

~~employee that it is not their problem, not their fault. They have even implied that the alleged serious assault was a result of the employee's own behaviour.~~

~~The employee requested secondment to less stressful duties which was coldly rejected by management, who then accused the employee of blackmail and said that the employee should 'hurry up and get over it' and should take leave without pay or long service leave. The lack of support and insensitivity is atrocious and clearly calculated to make the issue go away. This person has lost their dignity, their wages, their leave and their entitlements.~~

~~Morale amongst hospital staff is already abysmal, particularly when victims are victimised and whistleblowers are bullied and intimidated. The failure to properly manage this issue is abysmal. I have referred this matter to the Crime and Misconduct Commission.~~

~~(Time expired)~~

## LAND VALUATION BILL

### First Reading

**Hon. S ROBERTSON** (Stretton—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy and Minister for Trade) (12.02 pm): I present a bill for an act about land values for particular other acts and related purposes, to make consequential and minor amendments to the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 and to amend the Aboriginal Land Act 1991, the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, the Land Act 1994, the Land Tax Act 2010 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 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:* Land Valuation Bill 2010.

*Tabled paper:* Land Valuation Bill 2010, explanatory notes.

### Second Reading

**Hon. S ROBERTSON** (Stretton—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy and Minister for Trade) (12.03 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Earlier this year the government introduced a range of amendments to the Valuation of Land Act 1944 and announced major reforms to the valuation system. I stand here today to introduce to the House a bill that delivers on those reforms. In developing these reforms over the past five months, the government has delivered on the commitment to closely consult on every aspect of the reform to the valuation system with key industry stakeholders.

Extensive consultation has occurred with a valuation reform reference group which was formed in April 2010—a group comprising key non-government stakeholder bodies with interests in valuations. The reference group members represent the following organisations: the Local Government Association of Queensland; the Property Council of Australia; the Shopping Centre Council of Australia; the Queensland Tourism Industry Council; AgForce; the Queensland Farmers Federation; the Queensland Resources Council; the Real Estate Institute of Queensland; the Urban Development Institute of Australian—Queensland branch; the Australian Property Institute of Queensland; and the Queensland Law Society. I am happy to say that, through the exhaustive consultation undertaken and the good faith and involvement of these stakeholders, there is general support for this bill in relation to the provisions for introducing the site value methodology for non-rural land in 2011, the strategies put in place to transition landowners across to the new methodology and the reforms to the valuation system.

Consultants PricewaterhouseCoopers were engaged by my department in April 2010 to provide independent, expert advice on options for the introduction of site value and other reforms to the valuation process in Queensland. They also met with key stakeholders, independently from officers of my department, to discuss options.

At this time I would also like to recognise the contribution my parliamentary secretary, the member for Capalaba, has made to this process. His interest in valuation reform is clear. Michael, I have appreciated your involvement and assistance in bringing this bill to the parliament.

This bill sees a new era in the statutory valuation process in Queensland. Those aspects which were so contentious previously under the unimproved value methodology—that is, the consideration of 'intangible elements' such as including development approvals, leases and infrastructure credits in determining a valuation—are no longer part of the unimproved and site value definitions. The existence

of any agreements for lease, leases, development approvals or infrastructure credits and their added value, if any, will not be considered when determining the value of the property. Queensland is adopting an amended version of the New South Wales definition of site value which is generally consistent with other states and is used by the Commonwealth Grants Commission in the distribution of GST funds back to the states. The amendments and wording of the definition have been fully endorsed by stakeholders.

To put it simply, from next year the state will value all non-rural land based on site value, consistent with other states—a value that is more closely aligned to the property market and more reflective of a developed state. Rural land will continue to be valued using the unimproved value methodology. This new valuation approach delivers on a more transparent and robust valuation system and will provide all landowners with a simpler valuation that is fair and equitable.

While most landowners will see very little difference in the valuation when it is issued in 2011, where there has been significant fall made to the land landholders will see some increase in value. Any impact from this increase can be readily managed through existing tools that local governments and the Office of State Revenue have such as averaging and capping.

The Queensland government is introducing a site value methodology which will align with other states but is doing it with a more generous package of transition measures than has occurred when other states have moved from unimproved to site value. These include: the benefits of capping and averaging on land tax to mitigate the effect of any change in the statutory valuation to land taxpayers; and an allowance which can be claimed on site improvements undertaken at the property in the past 12 years where it has occurred at the current owner's expense. This means, for example, if a developer has made site improvements in preparing the land for development in, say, the last three years they will be able to deduct the value of these improvements for the next nine years, or until sold, in recognition of the cost of development.

The last measure is a phased-in approach for landholders whose property value increases by more than \$1 million when the new site valuations are issued in March next year. For those landowners where there is more than a \$1 million difference between the existing unimproved value and the new site value when it is issued in March next year, the government has included a transition strategy. To transition these landowners to the new site valuation methodology, the state will incrementally phase in the increase in value over 12 years to mitigate against any significant increase in land tax and local government rates, allowing time for these properties to adjust to a level playing field with other properties, reflecting the value the land would sell for.

Landowners will not have to do anything to receive this. The state will automatically transition a landowner's value and they will be advised in their valuation that this provision has been applied to their valuation. Of course a landowner will still retain full objection rights to their valuation through this process. The full value of site value will be introduced at the end of the 12-year period or if the property is sold beforehand.

017 Through these significant measures to assist the transition to site value, the government has demonstrated its commitment that this reform process is not a revenue-raising measure. Other valuation reforms being implemented include reinstating the position of the Valuer-General and defining the role and responsibilities of the position; enhancing the objections and appeals framework; delivering annual valuations to all property owners; and streamlining business processes to provide for ongoing performance improvement in the State Valuation Service. As announced last week, Mr Neil Bray has been appointed to the position of Valuer-General and will commence duties in October this year. Mr Bray will have the lead role in the ongoing implementation of the reforms. The amendments to the objections and appeals process simplify this provision for landowners. The amendments provide for greater periods of time to lodge and correct objections and preserve a landowner's rights. Every aspect of the objection and appeal process has been reviewed and the changes are supported by the Queensland Law Society and the Queensland Bar Association. This process is now much more simple and ensures a landowner's rights to have decisions reviewed and appealed are upheld within reasonable time frames.

A key issue raised by the Local Government Association of Queensland during the reform process and development of this bill was the removal of concessions from the valuation process. There is an argument in policy terms that it is better to produce a pure valuation and to provide any concessions in the revenue measures, such as rates or land tax settings, than in the value. However, in the current economic environment and recognising the significance of other reform measures in this bill, the government has not sought to reform this aspect of the Valuation of Land Act at this stage. We have taken close account of stakeholder interests in this matter and the new legislation provides a requirement that a review be undertaken of the concessions in 2012. The timing of this review will allow further consultation with stakeholders to determine how the removal of concessions may be better managed. By this time, the new site valuation methodology introduced in 2011 will have been bedded down. This bill is about modernising the valuations system in Queensland and introducing a simpler, more equitable process for assessing non-rural land. The existing system of valuation was first

introduced more than 65 years ago. A review was overdue and now is the right time for us to move to a methodology that is more reflective of the market value of the land.

The bill will also amend the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 to provide that land may be granted to a registered native title body corporate and for that land to be held for a broader group of Indigenous beneficiaries rather than only those persons who hold native title. The bill also provides for roads closed within an Indigenous deed of grant in trust to readily become transferable land under the ALA and TSILA for transfer to Indigenous ownership; for land that is opened as road within a Torres Strait Islander DOGIT to no longer be transferable land; and to allow registered interests in transferable land under the TSILA, held by the Queensland or Australian governments or easements that benefit that land, to continue upon transfer. These amendments will facilitate the priority transfers of the Hope Vale and Badu Island DOGITs. The option to appoint a registered native title body corporate to hold land for a broader group of Indigenous beneficiaries though specifically facilitating the Hope Vale DOGIT transfer will also be available in other transfers of land under the ALA and TSILA. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Nicholls, adjourned.

## ~~CHILD PROTECTION AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL~~

### ~~Second Reading~~

~~Resumed from 31 August (see p. 2946), on motion of Mr Reeves—~~

~~That the bill be now read a second time.~~

~~**Ms DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (12.13 pm): Today I rise to speak to the Child Protection and Other Acts Amendment Bill. As the shadow minister has indicated, the LNP will not be supporting this bill, which in itself is a snapshot of Labor's failure over the last 12 years to effectively manage child safety. The wellbeing of children is a paramount concern for our community. Children who are left in exposed, risky and dangerous situations which can cause emotional, psychological and physical trauma need to be able to depend on our community through our government to help them. There is no process for children to resolve the problems and it needs the careful, considered and compassionate intervention of Child Safety to ensure their best possible wellbeing, both in the short term and long term.~~

~~It is not an easy subject and nor is it an easy process. Dealing with such vulnerability and with every step involving risk of harm and damage, managing a child safety system effectively is difficult. That does not excuse the consistent failure of this government to provide a workable system. Watching the Bligh government deal with child safety has been a case of waiting for the next blunder, the next failure to resource the system, the next exposure of children to unnecessary risk. Since Labor announced the protection of children was reason enough to call an early election in 2004, we have witnessed a constant turnaround in the portfolio. Shuffling ministers like deckchairs, there have been three reviews of the Child Protection Act in six years and new ministers to match them all. Yet still this bill fails to advance the recommendations of the CMC review and will in fact unwind some of the advances that have been made.~~

~~Family is another concept that is central to our community and to the ideology of this side of the House. A lot of the work of child safety officers is trying to protect the wellbeing of the child while also trying to protect the remnants of family life. This bill damages that process further. Under this bill, a temporary custody order will remove the obligation of the department to notify the parents of the action, which flies in the face of a more family focused approach. Amendments to the assessment care arrangement will remove the rights of one parent having a say in the child's removal and care. This could mean a situation where a father, who is not currently resident with the child but willing to provide for his son or daughter, is excluded from the process. Child safety, by its very nature, does not deal with the happiest and the most stable of families. The expectation of the minister that involving just one party will lead to a resolution is naive and potentially dangerous.~~

~~The Bligh Labor government seems to be of the attitude that if it can trumpet the record spending in the child protection sector the money will simply fall into the places where it will be most effective. Time and time again this has proved to be wrong. Bumper budgets do not automatically equate to the safety and protection of children. Adequate resourcing, workable systems, common sense staffing and considered allocations are needed. This bill provides none of that.~~

~~An example of the expenditure process under this government is nicely summed up by a couple of statistics from the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian. In the last 12 months the commission decreased its staff by 30 people. That is simple enough, except for the fact that the salary bill increased by \$3 million in the same period. Within the same office, the biggest increase in revenue is due to appear in the next 12 months courtesy of the blue card system. Following the criminal history legislation that passed this House recently, blue card revenue is increasing from \$4.678 million to \$7.784 million in 12 months. It was in fact the hurry of the government to defuse the member for~~