last matter that I wish to raise relates to the changes to marine safety. I do not want to go into the detail of those proposals other than to say that there was a major spill in the port of Gladstone. The Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Transport came to the area and, I think, both handled the situation well. However, the retained feeling of the people in the city of Gladstone and the region is that the response time was too long. So any changes that would create a lack of clarity to the response to a maritime incident is not a step forward at all.

I listened to the comments of the member for Maroochydore when she highlighted some of the shortcomings in the response to a shipping incident which has been reported on. Given that Gladstone is a major shipping port of bulk commodities, some of which will now have attached to them certain risks, the ability to respond to a marine incident needs to be short and sharp. It has to be done the right way and it has to be seen to be done the right way. I would be very concerned about any changes to maritime safely that would elongate that response time or give rise to community concern that the response is less than adequate. I look forward to the minister's response.

As I said, I have problems with mandatory sentencing. I am sure we will deal with that issue during consideration in detail. Overwhelmingly, the community that I represent—and the communities that we all represent—want people to be able to travel safely on our roads. Thankfully, the vast majority of motorists are good drivers. They drive safely and they are responsible. In the main, these pieces of legislation are aimed at that small percentage of people who are not responsible.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (4.32 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010, particularly those amendments that relate to heavy vehicle speed compliance. However, before I speak to these amendments, I want to mention that I read today's *Cairns Post* with horror and shame as I discovered that, during a recent blitz in Far North Queensland, one in every 37 drivers who underwent breath testing was drunk. This figure is well above the state average of one in 80. It was reported that in only a five-hour period, 24 drink drivers were caught. That shows that the 'anywhere, anytime' approach to enforcement is working. However, some people are just not getting it. I have no time for any of these drivers. The vast majority of drivers can manage their alcohol consumption and use sound judgement before getting behind the wheel. Quite simply, those drink drivers, particularly the repeat offenders, have absolutely no respect for the law and no respect for life—not only their own but the lives of other road users and their passengers who they put at risk.

The need for alcohol interlock devices for repeat drink-driving offenders has been well established by members on both sides of the House during this debate, so I do not intend to cover the same ground. Suffice it to say that I welcome the amendments in this bill. Moreover, I welcome the discussion that the government is having with the people of Queensland regarding a range of tough measures to tackle drink driving in our communities. I encourage people to put forward their views on this important subject.

As I said at the outset, I welcome the opportunity to contribute to the debate on heavy vehicle safety. Like many other rural and regional parts of Queensland, in the electorate of Mulgrave trucks play a vital role in supporting the economic growth and viability of local industry—local industry that supports and creates jobs for Queenslanders. But my constituents, like others all across Queensland, quite rightly expect heavy vehicles to operate to the highest safety standards, whether it is by having mechanically sound trucks, appropriately secured loads, drivers being prevented from driving when tired or, as is the case with these amendments, ensuring that drivers are driving at safe speeds. I am advised that over the past five years approximately 18 per cent of the road fatalities related to crashes involving heavy vehicles. Of those, approximately 27 per cent of fatalities were occupants in a heavy vehicle, with the remaining 73 per cent being other road users, including pedestrians and cyclists. That is a serious concern and one that needs to be addressed. That is why the amendments introducing the heavy vehicle speed compliance reform are so important.

I am required to undertake a significant amount of driving to service the electorate of Mulgrave, which stretches for approximately 100 kilometres from top to bottom. Like many road users, I am bewildered at not only how often I see dangerous driving activities undertaken by drivers of heavy vehicles but also how often I am overtaken by trucks that quite obviously are not speed limited to 100 kilometres per hour but are badged as such. Following an approach by a constituent last year, I raised this issue with the Minister for Transport, who advised that the Department of Transport and Main Roads enforces vehicle standards for heavy vehicles, including speed limiter requirements under the Australian Design Rule 65/00. These requirements include checking vehicle engine management unit settings for speed limiter compliance as part of the department's random vehicle inspection program.

The department intends to use data from trucks in the Intelligent Access Program to monitor truck speed. Although it is primarily designed to monitor the adherence of higher mass limit vehicles to certain routes, the satellite tracking can also calculate the speed of the vehicle every 30 seconds and the speed above 100 kilometres per hour. This information will be used to trigger speed-limiting compliance action against the monitored heavy vehicle. I was also encouraged that, when the issue of altered gearbox fins to enable some vehicles to be unrestricted in road speed was raised with the federal minister for transport, Anthony Albanese, a commitment was made to investigate this practice in a review of the Australian design rule.

I would like to point out that the amendments in this bill do not change the speed limits that apply to trucks, nor do they remove the obligation for drivers to keep their vehicles travelling below the speed limit regardless of the terrain, weather or surrounding traffic. After the reform commences, heavy vehicle drivers must continue to obey the road rules. The Queensland Police Service will continue to enforce these rules, just as it always has.

When I raised the issues relating to heavy vehicle safety with the minister last year, I was advised that the department was committed to implementing the national heavy vehicle speed compliance reform and would be introducing legislation—which is this legislation—designed to target those people in the logistics chain who influence a driver's behaviour. A key element of this reform is to hold those people accountable if their influence results in the driver committing a speeding offence. Called the chain of responsibility, the principle of shared responsibility for transport offences was legislated in Queensland as early as 1998. In fact, I am informed that Queensland was the first state in Australia to introduce the chain of responsibility into legislation.This reform is based on concepts used in previous chain of responsibility reforms for fatigue management and mass dimension and load restraints. Put simply, specific parties in the logistics chain, such as employers, prime contractors and operators, will be held liable for individual speeding breaches committed by drivers. These parties have a major influence in controlling the on-road behaviour of drivers. Therefore, they are the parties with the broadest duties placed on them.

However, I note that, as part of the reform, parties captured in the chain of responsibility have a legal defence available called the reasonable steps defence. That means that if a party did not know, or could not have known, of a speeding offence by a driver and took all reasonable steps it could to prevent an offence from occurring, it has a defence under these amendments. There are no limits on the steps a person can take to establish their defence. This, of course, is a sensible and pragmatic approach, as it uses familiar processes to allow companies to do all they can to prevent a driver from speeding.

The reform places a series of positive duties on a broader range of parties in the chain. In addition to employers, prime contractors and operators, these duties are placed on loading managers, schedulers, consignors and consignees. The duties are specific to the activities performed by each party. The core obligation is that they must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the party's activities or functions will not cause, contribute, or encourage a driver to break the speed limit. That is done through specific duties targeting high-risk business practices. For example, in no way should a schedule require a driver to speed to meet a deadline, operators cannot offer inducements for a driver to speed and contracts that would likely cause a driver to speed are illegal. As with other transport laws for the road freight industry, when a risk that could influence a driver's speed management is identified or becomes known to a party, that party must assess what the risk is, how serious and likely it is to cause a driver to speed and what they can do to minimise the risk of a driver speeding.

I go back to my earlier comments on the number of fatal crashes involving heavy vehicles. I think it is very important to acknowledge that the road freight industry has an increasingly proactive attitude towards enhancing safety. Evidence of that is reflected in the road toll. I am advised that, despite a consistent increase of approximately seven per cent per annum in vehicle kilometres travelled by heavy vehicles, since 1998 fatalities resulting from heavy vehicle collisions have been decreasing steadily. I am also advised that representatives of the road freight industry have been strong advocates for this reform in forums such as the Road Freight Industry Council as well as in communication with the department. By its support for this reform, the industry has shown that it is prepared to do its part in ensuring that all road users are safe.

Before I finish, I cannot pass up an opportunity to respond to some of the comments made by those opposite during this debate. Some disgraceful comments have been made—suggestions that this government has the blood of Queenslanders on its hands for not introducing provisions for alcohol interlocks earlier. We are all very aware of the former Travelsafe Committee's 2006 report and its recommendations, and I commend the work of the members of that former select committee.

However, let us remember that this was an all-party committee. Liberal and National Party members for Mirani, Moggill and the former seat of Charters Towers at some time contributed to bringing this report to parliament. I ask those opposite: where have their voices been on this matter since this report? Couldn't any one of these members have drawn up a private member's bill or urged the shadow transport spokesperson to do so if those opposite really believed that the government was dragging its heels? Of course they could have, but why not use an issue that could easily have been progressed in a bipartisan way as an opportunity to grandstand and play politics! What is worse, it was on 28 October last year that the Minister for Transport announced that the government was going to introduce a bill regarding alcohol interlocks and surprise, surprise, a private member's bill is introduced on 11 November.

I genuinely commend any member of this House who puts forward measures that can assist in the fight against the scourge of drink driving, but I ask: who is following whom? In no way was the government dragged kicking and screaming to this point, nor has it in any way bowed to pressure from

the opposition. The issue of alcohol interlocks is serious and complex with potential implications for people's civil liberties. The government has acted appropriately to ensure we got it right. I congratulate the minister and the department on their work on this bill and look forward to seeing the resulting measures at work.

Mr MOORHEAD (Waterford—ALP) (4.40 pm): I rise to support the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 and commend the minister for bringing this bill before the House for its consideration. As members would have heard from previous speakers, one of the key aspects of this bill is the introduction of legislation to facilitate the requirement for high-risk drink drivers to install and use alcohol ignition interlocks. This is an important measure to address the risk to road safety proposed by high-risk drink drivers. These risks are posed not only to the driver and the driver's family and passengers but also to the other motorists who share the road with them.

There has been a key change in culture on drink driving along with a range of regulatory reforms over recent years that have made significant improvements in the road toll. In 1975 there were 30.96 deaths per 100,000 people on Australian roads. In 2008 that figure was 7.64, a significant drop in anyone's language. Unfortunately, a problem persists. In the 12 months to 2008 there were 29,000 people charged with drink driving, including 12,000 repeat offenders. Although the community no longer finds drink driving acceptable, these individual behaviours persist. This is one of the key challenges for community perceptions in the issue of road safety. People understand that speeding and drink driving is dangerous, but when asked about their own behaviour they think that a little bit over is okay. That is simply not the case.

The new section 91I defines the drink-driving offences that will attract the installation of an ignition interlock device following a period of disqualification. This will be focused on people who are over the high limit or people with a previous history of drink-driving offences. Those people who are required to install an alcohol ignition interlock into their car will also be provided with the opportunity to ask for an exemption from that requirement and an opportunity to appeal to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal if they are disqualified. This means that people who are considered to be at a high risk of reoffending for high-level drink driving would be required to provide a breath sample before their car would start. I think that this is an effective measure. This interlock will be in place for 12 months and the driver will not be able to start their car without a zero blood alcohol content. Obviously there are opportunities for misuse: for other people to provide a sample or for the person to drive another car. What this parliament can do is provide penalties for that behaviour and provide a strict enforcement regime.

Before coming to this place, I helped many workers who found themselves charged with drink driving and who were seeking work permits. In many cases people charged with high-level drink-driving offences or people who had consistently reoffended, and who generally at law were very unlikely to get work licences, had an underlying problem with alcoholism. They were people who simply had a problem and despite their best intentions were highly likely to reoffend. This will create a net to catch those people.

In a recent meeting with officers from the Loganlea Fire Station, their advice to me was that they were sick of pulling people who have been wrapped around trees out from their cars to find out they have been intoxicated and generally beyond that high level. This is an important initiative. It is about getting tough on drink driving. Unfortunately, it is sometimes necessary to save drink drivers from themselves.

The member for Indooroopilly stated that he was sure that this was not a measure of revenue raising. I think that the member for Indooroopilly was dog whistling to that great old statement that enforcement of road safety is a measure of revenue raising. When all of his colleagues have got up and said how important it was that we get tough on drink driving and enforce the provisions, it is disappointing that he goes back to that hoary old chestnut of revenue raising. The member for Buderim suggested that the proceeds of speed cameras should go to road safety initiatives. They already do. That has been happening since the introduction of speed cameras in 1997. There was an amendment moved during the debate on that bill by the then Labor opposition to ensure that those funds that were to be collected in road safety enforcement through speed cameras would go to road safety initiatives.

In the time left to me I want to deal with three other matters. The first is the chain of responsibility changes for heavy vehicle transport. This is a recognition that responsibility for safety in the heavy vehicle transport industry goes well beyond the driver. There is a range of people who influence driving safety and the pressure placed on heavy vehicle drivers, and that includes employers, prime contractors, operators, schedulers, loading managers, consignors and consignees. We must recognise that heavy vehicle drivers are undertaking their job and they want to do the best that they can and keep their job. We have to realise that the pressure that can be placed on them to drive in an unsafe manner is significantly greater than those of us who drive to and from work or to the golf club on Saturday. This is about people for whom driving heavy vehicle transport is their job. It is recognising that all the people in that relationship must play their part and take responsibility for road safety.

There is a requirement on those participants to take reasonable steps to ensure actions do not pressure drivers to speed. Some of the requirements might include things such as checking speed limiters or ensuring that schedules allow sufficient time for the distance to be travelled. It is also great to see that this is nationally consistent legislation and supports the seamless economy which has been the focus of the Queensland and federal governments for some time now.

In respect to the changes in regard to digital speed and red-light cameras, this is an important update ensuring that the provisions can allow for new and better technologies for the enforcement of speed limits. Again this comes back to that mismatch between people's understanding that their behaviour is dangerous and the influence that it has on their own behaviour. One of the complaints lodged against fixed speed cameras is that people might slow down where that speed camera is. The point-to-point initiative contained in this bill will ensure that enforcement is not just about one small part of the road but can also measure longer average speeds that motorists are using in their driving behaviour. There are still issues around community acceptance, and that is why the Economic Development Committee is currently examining fixed speed cameras in Queensland.

Finally, the changes to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 are sensible changes in terms of providing an option for saliva testing rather than urine testing in drug testing of transit officers. Saliva testing is often a more accurate reflection of a worker's impairment rather than their drug use, particularly in relation to cannabis use. When employers are undertaking testing for safety, they are not undertaking testing for criminal behaviour but whether that person is safe to be at work or not. Saliva testing often provides a more accurate measure of a person's impairment across a range of drugs, particularly in relation to cannabis. Traditionally, saliva testing has not been preferred because it does not have an Australian standard, whereas urine testing does. That Australian standard is still under development and I understand is not far away. Saliva testing, from all scientific accounts, can be more accurate in measuring a person's impairment from drug use. I commend that being added to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 for the workers involved there. I commend the bill to the House and congratulate the minister on bringing in this bill for the parliament's consideration.

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (4.50 pm), in reply: I thank members for their contributions in this cognate debate of both LNP and government legislation. In summing up the LNP's Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill, I am proud to be part of an LNP team which has put our policy into parliament, leading the way on an important initiative to save lives on our roads in Queensland through the introduction of laws for alcohol ignition interlocks.

It is time to get off the road the idiots who repeatedly drink drive and who seem to be getting away with it. Of the 29,000 who are caught drink driving each year, 12,000 are repeat or high-level offenders and 22.9 per cent of fatalities are due to drink driving. The public is fed up with it. The families of the victims of this carnage are fed up with it. The government, which promised to act nine years ago—first trialling alcohol ignition interlocks in 2001—has been promising almost yearly to implement this program. Well, we also got fed up with waiting and introduced our own bill to the parliament five months ago. That spurred the government to bring in its bill this year.

I am pleased that the government is finally responding but, while Labor members can argue about the relative merits of who has the tougher bill, the facts are that the parliament could have debated our bill before Christmas last year. It is unfortunate that even this further delay of another five months has meant that more innocent people have died in the meantime unnecessarily due to repeat drink drivers.

The LNP bill and the government bill in regard to alcohol ignition interlock laws are very similar, but we would argue that our bill does go further in some key areas. Two fundamental differences are: the LNP bill also includes provisions to make drink drivers undertake rehabilitation; and the LNP bill has a 'three strikes and you're out' provision for very high level repeat drink drivers, over and above the interlock provision.

In regard to rehabilitation, this provision is not in the government bill, despite its own drink driving discussion paper which came out a few weeks ago noting the importance of education and rehabilitation to making the best use of alcohol interlocks. This paper recognised that both measures need to go hand in hand to bring about great change in personal drinking behaviour. The LNP will be moving amendments to insert our provision for rehabilitation and the three-strikes rule into the government bill, as in this cognate debate the government bill will be voted on ahead of the LNP bill. This will mean that, due to the rules of the parliament, the second bill will not be considered in the consideration in detail stage.

The government's delay on alcohol ignition interlocks has definitely cost lives in Queensland in the last nine years. Since 2001, when this concept was first trialled in Queensland, about 600 people have been killed due to crashes involving drink drivers. As I have said, we have a further delay of another five months. By introducing our legislation last year on the important issue of alcohol ignition interlocks—a bill which has matured and had to be debated this week—we have forced the government

to act. In the last two days I believe we have had an informative and committed debate from members across the chamber as the Queensland parliament sends a strong and collective message that drink driving will not be tolerated and that it is an abuse of the privilege to drive.

The LNP is proud to put our policy into parliament. If we can save one life by leading this debate and driving the agenda on this important issue, we know that we have contributed to a better Queensland. Ultimately, laws alone will not make roads safer. There must be effective, well-resourced enforcement so the offenders who risk the lives of others are caught and then removed from driving on the roads. No law is 100 per cent guaranteed but there is evidence, as has been shown in other jurisdictions such as Victoria, that the recidivism rate can be substantially reduced—by up to 60 per cent—where alcohol interlock initiatives are applied effectively, particularly where rehabilitation and education is employed.

I commend the LNP bill to the House. I commend the support of this parliament to finally address what is critically needed—a crackdown on repeat drink drivers.

Hon. RG NOLAN (Ipswich—ALP) (Minister for Transport) (4.55 pm), in reply: I rise to sum up the cognate debate in relation to my Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill, which is a private member's bill. I thank members for their contributions.

The primary purpose of these bills is to provide for the establishment of an alcohol interlock scheme. Alcohol interlocks comprise one element of a major program of road safety reform currently being undertaken by this government. Speed and drink driving are consistently the most prevalent causes of fatal road accidents, accounting on average for 20 to 25 per cent of the road toll each year. In addition to the interlocks which target drink driving, the government has also released a major discussion paper on the next steps in relation to drink driving, and late last year it announced a comprehensive program of speed reform—including digital cameras, reduced speed tolerances, point-to-point speed monitoring and a step-up in covert speed surveillance.

I think to members of the community MPs talking about road safety may sometimes seem so prevalent as to almost come across as background noise. People should take heart, though, that all that policy effort and all that advertising works. The meaningful way to measure the road toll is of course in per capita terms. By such a measure, the worst-ever year on Queensland's roads was 1973, when 32.1 people per 100,000 died. Last year the Queensland road toll stood at 7.51 per 100,000 of population—still a shocking and unacceptable figure but notable in that it was the best year on record.

Notwithstanding the claim by the member for Maroochydore in a media release on 18 August last year that I was 'ignoring my responsibilities' for road safety, members may wish to consider and note the breadth of the current program of road safety reform and that significant improvement in the outcome. I table the media release.

Tabled paper: Copy of an email, dated 25 March 2010, from Clare Gillic to Daniel Cheverton titled 'A death every day on Qld roads' [1965].

The current program of reform follows the graduated licensing reforms pioneered by Minister Lucas as transport minister and the significant motorcycle reforms developed by then Minister Mickel. But where would the member for Maroochydore be if all of a sudden the House decided we were going to let the facts get in the way of a good dose of breathless hyperbole? Normally I would thank members for the dignity with which a debate is conducted. I could not do that in good faith today.

The government accepts that it has been cautious in the introduction of alcohol interlocks. We have done so because, not so much in the legislation but in the rollout itself, the implementation of interlocks is a complex undertaking. And we have done so because, at a projected cost of $2,000, an interlock will—when combined with the existing fines, suspensions and in some cases jail time—put a major imposition on the people involved. I do not think the extent of that imposition, while I believe it is perfectly justifiable, should be underestimated. So while the government has been cautious, as I have outlined above, it could not plausibly be claimed that the government has stood still on road safety.

The debate in the House has centred on two points—the timing of the bills' introduction and the variations between the two models before the House. In this debate, 21 opposition members have spoken. Twenty-one of them have criticised the government for the timing of this bill, and all have given the member for Maroochydore a hearty pat on the back for what they have described as her 'foresight' and 'leadership' in this debate. I note that she hardly missed the opportunity to give herself a bit of a pat on the way through too.

Some have done so in more appropriate ways than others. Some have said the government should have acted sooner, some have asked how many people have died in the interim and the member for Currumbin, with her usual touch of class, has accused the government of having 'blood on its hands'. The chronology of government pronouncements on alcohol interlocks has obviously been circulated with a half-time pep talk in the opposition party room, and LNP members have obviously come in here appropriately geed up and ready to go.

LNP members who have spoken on this bill may also wish to consider that, while the member for Maroochydore did indeed introduce a private member's bill into this House, she did so two full weeks after I announced that the government would introduce them and two weeks after that announcement ran as a major story on the Channel 9 news. I table the transcript of that story.

Tabled paper: Copy of transcript of interview, dated 28 October 2009, relating to car ignition locks [1966].

With these LNP claims of the member for Maroochydore's far-sighted leadership ringing in my ears, I had the Parliamentary Library conduct a *Hansard* and media search of the member for Maroochydore's pronouncements on this critical matter of alcohol interlocks. Do members know how many times the Parliamentary Library found that the member for Maroochydore had raised this matter prior to my announcement that the government was going to go ahead with it? Do members know how many times the member for Maroochydore had spoken about this supposedly desperate need right up until the point when I announced that the government was going to do this? How many times? It was a big fat zero: far-sighted leadership, but she mentioned it zero times right up until the government announced we were going to do it. How is that? She has had 18 years in the parliament and three stints in the shadow transport chair since 2004, and the sum total of her policy leadership is to announce a private member's bill two weeks after the government announced we were going ahead with it. That is scintillating policy leadership LNP style.

We have just sat in here through a full day's debate, with LNP members patting the member on the back—and indeed she gave herself a good go as well—and commending that leadership foresight. I understand that on that side of the House it may well look like policy foresight and policy leadership but, to me, it looks like the Simpson Desert of policy ideas.

As I have said, the government's bill is substantively different from the opposition's in that it is tougher and more comprehensive. Rather than leaving the decision about alcohol interlocks to the courts, the government has decided to introduce a mandatory administrative scheme—reducing the grey areas and making it clear cut, comprehensive and compulsory. In choosing a judicial scheme, the LNP has essentially adopted the New South Wales model of alcohol interlocks—a model which has seen 753 people through the scheme since it was started in 2002. The government's bill is more like that of Victoria, which has seen 20,000 people through. In addition to the clear road safety benefit of a more comprehensive scheme, a bigger scheme allows for the accredited interlock provider—for whom the government will soon seek expressions of interest—to establish a network of installers across the state, and it will of course through bulk purchasing bring down the average cost to those involved.

I wish to flag here that the government does not propose to accept the LNP's amendments to the bill as they have been put forward. The three amendments to the bill put forward by the opposition relate to two matters: a proposal to introduce an absolute disqualification from driving forever for repeat high-end drink drivers without recourse to the courts, which is effectively a life ban from driving; and a proposal to make alcohol rehabilitation mandatory for those subject to an interlock condition. The two amendments of course directly contradict one another. On the one hand, the LNP says it believes in the redemptive power of rehabilitation so deeply that it wants to make it compulsory. On the other, it is so convinced that repeat drink drivers could never overcome their alcoholism that it wants to keep them off the road for life. This is more clear, direct, consistent policy thinking LNP style.

The government does not consider the first amendment necessary because the courts have the power now to absolutely disqualify people, with the only way to get your licence back if you are disqualified for two years or more being to go before the court again in order to establish that you have genuinely changed your ways. While we reject the compulsory rehabilitation program amendment, the possibilities around rehabilitation are currently being considered by the community as part of the drink driving discussion paper.

Throughout this debate, members have also commented on other elements of the bill. I note that there has been broad support for the measures to create chain of responsibility laws for heavy vehicle speeding and for the measures to prevent ship sourced sewage pollution. I note the member for Whitsunday quite appropriately made some comments on that matter. The member for Nicklin and the member for Toowoomba South asked how the provisions in regional areas for the declaration of special events for public transport purposes would work. The answer is that my department will have the capacity to declare a special event for something like the V8s in Townsville and can therefore require the organiser to put in place and pay for a public transport plan.

There were also some concerns raised, notably by the member for Gaven, about the provisions to deal with the new Queensland driver's licence. I think the concern was based on a genuine misunderstanding. The legislation is to allow for information collected under a number of acts, such as your boat and driver's licence, to be collected in one place. It does not provide for the sharing of that information with other parties or for the sharing of information from other sources, such as your health information on the one database or the one card. I hope that clarifies that degree of confusion. With those words, I thank members for the debate and I commend the government's bill to the House.

Question put—That the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Speaker's Ruling—Same Question Rule

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hoolihan): Honourable members, the question before the House is that the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill be now read a second time. I draw members' attention to the Speaker's statement circulated in the chamber on 24 March 2010 regarding the application of the same question rule contained in standing order 87. Standing order 87 provides that a question or amendment shall not be proposed which is the same as any question which during the same session has been resolved in the affirmative or negative. This Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill seeks to achieve substantially the same objective as that contained in the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which the House has just resolved to read a second time. Therefore, under standing order 87, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Interlocks) Amendment Bill cannot proceed and is therefore discharged from the *Notice Paper*.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Ms NOLAN (5.10 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 14, lines 12 to 14—

omit, insert—

'(c) chapter 4, other than part 8;'.

This first amendment removes the reference to section 128 that appears in the commencement clause of the bill. I will be shortly moving an amendment to remove that section from the bill, so I might as well speak to it now. The section deals with record-keeping requirements that are imposed on those who repair or repaint motor vehicles. It is my view that consultation has been inadequate on this matter, and as such those amendments will be withdrawn. I table the explanatory notes to the amendments.

Tabled paper: Explanatory notes to Ms Nolan's amendments to the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill [1967].

Ms SIMPSON: This was an issue I raised in the briefing, as we were interested in what level of consultation had taken place on these provisions. At the briefing, information on the level of consultation was not available. I take it that consultation was done after the bill was introduced.

Ms NOLAN: I agree with the member's concern. I am advised that departmental officers had consulted with the Motor Trades Association of Queensland but had done so some time ago, and therefore were of the understanding that this was agreed to. I asked the same question that the shadow minister did in my briefing. We are of the understanding that this would be beneficial for industry but had not consulted recently, and industry was concerned about it. I think with this we will probably get to an outcome along these lines, but I do think it appropriate that we talk to industry, get an up-to-date view and make any changes that it requires. That is why I have sought to withdraw these provisions now so that we can ensure that industry is satisfied going forward.

Ms SIMPSON: It is appropriate to consult with industry so that any new provisions are workable and can be brought about in a way that assists business and achieves the policy outcome that is intended. The minister's answer only raises further questions. How long have these provisions been on the go? When were they first consulted upon? Did the minister ask who had been consulted only after the legislation had been drafted and put before the parliament, given that it has now been withdrawn for further consultation?

Ms NOLAN: I understand that the provisions have been around for a number of years. No, I did not ask about this after the bill was introduced. I asked about it and was told that industry would be happy with it, and specifically that this would ease the red-tape burden on industry. I accept the advice from my department that that was what it was told some time ago when the amendments went forward, but I do not accept that it is okay to act on advice from a couple of years ago and not check when it comes time to bring the legislation forward. When that happened, industry raised legitimate concerns. As we are a consultative government, we agreed to take seriously its concerns. I have withdrawn these provisions and will talk to industry to ensure that we make any changes it wants and ensure that we get it right.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

Ms NOLAN (5.15 pm): I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 14 (Amendment of s 78 (Driving of motor vehicle without a driver licence prohibited))

Page 21, line 11, '5'—

omit, insert—

'2'.

3 Clause 14 (Amendment of s 78 (Driving of motor vehicle without a driver licence prohibited))

Page 21, line 30 and page 22, lines 1 to 14—

omit, insert—

'(j) if the person committed the offence while the person was a person mentioned in subsection (1B) or (1C)—for a period, of at least 1 month but not more than 6 months, decided by the court.'.'.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Ms SIMPSON (5.16 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 After clause 15

Page 23, after line 5—

insert—

'15A Amendment of s 86 (Disqualification of drivers of motor vehicles for certain offences)

'Section 86—

insert—

'(1H) If a person is convicted of a drink-driving offence committed after the commencement of this section (the ***current conviction***) and the court before whom the person is convicted is satisfied that, at the material time, the person was over the high alcohol limit and the person, within the period of 5 years before the current conviction, has been previously convicted more than once of a drink-driving offence involving a finding that, at the material time, the person was over the high alcohol limit, the person is disqualified absolutely by the current conviction and without any specific order from the date of the current conviction from holding or obtaining a Queensland driver licence.'.'.

This amendment is the provision the LNP is putting forward of 'three strikes and you're out'. This is an additional provision over and above the interlock provisions that we propose in our legislation. This is to do with not only high-level offenders but also repeat high-level offenders over a three-year period. This clause provides that, if a person has been convicted of a drink-driving offence three times within five years over the high-alcohol limit, the person will be disqualified absolutely from holding a Queensland driver's licence.

We believe that the provisions in our legislation, and some of those that are replicated in the government legislation, provide measures along the way to knocking out people who are repeat drink drivers, but there is still a high level of drink drivers who repeatedly offend. There comes a point when you have to ask the question: do people ever deserve to get their licence back? I think the community would say that there is a very high level of offender who does not deserve to get their licence back. That is why we have included this provision which we believe is practical and which reflects what the community believes needs to occur.

We have introduced legislation into this House on alcohol interlocks, but we are also proposing that this further provision is warranted for high-level repeat offenders. This is consistent with our approach that you must have the best possible tools for the courts as well as the police to remove those people from the privilege of driving.

I want to respond to one of the assertions of the minister. Quite frankly, for a Labor government to talk about policy for nine years is not policy leadership. It is action that makes a difference. It was the LNP that acted to bring legislation into this parliament. We did not talk about it for nine years. Talk is cheap. Action is what counts. It is our action which drove the government beyond policy statements and finally saw it enact legislation. It has brought on this debate in the week that our legislation matured and the debate had to come forward.

Ms NOLAN: The government opposes the amendment moved by the member for Maroochydore essentially for three reasons. The first, as I pointed out, is that there is an inherent contradiction in the sets of amendments that the member for Maroochydore is putting forward. On the one hand, the member for Maroochydore with one set of amendments is saying that there should be a redemptive power to rehabilitate high-level repeated drink drivers—which is totally unacceptable; that is why we are bringing in a system of alcohol interlocks. On the other hand, at exactly the same time, she is saying that they should have a life sentence from driving.

Right now there is the power for the courts to disqualify people for any period of time. If that disqualification runs for two years or more then the only way they can get their licence back is go to the courts and argue their case. They would most likely say, 'I have given up drinking,' and prove to the courts that they are a changed character. There is an absolute provision now and there is the power to argue the case in the future.

If we disqualify someone for life at the age of 25, with no power to ever get their licence back, and we say to them that they can absolutely never drive again and then later in life they swear off drinking, as we know some people do—Queensland's most famous historian has just written a book about his journey in this direction—we then take away any incentive for them to follow the rules. We are opening the door to those people through the rest of their lives to drive unlicensed and as a result drive uninsured and we create quite a serious public safety threat even if they have not had a drop for 30 years.

I would make two points. Firstly, there is an absolute disqualification provision now. What the opposition is proposing to do is remove a person's ability to go back to the court after they have changed their ways and argue a case. Therefore, those opposite are saying that they do not believe people can change and they are condemning people to a life either of not driving or of unlicensed driving. I believe the member for Gladstone really summed up this point and I commend her comments to the member.

Ms SIMPSON: This is ludicrous. It is the government that is inconsistent. What we have outlined means that people would be subject to an alcohol interlock earlier and they would also be given rehabilitation. Those who, despite rehabilitation and the alcohol interlocks, continue to reoffend at a very high level over a period of time will then lose their licence. The bar is set higher with regard to those who are high-level repeat offenders.

Our legislation consistently provides the opportunity at the lower levels for people to be rehabilitated and then steps through those levels. If we have high-level offenders, there comes a point where they lose their licences. This is consistent with what the community expects. It provides the opportunity for people to be taken off the road and rehabilitated earlier in the process. But if they continue to flout the laws they should have their licences taken off them. It seems that the minister is out of step with community expectations.

Division: Question put—That the member for Maroochydore's amendment be agreed to.

AYES, 30—Bates, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Langbroek, McLindon, Malone, Menkens, Nicholls, Powell, Pratt, Robinson, Seeney, Simpson, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey. Tellers: Horan, Sorensen

NOES, 48—Attwood, Bligh, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Cunningham, Darling, Dick, Farmer, Finn, Grace, Hinchliffe, Jarratt, Johnstone, Jones, Kilburn, Lawlor, Lucas, Male, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nolan, O'Brien, O'Neill, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Reeves, Roberts, Robertson, Ryan, Schwarten, Scott, Shine, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Watt, Wellington, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Keech, Kiernan

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Ms Simpson) negatived.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clause 17—

Ms NOLAN (5.33 pm): I move the following amendments—

4 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 5, pt 3B)

Page 24, line 15, 'or (k)'—

omit.

5 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 5, pt 3B)

Page 28, lines 18 and 19, from 'the person is' to 'after'—

omit.

6 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 5, pt 3B)

Page 28, line 25, '5'—

omit, insert—

'2'.

Amendments agreed to.

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (5.33 pm): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 5, pt 3B)

Page 39, after line 3—

insert—

'Division 5A Drink-driving education and rehabilitation

'91YA Drink-driving rehabilitation course

'(1) This section applies to a person mentioned in section 91J(1).

'(2) Before the person's interlock period ends, the person must—

(a) complete, at the person's own expense, a prescribed drink-driving rehabilitation course; and

(b) give the chief executive a certificate or other evidence that the person has completed the prescribed course.

'(3) A regulation may prescribe a course about the use of alcohol and driving a motor vehicle as a prescribed drink-driving rehabilitation course.

'(4) A certificate mentioned in subsection (2)(b) must be in the approved form.'.'.

I table the explanatory notes to the amendment.

Tabled paper: Explanatory notes to Ms Simpson's amendments to the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill [1968].

This amendment relates to the issue of drink driving education and rehabilitation that I referred to in my second reading speech. This clause will apply to a person referred to in 91J(1)—that is, those who have been or are eligible to be subject to an alcohol ignition interlock.

The reason this clause refers to 91J(1) and not 91K, which is the alcohol interlock provision, is that some offenders may for various reasons not have an interlock fitted but should still have rehabilitation before they re-enter the driving community. Such persons must attend a drink driving rehabilitation course prescribed under regulation before the end of the minimum period of the alcohol interlock order or, if they choose not to be subject to an alcohol interlock, before their period of loss of licence is expired. The person must attend the course at his or her own expense and provide the chief executive with a certificate or other evidence of completion. I urge the government to reconsider its opposition to this provision because, to be consistent with what has been stated within the drink driving discussion paper, there is a significant benefit to having alcohol rehabilitation courses implemented alongside the interlock program. As stated earlier, the drink driving discussion paper that the government brought out only a couple of weeks ago states—

However, the effect is not sustained once the interlock is removed, with offence rates returning to levels similar to those that did not participate in the interlock program. Long-term change in drink-driving behaviour may be achieved with interlock participants where they also complete a rehabilitation program.

I heard the minister say that her legislation mirrored more closely the Victorian legislation, yet Victoria has had very strong rehabilitation provisions in its legislation. The evidence is there. It is certainly consistent with other jurisdictions' experience. We believe it is absolutely essential that this provision be supported.

Ms NOLAN: The government is looking at the possibility of rehabilitation programs like this one and is quite closely engaged in the current CARRS-Q trial. I am advised that government has put forward some of the data which is currently being considered as part of that trial. Indeed, I am also advised it is the case that the preliminary results of that trial are positive but the evaluation has not yet been completed. Therefore, we do not yet have a final outcome of the trial which is underway. The CARRS-Q trial costs up towards $1,000. Today with the introduction of an interlock program, we are placing an imposition of around $2,000 on people and the possibility of rehabilitation of this type is considered in the drink driving discussion paper which is currently on foot. The government's view is that we are very actively exploring the possibilities around rehabilitation, but we are loath to place an additional almost $1,000 requirement on people at the same time as we are imposing a $2,000 requirement on the basis of a trial which has not been finally evaluated. So it is the government's choice to consider this through the year as part of the drink driving discussion paper.

Ms SIMPSON: The LNP's amendment that has been moved does not prescribe the detail that has to be included within that rehabilitation course. In fact, it states—

A regulation may prescribe a course about the use of alcohol and driving a motor vehicle as a prescribed drink-driving rehabilitation course.

There is the opportunity to still work through the detail as to what is specifically delivered in that rehabilitation course. There is an opportunity in this amendment that I have moved on behalf of the LNP to provide the head of power to allow the government to bring in that rehabilitation course when it has sorted out the detail. My concern is that we see yet another trial on foot when there is evidence from other states that they have been able to make it work, and have been making it work for years. The danger is that without this provision inserted into legislation we might have to wait yet longer for that head of power to sit there to enable that very important rehabilitation to take place when the detail of the courses is established.

Why should we delay any further? Put the head of power into the legislation as part of this amendment and get on with it. Other states have done it. If we really want this provision for alcohol interlocks to be effective, then the government has to bite the bullet and get things underway with regard to effective rehabilitation. There is evidence that this can be done effectively. Why on earth is Queensland so slow in getting it together and moving on it? It should not be about another nine years of talking; it is about action. We would urge the House to support this provision which is about making alcohol interlocks more effective by providing for rehabilitation courses which would then be prescribed under a regulation.

Ms NOLAN: I do not think it is a good idea to create the head of power when you do not have a very clear idea about what it is that you are seeking to establish and therefore I would not support the amendment.

Ms SIMPSON: The minister is inconsistent, because in the briefing we had on the government's legislation we were told that a head of power was being included for the smart licences to provide for other elements which have not yet been worked out with regard to marine indicators and with regard to tow truck operators. The government still has not worked out the detail of how it is going to make that work, but it is creating the head of power. Here we are arguing that it should create the head of power to allow for rehabilitation courses which would then be prescribed under regulation and the government is saying that it does not want to do that. That is not good enough. It is time for action, not for another nine years of talk!

Ms NOLAN: For the benefit of members, I will read the provision that is proposed. Under the heading '91(YA) Drink-driving rehabilitation course' it states—

(2) Before the person's interlock period ends, the person must—

(a) complete, at the person's own expense, a prescribed drink-driving rehabilitation course; and

(b) give the chief executive a certificate or other evidence that the person has completed the prescribed course.

As such, this is an absolute provision that the person must complete the course. If it were, as the member argues, only a head of power and you could stick in the regulation later when the trial is over, then the provision at 91(YA)(2) would say—

Before the person's interlock period ends, the person may complete the course.

I think on the substantive matter both the LNP and the government are interested in pursuing the matter of rehabilitation programs and agree that more work needs to be done, but this amendment is not drafted only as a head of power at all.

Division: Question put—That the member for Maroochydore's amendment be agreed to.

AYES, 31—Bates, Bleijie, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Langbroek, McLindon, Malone, Menkens, Nicholls, Powell, Pratt, Robinson, Seeney, Simpson, Stevens, Stuckey, Wellington. Tellers: Horan, Sorensen

NOES, 46—Attwood, Bligh, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Darling, Dick, Farmer, Finn, Grace, Hinchliffe, Hoolihan, Jarratt, Johnstone, Jones, Kilburn, Lawlor, Lucas, Male, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nolan, O'Neill, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Reeves, Roberts, Robertson, Ryan, Schwarten, Scott, Shine, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Watt, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Keech, Kiernan

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Ms Simpson) negatived.

Clause 17, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 18, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Ms SIMPSON (5.49 pm): I move the following amendment—

3 After clause 18

Page 41, after line 13—

insert—

'18A Amendment of s 131 (Reviews and appeals with respect to issue of licences etc.)

'Section 131(2)—

omit, insert—

'(2) A person who has been disqualified, by operation of law or an order, from holding or obtaining a Queensland driver licence absolutely or for a period of more than 2 years, may, at any time after the following period, apply for the disqualification to be removed—

(a) if the person was disqualified under section 86(1H)—the expiration of 5 years from the start of the disqualification period;

(b) otherwise—the expiration of 2 years from the start of the disqualification period.'.'.

This amendment is a consequential amendment to that which I moved in respect of licences. It amends the reviews and appeals in respect of licences. The rationale is that the intention of this clause is to complement the new section 86(1H) that I moved previously. The intention of the 'three strikes and you're out' provision is that the offender loses their licence for life.

Currently, the offender would be able to appeal for the disqualification to be removed after two years. The LNP does not believe that that is long enough. This amendment is intended to extend this clause to five years, but only in cases where people lose their licence under section 86(1H). In all other cases, the two-year limit would still apply. The reason the LNP had included this provision was in order to give proper consideration to the rights and liberties of the individual as part of the fundamental legislative principles.

Ms NOLAN: I cannot see that this amendment could be in order, because section 2(a) refers to a person disqualified under section 86(1H), which is the proposed amendment that was just defeated. So, as such, it does not make sense.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr O'Brien): Order! Is that a point of order?

Ms NOLAN: It is now. I rise to a point of order. This is out of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can you give us your point of order again, please?

Ms NOLAN: My point of order is that the amendment is necessarily out of order, because the clause that the member for Maroochydore is seeking to insert refers to part 86(1H), which is the first of these three amendments, which was defeated.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Despite the fact that the amendment is amending a provision that is redundant, the member is still entitled to move her amendment.

Ms SIMPSON: To illustrate the point, we put forward balanced legislation and part of that package of amendments were appeal and review provisions. We believe that it is not only about having the penalty; it is also about having respect for rights and liberties. That is why we had balance in our legislation and our amendments. We know that the government has the numbers to vote these provisions down. That does not prevent us from presenting balanced legislation, which is what we are doing before the parliament today, and certainly bringing about effective change in Queensland by challenging the government in regard to the slowness of its legislative agenda.

Ms NOLAN: I think the question before the House is: does the member withdraw her nonsensical amendment or is she seeking to pursue a redundant clause in the classic form of LNP policy development?

Ms SIMPSON: This is just getting petty.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have the call.

Ms SIMPSON: We make the point that the amendments that we put forward were about a balanced package. We recognise that the government has the numbers and has voted down our provisions. The minister criticised the provisions we had relating to the 'three strikes and you're out', but we had a balance of amendments that were also about rights and appeals, which is what is included in the amendment before us. We know the government has the numbers to vote it down but we still intend to put before the House amendments that are balanced.

Non-government amendment (Ms Simpson) negatived.

Clauses 19 to 27, as read, agreed to.

Clause 28—

Ms NOLAN (5.54 pm): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 28 (Replacement of ss 57DB and 57DC)

Page 48, line 3, after 'employee of'—

insert—

'that'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 28, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 29 to 32, as read, agreed to.

Ms SIMPSON: If the Deputy Speaker could just speak slowly so that people can hear throughout the chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will try to speak slower for the member for Maroochydore.

Ms SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. I find that offensive.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am trying to get through the business of this House. Nobody else is complaining about the speed at which I am trying to get through things.

Clause 33—

Ms NOLAN (5.56 pm): I move the following amendment—

8 Clause 33 (Replacement of s 163E (Objective reasonableness test to be used in deciding causation))

Page 64, line 4, 'a chapter'—

omit, insert—

'chapter'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 33, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 57, as read, agreed to.

Clause 58—

Ms SIMPSON (5.56 pm): This clause relates to part 2. There are a number of clauses that relate to the smart licences that we have raised concerns and questions about during the contributions to the debate. Unfortunately the minister did not address these concerns and failed to answer some very important questions about how smart licences will be implemented in this state. The minister did not answer a number of questions about the cost of these licences, the scanners and what they will cost, who would have these scanners and who would pay for these scanners, let alone the serious privacy concerns and how those privacy concerns would be managed.

It is a bit smug for the government to brush over such important legislation. There has been ample time for the minister to answer these questions on the public record. I note that we have a briefing coming up, but these issues have to be addressed when the legislation is before the parliament, not in some subsequent briefing. The people of Queensland have a right to know these basic questions.

I again ask the minister to explain just how much this will cost. It is not enough to have private briefings where some members have been told that the figure for an individual smart licence, a new driver's licence for Queensland, could cost between $150 and $180 yet in public the government says it is not that amount. The government has failed to tell people exactly how much it will cost. We know that this program at the start was touted by the government as being subsidised by private industry and that programs will be attached to it to make these cards cheaper. Yet we saw $6 million, then $20 million, then finally up to $84 million assigned to this program in a huge cost blowout.

Many years down the track we are still waiting for answers as to how much it will cost and why it is taking so long. There are basic questions of privacy as well. Will the minister answer these questions now before the parliament?

Ms NOLAN: The legislation about the driver's licence was passed in 2008. These are minor technical amendments that I addressed in my summing-up.

Ms SIMPSON: It is not good enough to fail to give these questions, which are before the parliament, an answer. The people of Queensland and certainly motorists have been slugged enough with unexpected price gouging from this government which could not manage a chook raffle. Now it expects them to potentially pay $150 to $180—who knows how much because the minister is not telling the public. It is all a secret. She expects us to pass a number of further amendments in relation to this new Queensland driver's licence, the smart licence. That is not good enough. The parliament is the place where we ask the questions and we expect answers from the minister. That we cannot get an answer on this is just unacceptable.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr O'Brien): Order! Before calling this division, I wish to advise that there was an error in the tally of the last division. The results of the division were declared to have been ayes, 47 and noes, 31, when the results should have been declared as ayes, 46 and noes, 31. The record shall be accordingly amended.

Division: Question put—That clause 58 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44—Attwood, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Darling, Dick, Farmer, Finn, Grace, Hoolihan, Jarratt, Johnstone, Jones, Kilburn, Lawlor, Lucas, Male, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nolan, O'Neill, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Reeves, Roberts, Robertson, Ryan, Schwarten, Scott, Shine, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Watt, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Keech, Kiernan

NOES, 32—Bates, Bleijie, Crandon, Cripps, Cunningham, Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Langbroek, McLindon, Malone, Menkens, Nicholls, Powell, Pratt, Robinson, Seeney, Simpson, Stevens, Stuckey, Wellington. Tellers: Horan, Sorensen

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 58, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 59 to 76, as read, agreed to.

Clause 77—

Ms NOLAN (6.06 pm): I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 77 (Replacement of s 30 (Amendment of s 150A (Regulating form of licence)))

Page 115, line 1, before '*insert*'—

insert—

'*omit*,'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 77, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 78 to 86, as read, agreed to.

Clause 87—

Ms SIMPSON (6.07 pm): This provision allows the local government to recover penalties in relation to tollways. Given that Clem7 is already open, it seems to me that an LNP administration in this state can build tunnels and infrastructure quicker than the government can legislate to provide for it. This proposed amendment allows for penalties received or recovered in relation to a local government's tolling enforcement by an entity other than the local government to be paid to the local government and that penalties received or recovered by a local government in relation to the local government's tolling enforcement may be retained by the local government.

So Clem7 is open. Legislation in regard to the tolling provisions is still to be ticked off by this parliament. Let the record show that an LNP administration is able to quickly, ably and effectively deliver infrastructure in this state faster than this government can legislate.

Ms NOLAN: I have two points. The first is that the cameras in the Clem7 tunnel have all been provided for. The second is in relation to the Clem7 tunnel. I think the member for Maroochydore was making the point—sorry, I will not bother to respond to that. That is fine.

Clause 87, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 88 to 95, as read, agreed to.

Clause 96—

Ms SIMPSON (6.10 pm): This provision relates to MARPOL. As I outlined in my earlier speech, we have a major concern that these provisions are now to be referred to a website, that this parliament is to lose its ability to purvey this very important section. We support the way that MARPOL is currently being operated, but we do not support these provisions being removed from the overview of this Queensland parliament. In fact, marine pollution is something that this legislature and government need to take a greater interest in. As we have seen in recent times, if the government does not take leadership and take an active administration in ensuring that these provisions are effectively resourced and enacted, then the state is in trouble. It was more good luck than good management in regard to the recent Moreton Bay spill.

In regard to this legislation before the House, for section 6(3) of the act, the English text of the provisions of MARPOL is set out in the schedule, but what we are seeing is a removal of these from the Queensland act and we believe that step is unnecessary. We oppose this being removed in this way.

Ms NOLAN: This is a technical amendment which will not change essentially how things operate. The federal government is a signatory to the international convention which deals with marine sourced pollution, MARPOL. The way the Queensland legislation is established is that our legislation is automatically updated when MARPOL is updated. That currently sits in a schedule, but this technical amendment will not alter the way in which that operates now—that is, we automatically take the updates from the international convention.

Ms SIMPSON: While it may appear on the surface to be technical, it is technically removing it from the purvey of this parliament. That is why we will not support this provision.

Ms NOLAN: It is an international treaty that the parliament does not have the right to review any way; once we are signed up, we are signed up. My view is that it is a good thing that we are signed up to an international convention around marine sourced pollution. Both the member for Whitsunday and the member for Maroochydore's own colleague, the member for Noosa, made some comments around the importance of having high standards in relation to marine sourced pollution. I am with them.

Ms SIMPSON: As we have said, we support the MARPOL provisions. What we do not support is them being removed from our legislation. In fact, it is important that this legislature and the administration ensure they do not give lip-service to the legislation; they need to be actively involved in the effective administration of it. If ever we have seen a case where government members have removed themselves from effective administration recently, it has been the Moreton Bay oil spill. Still, they tried to pat themselves on the back and say that they did nothing wrong. This is a matter of principle. We do not support the MARPOL provisions being removed from the text of the legislation.

Division: Question put—That clause 96 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 45—Attwood, Bligh, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Darling, Dick, Farmer, Finn, Grace, Hoolihan, Jarratt, Johnstone, Jones, Kilburn, Lawlor, Lucas, Male, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nolan, O'Neill, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Reeves, Roberts, Robertson, Ryan, Schwarten, Scott, Shine, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Watt, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Keech, Kiernan

NOES, 32—Bates, Bleijie, Crandon, Cripps, Cunningham, Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Langbroek, McLindon, Malone, Menkens, Nicholls, Powell, Pratt, Robinson, Seeney, Simpson, Stevens, Stuckey, Wellington. Tellers: Horan, Sorensen

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 96, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 97 to 114, as read, agreed to.

Clause 115—

Ms SIMPSON (6.20 pm): This is an amendment of section 67B, the declaration of special events. I note this and that the following provisions relate to removing provisions from the Transport Operations (TransLink Transit Authority) Act 2008 and to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994. My question to the minister is this: could the minister please clarify the difference between mass transit and scheduled passenger?

Ms NOLAN: Sure. For special events we sometimes put on additional unscheduled services. Because this government has such a strong and demonstrated commitment to public transport—in contrast to the LNP's policy of cutting back on public transport services—we also have a commitment to declaring some events as special events. For instance, if there is a Titans game on a Saturday afternoon down at Skilled Stadium, which we built, we would put on additional unscheduled rail and bus services to move the fans to the game to see the Titans win. That is where mass transit is different from a scheduled passenger service.

Clause 115, as read, agreed to.

Clause 116—

Ms SIMPSON (6.21 pm): Could the minister please advise who will hold the coordination power?

Ms NOLAN: The DG.

Ms SIMPSON: Minister, you are going to be extending the ability to have special events in other parts of Queensland. Can you explain what the administration of that will be?

Ms NOLAN: I explained it in my summing-up. The issue is that there are occasions where major public events are conducted in some cases for profit. Let us say it is an AC/DC concert. AC/DC goes to Townsville, where I am sure it would be huge. So someone puts on a major public event but neglects to put in place a public transport plan, therefore creating traffic chaos and an expectation that the state would provide public transport, therefore ultimately subsidising the profit in that event. The way this would work would be that officers from the Department of Transport and Main Roads would on a regional level identify that such an event was coming up and would seek to have it declared as a special event. Thereafter, they would work with the organisers of the event to put in place a public transport plan depending on the local circumstances. If it is footy in Mackay, there would be a local bus system established for that event.

If the member for Maroochydore wants to oppose such an amendment then obviously she could, but in doing so there are only two possible implications. One would be to create traffic chaos in the regional location having the special event. The alternative would be to shift that cost to the state.

Ms SIMPSON: Given that I have just been verballed by the minister, I will reply. We are in no way opposing these provisions. I was simply exercising my right in the parliament to ask questions about how they actually apply. I believe there are some excellent opportunities to do this, and Townsville is an example of where it does have benefits. It is unfortunate that the minister chose to take it negatively that I would ask her questions about how these provisions would be administered.

Clause 116, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 117 and 118, as read, agreed to.

Clause 119—

Ms NOLAN (6.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

10 Clause 119 (Insertion of new ch 6, pt 4)

Page 134, line 2, '67G(1)'—

omit, insert—

'67H(1)'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 119, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 120 and 121, as read, agreed to.

Clause 122—

Ms SIMPSON (6.25 pm): This provision specifically requires transit officers to undergo alcohol tests or drug tests, or the chief executive may require a transit officer to undergo an alcohol test or drug test. In the briefing I asked about the status of these transit officers and what was happening. I would like the minister's advice as to how she is going to administer this. Does she intend having a random drug-testing program in regard to transit officers? What will her requirements be as far as these particular tests are concerned? Obviously it is important that we have people of the highest standard who are effective in being able to implement their responsibilities under the act.

Ms NOLAN: There will not be any changes to the current drug-testing regime. The only change is that at the moment it is a requirement that the Police Commissioner has to approve the drug-testing equipment that is used. That expertise is not only held by the Police Commissioner. The change that is proposed is that the chief executive of my department would be able to give approval to appropriate drug-testing equipment. In every other way the current regime will remain unchanged.

Ms SIMPSON: To provide clarity in regard to that regime, is that where the chief executive officer reasonably suspects that somebody is under the influence while trying to perform their duties, or is there going to be a random drug- and alcohol-testing program?

Ms NOLAN: There are two circumstances. If the chief executive suspects that there is a problem with drugs, or if a person is detained and the person detained sustains an injury, then the transit officer who detained the individual would undergo testing as well.

Clause 122, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 123 to 126, as read, agreed to.

Clause 127—

Ms SIMPSON (6.28 pm): This provision relates to local governments in that it states the regulation of vehicle access to a public place that is a local government controlled area. I understand from the briefing that until now this has not been an issue and this is just a clarification. Could the minister advise what the legal status of previous local government laws are, as technically under the previous law any local laws relating to vehicle access to local government controlled areas may be invalid as that was a state power?

Ms NOLAN: No problem has previously been raised with it by local governments or anyone related. In going through the legislation to make sure that it was all in order, officers from the department felt this needed clarification. So this should be viewed as a preventative amendment as opposed to a response to any particular problem.

Ms SIMPSON: I thank the minister for her answer. I seek some further clarification. While the government does not believe there has been a problem, I ask whether there will be a problem as far as people identifying now whether they were legally penalised while operating in what they thought was a local government controlled area? I presume a large number of vehicles would potentially be impacted by local penalties and administrative orders that may now have been identified as invalid.

Ms NOLAN: Clause 129 retrospectively validates anything that may have happened. I think that makes the legislation reasonably watertight. This is not in response to a particular problem that has been identified.

Clause 127, as read, agreed to.

Clause 128, as read, negatived.

Clauses 129 to 138, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. RG NOLAN (Ipswich—ALP) (Minister for Transport) (6.31 pm): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. RG NOLAN (Ipswich—ALP) (Minister for Transport) (6.31 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. JC SPENCE (Sunnybank—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.32 pm): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 13 April 2010.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. JC SPENCE (Sunnybank—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.32 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Hervey Bay, Patient Transfer

Mr SORENSEN (Hervey Bay—LNP) (6.32 pm): As so many patients are transferred from Hervey Bay Hospital to Brisbane by air the Hervey Bay community pulled together and built a patient transfer facility at the Hervey Bay airport. A committee was formed and they raised the money required. The committee raised about $57,000. This included a $6,000 furniture donation from the Pialba Masonic Lodge. The Hervey Bay RSL contributed $80,000 while the Fraser Coast Regional Council budgeted $193,000 for the facility.

I would like to take the time to mention some of the organisations and people that helped out in building that facility. They include: the Fraser Coast Patient Transfer Facility Committee; the Hervey Bay RSL and Services Memorial Club; the Queensland Ambulance Service; the Fraser Coast Regional Council; the Pialba Masonic Lodge No.192; the Extremely Disabled Veterans; the Hervey Bay Lions; the Fraser Lions Club; fire services; the Vietnam Veterans Social Club; M1 Helicopters; the RSL Ladies Auxiliary; the Sarina Beach Ladies; the Adult Fellowship United Church; the Urangan Mufti Bowls; the Ex-Service Women's Association; Dellyse Harper; the Hervey Bay Garden Club; the Retired New South Wales Police, Wide Bay branch; the Older Mens Unlimited; the Hervey Bay Boat Club; the Seabelle Singers; the Hervey Bay Model Aero Club; and Bunnings.

They did a fantastic job building this facility. This means that patients can now wait comfortably on a hospital bed in a family friendly area. It will mean that the patients will not be sitting out in the wind and the rain on the airport tarmac. This means so much to the families. The families can actually sit around and wait for the plane to come in and the patient is on a bed. This was a fantastic effort by that community. There are about four or five patients a day flying from Hervey Bay to Brisbane for medical services. This goes to show what the community can do when it pulls together.

Career Keys

Mrs SCOTT (Woodridge—ALP) (6.34 pm): How often do we hear a business owner bemoan their inability to source work-ready juniors? For a youngster to transition from school or for those who have disengaged from school to transition into the workplace requires a great deal of development for them to become an effective part of the team and requires confidence, an understanding of the tasks required, development of their skills with accuracy and speed and, most importantly, reliability. Career Keys has responded to this need in the hair and beauty industry by setting up a new community development venture at their training centre in Marsden, their Style It Up Salon.

Career Keys was born out of a school based program at Marsden State High School and has grown from strength to strength with the former foundation principal of Marsden State High School, Mr Don Whitehouse, still chairman of the board, my colleague Evan Moorhead a board member, Wayne Lee the business relations manager and Deidre Foreman the manager, along with a very dedicated staff and other board members.

This salon is not operating in competition with local hairdressers. It is open two days a week with an experienced hairdresser offering full hair and beauty treatments to friends of Career Keys at very affordable prices. There are several objectives at play in this venture. Firstly, it is designed to give vital experience to mainly young women—there will be an occasional young man—who wish to enter this industry and take up an apprenticeship in the hairdressing sector. Career Keys will have entry-level juniors who are experienced, confident, able to interact with other staff and customers and are instantly a valuable asset to the business.

It will give salon owners the opportunity to meet the trainees, observe them on the job, interview them, trial them and ultimately offer them employment. This is a great outcome for the trainees as well as the salon owners, saving them time and money and saving them from the occasional poor choice.

The other program is one which has even wider application. Career Keys has many people of all ages undergoing training in many varied avenues of endeavour. Some trainees have dropped out of school, some may be retraining after their work became redundant or unsuitable as in the case of a workplace accident and others are mums returning to the workplace who are upgrading skills and gaining self-confidence.

The Style It Up Salon offers the finishing touches program, teaching personal grooming for those about to apply for jobs, attend interviews and re-enter the workforce. It includes a grooming for success session and resource handout, a personal manicure, a make-up application session, a style haircut and scalp massage and refreshments. This can be done in a group booking which would make it a fun occasion.

(Time expired)

Indooroopilly Electorate, Public Transport

Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (6.37 pm): Public transport users in my electorate from the start of this year found themselves paying massive increases in fares—an additional 20 per cent more for go card holders and 40 per cent for paper ticket buyers—to catch a train, bus or ferry. Many of those commuters still do not realise that those fares will continue to rise over the coming years—a 15 per cent rise every year until 2014. In fact, by 2014 they will be paying twice the level of today's fares.

When the Bligh government announced the fare increases in October last year—another thing it failed to mention before the state election—the government insisted the increases were necessary 'so we can keep rolling out more and better services'. At the time of the announcement of these massive rises in fares, the Deputy Premier, Paul Lucas, claimed the extra funds would be used to help add more than 301,000 additional passenger capacity a week to the SEQ network by July 2010.

Well, we are just over three months from that July 2010 date but the Bligh government, while taking the extra fares, is unfortunately well short of that target. As Robert Dow from the public transport advocacy group Back on Track said, it is now March and we have only seen a small number of these promised seats introduced. As Back on Track said, of the additional 201,000 seats on buses promised by the Bligh government to be delivered by July this year, so far we have seen less than 20 per cent delivered.

Of the additional 17,000 seats on ferries promised by the Bligh government, less than 20 per cent have been delivered. Of the 83,400 seats on trains promised by the Bligh government, there has been a zero increase. The only promise the Bligh government has met so far is to increase fares, and I bet the only promise it is guaranteed to keep is to continue increasing fares. As Robert Dow said—

We look forward to the extra trains, buses and ferry services that were promised last October. The 1st of July is fast approaching.

But Robert Dow and other public transport users are set to be disappointed, because the 1 July 2010 deadline has been quietly, secretly dumped. Transport minister Rachel Nolan mentioned the 301,000 in parliament this week but failed to mention the 1 July date, and on the TransLink website the 1 July date appears to have vanished. The 1 July date is no longer there. What it now says is that they will be delivered over the next year. So we have seen a blow-out by at least six months, so once again public transport users have been let down by the Bligh government. They are paying higher fares, but the promised increases of additional capacity have failed to be delivered.

Carers Queensland

Hon. CR DICK (Greenslopes—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Industrial Relations) (6.40 pm): On Friday, 12 March 2010 it was my very great privilege to attend the launch of the new education and training unit of Carers Queensland Inc. Carers Queensland is based in the Greenslopes electorate and, as its strategic plan states, is the peak body representing the diverse needs and interests of carers in Queensland. Carers Queensland is dedicated to advancing the recognition of the carer's role in the Queensland community. Carers Queensland does mighty work throughout our state, supporting the one in eight Queenslanders who provide unpaid care to family members and friends with physical or mental illnesses or disabilities, or who are frail.

The new education and training unit will be known as the Widilia Hookham Carer Resource and Training Unit. The training unit has been named in honour of Widilia Hookham. Widilia served on the management committee of Carers Queensland from December 2002 and became Carers Queensland treasurer. She served in that capacity almost continuously until her passing in November 2008. Widilia served Carers Queensland and the families and individuals it represents and supports tirelessly and unstintingly. Widilia's contribution to Carers Queensland, to the communities she served and, most importantly, to her family was remarkable and it was more than appropriate that Carers Queensland should honour her memory by naming the new training centre after her. Widilia's family—her daughters, Dilia and Sarah, Dilia's partner, Warren, and Widilia's grand-daughter, Ava—attended the ceremony. Dilia and Sarah spoke lovingly and proudly about their mother. It was a privilege to have been able to share this important occasion with them.

The new training centre will be of particular use to those Queenslanders caring for others, as Carers Queensland has recently been successful in being registered as a national registered training organisation. This will ensure Carers Queensland can offer eligible family carers the opportunity to undertake a Certificate III in a community services work training course. This is a wonderful service for Carers Queensland to provide and will enable eligible carers to obtain a formal qualification, building on what they would otherwise do through duty, responsibility or simply love in caring for others.

The centre was opened by the Parliamentary Secretary for Disability Services and Multicultural Affairs and member for Mount Ommaney, Mrs Julie Attwood, who was representing Minister Annastacia Palaszczuk, who was unable to attend the ceremony. I know both the parliamentary secretary and the minister hold Carers Queensland in very high regard and work closely with it to help improve the lives of Queensland carers. I want to publicly acknowledge the work of all volunteers and staff, including the board of governance, particularly board president Julene Gibson; the CEO of Carers Australia, Joan Hughes; and the CEO of Carers Queensland, Debra Cottrell.

I am proud to have such a valuable community organisation like Carers Queensland based in the Greenslopes electorate and am prouder still to be able to recognise and honour organisations like Carers Queensland in this parliament for everything they do to make our state a better place for all.

Sunshine Coast, Landslips

Mr DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (6.43 pm): Last week my office was contacted by a constituent who said that the land around her house was slipping, with big cracks opening up. The problem affected several neighbouring properties as well, with big cracks in the ground and retaining walls collapsing. The caller reported that her swimming pool had tilted due to the movement of the land. The problem is not confined to one street. The land in question is on the side of a hill and there are another five homes directly below in the path of anything that could slip down the hill from above. We are not just talking about a few rocks; we are talking about people's homes.

The next day a resident in Nambour was the victim of another landslip, with the collapse of a retaining wall behind the property. Fortunately, the company that owns the land above is taking responsibility for that landslip and will repair the damages. The matter is not so simple for my constituents. Those higher up on the hill are blaming the approval of the development below them for the landslip, and I share their concerns. They are facing uncertainty over who will pay for the damages that have been caused.

These incidents raise serious questions about the way we approve growth in this state. Too many times we see development applications refused by councils but subsequently allowed by the court system. There is at least one other example of this in my own electorate. Buderim is built on and around a hill. Much of it is steep land. When you build on that land, you increase the possibility of a landslip. There is pressure on councils to approve development of parcels of land that would have been considered too steep in the past. Engineers can solve lots of problems, but there is only so much that retaining walls can do when there is a lot of rain and the soil is prone to slipping.

Sometimes the only sensible answer is to say, 'No, the risk is too great.' And this does not just relate to approval of developments on steep land; we also need to be concerned about flood-prone land. Again, there is pressure on councils to approve development of land, including former cane land, that

floods in times of heavy rain. Yes, you can fill the land to raise it above the predicted flood levels, but that just creates potential problems for adjoining properties. The Bligh government wants to force growth on the Sunshine Coast. It is demanding the fast-tracking of development of greenfield sites that will bring another 75,000 people to the region. Those developments are not on the side of a hill, but one is in the Mooloolah River catchment area. Some of the land has been designated flood-prone and not suitable for development, but there is a large area that will be built on.

Are we rushing development that may cause problems in the future? With the impact of climate change making us change our computer models for flood levels, why not take a little longer and more care in deciding where we should be allowing development to occur? I am sure that my constituents who are facing an uncertain future because of a landslip caused by the development of land that probably should have been left alone would agree. This type of development should have been knocked back, but it has slipped through the Land and Environment Court. The court approves these things. I think it is something the government needs to take into account. It is all well and good to let people buy houses on these developments, but who is going to pick up the tab? Is the government going to pick up the tab? At the end of the day, the government is totally responsible for the development that occurs in Queensland, particularly greenfield site developments.

Stolz, Mr F

Hon. DM WELLS (Murrumba—ALP) (6.46 pm): After three decades as principal of Grace Lutheran College, the school of which he became the foundation principal in January 1978, Fred Stolz has gone into retirement. He leaves behind him a highly respected educational institution of 1,766 students and over 200 staff, with its first campus at Rothwell in my electorate and the second campus at Caboolture in the electorate of Pumicestone. I can bear witness not only to the bricks and mortar of Fred's achievements but also to the educational and social capital he generated.

I attended the opening of stage 3 in 1984—well before I came into this place—and I attended the opening of stage 13 last year. But Fred is not just a builder. Fred always made his greatest contribution as a gifted and committed educator. Despite the demands on his time in his role as principal, Fred always made some of his time available for classroom teaching. Thousands of my constituents learned their maths from Fred and he believed in the principle of mens sana in corpore sano—a sound mind and a healthy body—and he took time away from administration to coach and to encourage sport, particularly his beloved football and cricket.

Mr Moorhead: He did keep an eye on us.

Mr WELLS: The honourable member for Waterford, an ex-student of that school, says that Fred did encourage him and keep an eye on him, and this is fortunate because everybody knows that the honourable member for Waterford plays a straighter bat than anybody else.

As one would expect of the principal of a Lutheran school, Fred is a committed Christian who vigorously inculcated Christian values among his staff and students. But he is also famous for his remark, 'There's no point in converting them if you don't educate them as well.' Fred is a highly respected and effective educator. He ran a highly respected and effective educational institution. As Fred goes into retirement, his successor, Ruth Butler, takes over very much a going concern. I say to Fred Stolz: thank you, Fred, for educating and improving the lives of so many of my constituents.

Mount Morgan

Mr MALONE (Mirani—LNP) (6.48 pm): Since the return of the new parliament almost 12 months ago I have represented in this House the historic town of Mount Morgan. Indeed, over that period I have come to understand and appreciate the history of Mount Morgan and how close a community it is. A visit to the mine site to see the excavation site of the biggest amount of gold in Australia and to see the dinosaur footprints on the top of the mud mine, where mud was taken out in order to make bricks for the chimneys, is indeed going back through history. A walk through the cemetery of Mount Morgan is definitely a walk back through history, with many of the graves dating back to before the last century.

The high school at Mount Morgan was one of the first four high schools built in Queensland. Indeed, it is almost as if Education Queensland has left it as it was then. The manual training centre is a very similar building to the one that I used, as most members would realise, a very short number of years ago. Quite frankly, I am sure some of the equipment at that centre came out of the last century.

As I said, Mount Morgan is a very close community. There is a need for better education and training facilities in Mount Morgan. Indeed, a small group of youths in Mount Morgan are causing quite a deal of concern and frustration to the township with vandalism and attacks on older people et cetera. That really is a shame because, as I said, I believe that Mount Morgan is a terrific town and these young people are causing other people to have a negative attitude towards Mount Morgan. Mount Morgan needs a skill centre of some sort to give the young people there some hope.

On a positive note, I am pleased to say that the principal of Mount Morgan State High School, Tricia Underwood, and the head of the department, Melissa Graham, at my invitation were able to travel to Sarina recently to visit the agricultural and engineering skills centre there. They also visited the Mirani State High School to see firsthand the Lighthouse project Kickstart to Literacy program. I am working with both Tricia Underwood and Melissa Graham to achieve similar programs for the young people of Mount Morgan. We hope that, in turn, those programs will go a long way to addressing some of the issues relating to the young people of Mount Morgan and give them the same opportunities to learn and to earn a living post their school years.

Cyclone Ului

Ms JARRATT (Whitsunday—ALP) (6.51 pm): As the seven-day anniversary of our encounter with Cyclone Ului approaches, I am pleased to report that life is beginning to return to normal for most Whitsunday residents. All schools are now open, although the clean-up goes on, and power has been restored to the majority of areas. Shops and businesses are gradually getting back to work and most island resorts are well and truly open for business.

Of course, there are those who continue to face challenging times and probably will do so for some time. Some communities and individuals still do not have power connected, but it is not for the lack of Ergon's efforts. Local crews have worked alongside crews from other districts to reconnect power to most properties in record time.

I am still haunted by the sight of so many boats damaged or beached around Airlie Beach and Shute Harbour. I am also disgusted to hear stories of looting from these vessels. That is unacceptable and I hope that it stops. I know that many local restaurants and food outlets have lost stock and trade and will face some tough times. Tourism operators generally will be suffering a loss of trade associated with immediate cancellations and many face an even more worrying time in the run-up to Easter, which traditionally marks the beginning of our tourism season. Under these circumstances, I am incredibly grateful that the Premier and Minister for Tourism responded decisively to my calls to fund an immediate campaign to let everyone know that the Whitsundays will be open for business over the Easter school holiday period. This campaign begins in newspapers this weekend as well as online.

I am sure that in the weeks and days ahead we will start to analyse our experience with Cyclone Ului and ask what can we learn that will be of benefit next time. It is early days, but I want to say that, although I think authorities did a great job in encouraging people to be prepared prior to the cyclone hitting, there are some other messages that might have helped us prepare for the time following the cyclone. I would like to see a protocol developed that informs residents, and particularly visitors, about what to expect after a cyclone has passed. People need to know that power supplies can be cut for days or weeks and that means no ATMs, no restaurants or food outlets, no shops or supermarkets, no fuel and possibly no water for that length of time. I am a little amazed that so many visitors had not prepared by getting money out or stocking up on food before the cyclone. Perhaps there are reasons for that that I have not considered, but I think once a cyclone warning is in place we need to have a pamphlet or brochure available at all accommodation places that explains what a cyclone is and what its effects might be.

As I said, there will be time for analysis in the days ahead. Right now, my office and other community providers are simply busy helping those who are still suffering. Some assistance is available for primary producers and small business operators who have been impacted, and the Department of Communities continues to provide immediate financial assistance to individuals and families in need. All we would really like now is a little sunny weather and a busy Easter. On that note, may I wish all members a very happy Easter.

Gladstone Electorate, Infrastructure

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (6.54 pm): This morning the Premier confirmed my electorate's concerns when she replied to my question regarding infrastructure for the region in light of the growth of LNG. She said—

> ... this government's view is that the royalties that come as a result of this resource being tapped should go to the benefit of all Queenslanders, with a particular focus on those communities—like Gladstone, like the wider Gladstone region and the south-west and the Darling Downs region—which will be seeing increased population growth and increased pressure on their existing roads.

Unfortunately, that will be too little, too late, because the royalties do not flow until the impact has well and truly been felt. To attract the necessary workers, we need infrastructure in place before we reach peak construction and operational staffing levels—areas such as health, where those thousands of workers will not take kindly to having to travel an hour and a quarter to tend a broken bone or for more complicated procedures including getting X-rays and attending birthing centres. We have a high number of babies being born in the region, but more and more mums-to-be are being referred to Gladstone because they may have complications. We should have that birthing facility there. We have no secure

ward for mental health. Many of our unwell residents now have to go to Rockhampton. Again, with that increase in population that will not be welcome. That will make it more difficult to attract the necessary workers.

We have a wonderful Child Safety team, but demands on their resources and the community services resources will increase with the population increase and the dislocation that people will experience from family and friends. I know in this chamber we have talked about affordable housing. The minister has said that members on the non-government side do not welcome affordable housing in their areas. I would welcome it in Gladstone—any time and any amount.

In terms of disability services, there is a need for independent living. We are still waiting for a new station at Calliope, which was promised at the last election. Resources such as water police and improved road transport—all of that will be required. There will be great pressure on services not when the royalties are flowing, as I said, but well before. There has been so much development in my region. This is not new science; it is known science. Waiting for royalties to accrue before the infrastructure is provided is irresponsible, unacceptable and I believe an indictment on the government. We need to be ready, not found wanting.

Donnybrook and District Bowls Club

Mrs SULLIVAN (Pumicestone—ALP) (6.57 pm): Last Saturday I was honoured to represent the Minister for Sport, the Hon. Phil Reeves, to officially open the external refurbishments of the Donnybrook and District Bowls Club.

Government members interjected.

Mrs SULLIVAN: I acknowledge the honourable minister in the chamber today to listen to this speech.

Mr Reeves: Did the kangaroos come to visit?

Mrs SULLIVAN: They certainly did. Works included a new synthetic surface for the club's bowling green and a retractable shade, which provides welcome relief for bowlers in hot weather. The new green, which can be played on all year round, will save the club around $30,000 in maintenance fees annually.

The state government partnered the bowls club and funded $170,000 of the $374,475 total cost. The new facilities will boost the club's appeal and significantly improve physical activity opportunities for members and the local community. Already the club has seen an increase in its membership.

Government grants do not come easy. Applicants put in hours of volunteer work to ensure that their submissions to government are successful. The Donnybrook and District Bowls Club's project manager, Brian Nicholas—he was honoured on the day with life membership—and a small willing team of members deserve a vote of thanks for their efforts in improving even further the club's facilities.

I enjoy a game of bowls, and on the day I was invited to participate in the first official bowls game on the synthetic green. I would like to thank my team—Gary Peters, the men's president; Cathy Hartshorn, the president of the Caboolture District Ladies Bowls Association, or CDLBA; and Dave McPherson, the assistant men's secretary of the club—for a great game.

Mr Reeves: Good local representation.

Mrs SULLIVAN: We actually won. I want to pay tribute to the more senior members of the club who are willing to pass on their experience and bowling tips to their only registered junior player, Corey Wiemers. His dad, Rob, introduced Corey to the game three years ago when he was only 11. I watched him play and I can say that he is a committed young man. I have no doubt that he will be a bowls champion one day.

Not only has the Donnybrook and District Bowls Club seen improvements to the outside facilities; the inside of the club has also received improvements. Last year the Minister for Sport, the Hon. Phil Reeves, visited the club and remarked how improvements had made the club an even better central and focal hub of the Donnybrook community and he congratulated the members on their efforts.

Mr Reeves: A lovely place.

Mrs SULLIVAN: Yes, it is a lovely place. The recent works are a credit to those decision makers who made these changes happen, and this project is an excellent example of the state Labor government's Toward Q2: Tomorrow's Queensland initiative, which aims to make Queenslanders the healthiest people by allowing better access to physical activity. The Queensland state government's funding to sport and recreation facilities and programs is higher than that of any other state in Australia.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 7.00 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Attwood, Bates, Bleijie, Bligh, Boyle, Choi, Crandon, Cripps, Croft, Cunningham, Darling, Davis, Dempsey, Dick, Dickson, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Farmer, Finn, Flegg, Foley, Fraser, Gibson, Grace, Hinchliffe, Hobbs, Hoolihan, Hopper, Horan, Jarratt, Johnson, Johnstone, Jones, Keech, Kiernan, Kilburn, Knuth, Langbroek, Lawlor, Lucas, McArdle, McLindon, Male, Malone, Menkens, Messenger, Mickel, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nicholls, Nolan, O'Brien, O'Neill, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pratt, Reeves, Roberts, Robertson, Robinson, Ryan, Schwarten, Scott, Seeney, Shine, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Spence, Springborg, Stevens, Stone, Struthers, Stuckey, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Watt, Wellington, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson

GOVERNMENT PRINTER, QUEENSLAND—2010