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

51ST PARLIAMENT

Subject Page

Tuesday, 23 May 2006

BY AUTHORITY
L.J. OSMOND, CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER—2006

TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2006

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. T McGrady, Mount Isa) read prayers and took the chair at 9.30 am.

ASSENT TO BILLS

17 May 2006

The Honourable Demetrios Fouras MP
Acting Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

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

Date of Assent: 17 May

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Water Act 2000"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995, and for other purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Maritime Safety Queensland Act 2002, the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995 and the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, and for other purposes"

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

Yours sincerely

Governor

PROCEDURE

Speaker's Statement—New Record of Proceedings

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, a new *Record of Proceedings* will be produced from today. It will combine information previously contained in two separate documents: the *Votes and Proceedings* and *Hansard*. The new *Record of Proceedings* will provide one official record of all debates and proceedings. This means one document containing both an edited record of what is said and a record of procedural events in the House. The *Votes and Proceedings* will continue to be produced as a separate document until the House otherwise decides.

Procedures for checking and publishing the *Record of Proceedings*, including turnaround times, will be the same as for the current *Hansard*. This is part of an initiative to deliver more modern, user-friendly and integrated documents relating to the proceedings of the House. It has only occurred following extensive consultation with honourable members and other stakeholders, who supported the proposals. Of course the Clerk and I welcome further feedback from members about the new *Record of Proceedings*.

Regarding records of proceedings, can I announce that the Clerk is 39 years of age today. I am sure all honourable members will join with me in wishing him a happy birthday.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Parliamentary Annexe Lifts

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 11 May 2006 the member for Stafford raised concerns in the House about the slowness of the high-rise lifts in the Parliamentary Annexe during a call for a division. I also received correspondence on the same day from the member for Beaudesert on this matter. I advise that the Clerk has made various inquiries about the incident. These inquiries reveal that for at least two separate divisions on that day there was some delay caused by visitors using the lifts in the Parliamentary Annexe.

Anecdotal evidence has also been provided directly to me that some honourable members are holding the lift doors waiting for other members on their floor. I would ask all honourable members to ensure that they take responsibility for their guests and ask their guests to heed the warnings and not use the lifts during divisions. I would also ask that honourable members not hold lift doors open for considerable periods of time waiting for other members on their floor to enter the lifts as this may cause undue delay to members on other floors.

Finally, I advise that a memorandum has been issued under my hand today to all Parliamentary Service staff, opposition staff and government staff who occupy the precinct on sitting days reminding them to not use the high-rise lifts in the Parliamentary Annexe unless necessary and to never use any lifts during divisions.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Communications by Constituents

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 25 August 2005 I advised the House that I had considered a matter raised by the member for Burnett concerning a constituent's communication with a member and subsequent threatened legal action against the constituent by a public official. At that time I indicated that, despite my ruling that there was no matter of privilege, I would correspond with the Premier to examine whether there were any changes to policies, protocols or Public Service codes of conduct which may reduce the likelihood of similar matters occurring again.

I advise that I have recently received correspondence from the Premier in respect of this matter. The Premier has indicated that he is satisfied that departmental codes of conduct can already be used to encourage public servants to allow complaints-handling processes under those codes to run their proper course. However, such codes cannot be fashioned in such a way as to prevent public servants seeking advice from their lawyers or to prevent their lawyers threatening defamation or other proceedings against complainants.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Allegations of Misleading the House

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 21 April 2006 I received correspondence from the member for Moggill alleging that the Minister for Health had deliberately misled the House in answer to a question without notice on 8 March 2006 regarding the tender for a government contract. I have reviewed the member's correspondence and the Minister for Health's ministerial statement to the House on 21 April 2006 and documents tabled during that statement. I am satisfied that there is no matter of privilege and do not intend to refer the matter to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Allegations of Misleading the House

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 10 May 2006 I received correspondence from the member for Surfers Paradise alleging that the Minister for Energy and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy had misrepresented the member's words in the House on 28 March 2006. I have reviewed the member's correspondence, the original statement and the member's personal explanation in the House on 10 May 2006. I am satisfied that there is no matter of privilege.

PAPERS

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

12 May 2006—

- Addendum to the Report of the Strategic Management Review of the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman tabled on 11 May 2006

15 May 2006—

- Marine Incidents in Queensland—Annual Report 2005
- Sugar Authority—Final Report 1 July 2005—1 January 2006

16 May 2006—

- Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Robertson) to a paper petition presented by Mr Caltabiano from 439 petitioners and an E-petition sponsored by Mr Caltabiano from 742 petitioners regarding Queensland's free hospital system
- Response from the Minister for Public Works, Housing and Racing (Mr Schwarten) to an E-petition sponsored by Mr Caltabiano from 221 petitioners regarding the Yungaba property

17 May 2006—

- Response from the Minister for Police and Corrective Services (Ms Spence) to an E-petition sponsored by Mr Caltabiano from 330 petitioners regarding residential noise levels

18 May 2006—

- Erratum to Explanatory Notes to the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006 tabled on 9 May 2006
- Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Robertson) to a paper petition presented by Mr Beattie from 76 petitioners regarding the temporary closure of the Caboolture Hospital Emergency Department

19 May 2006—

- Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Lucas) to an E-petition sponsored by Ms Bligh from 485 petitioners regarding the suite of proposed Brisbane City Council projects titled TransApex

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Local Government Act 1993—

- Local Government (Toowoomba Water Futures Poll) Regulation 2006, No. 85 and Explanatory Notes for No. 85

Water and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2005—

- Water and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2006, No. 86

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990—

- Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment of Deed Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 87

Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000—

- Police Powers and Responsibilities Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2006, No. 88

Community Ambulance Cover Act 2003—

- Community Ambulance Cover Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 89

Fisheries Act 1994, Tow Truck Act 1973, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

- Transport Legislation and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 90

Health Act 1937, Public Health Act 2005—

- Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2006, No. 91

Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995—

- Workplace Health and Safety (Codes of Practice) Amendment Notice (No. 2) 2006, No. 92

MEMBER'S PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

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

Member for Southport (Mr Lawlor)—

- Non-conforming petition from 205 petitioners regarding sections 75 to 80 [Chapter 5: Instruction in a religious or other belief] of the of the Education (General Provisions) Bill 2006

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Queensland Health, Recruitment

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.38 am): A high-powered doctor recruitment mission I led to Britain and Ireland from 12 to 17 May captured the interest of about 150 well-qualified doctors who spent up to two hours at our seminars discovering how they could gain work with Queensland Health. The reaction from the doctors was very positive, and I am confident that many of the 150 doctors will come to work in our public hospitals. The campaign has also resulted in 469 hits on our recruitment web site in the nine days following the launch compared to 214 in the nine days before the launch.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker is back in the chair and I remind all members that I will not accept interjections when ministers are addressing the chamber or indeed when members are asking questions. That is my final warning.

Mr BEATTIE: It is quite obvious the opposition has no interest in recruiting doctors into Queensland Health, so let their record stand. Those opposite think it is a joke. I am happy to recruit doctors. We work; they whinge.

It is essential to recruit the doctors we need from overseas because even the Prime Minister has conceded that Australia has not trained enough doctors, but he has refused to provide the 325 extra medical places at universities that we need. Because there is strong competition among the Australian states to recruit from those countries which have standards similar to Australia, such as Great Britain and Ireland, we have to ensure that Queensland makes the biggest impact in those countries.

That is why I initiated a recruitment campaign in the United Kingdom in September last year with a series of advertisements and functions which attracted 649 expressions of interest from a wide variety of health professionals in Britain. Queensland Health has examined the health professionals' credentials and carried out interviews, and so far 34 doctors either have started working for us or are being appointed, and another 193 doctors are being considered for appointments. Fifty-six nurses, allied health workers and dentists also either have been appointed or are going through the same process.

With other states using similar advertising, the best way to demonstrate our credentials and press home the message that Queensland is the best Australian destination for English doctors and nurses was for me to lead a high-powered team on a recruitment mission to Ireland and Great Britain. Between 12 and 17 May I was joined by the following—and I want the member for Moggill to notice this, because he deliberately misrepresented who was accompanying me. I want the record to be set straight. I stated this in the parliament during the last sittings, yet he deliberately went out and misrepresented who was going to accompany me. I expect a little bit of decency from members on these matters.

Between 12 and 17 May I was joined by Professor Ken Donald, Head of the School of Medicine, Queensland University; Jim O'Dempsey, Executive Officer, Medical Board of Queensland; Dr John Dunning, Medical Director of Cardiothoracic Surgery at Prince Charles Hospital, whom we recruited from England's world-famous Papworth Hospital; my wife, Dr Heather Beattie; from 14 May Dr Bill Beresford, newly appointed Queensland Health Clinical Director for the Rockhampton area, another distinguished doctor who comes from Britain; until 15 May Dr Bill Glasson, Chair of the Medical Recruitment Advisory Group and a former national president of the AMA; and Veronica Casey, Chair of Nursing in the Division of Medicine, Queensland Health. I thank all of them for their hard work, teamwork and great enthusiasm which resulted in very professional and compelling seminars for the 150 doctors.

I also launched this latest phase of the campaign with advertisements in the *Times*, the *British Medical Journal* and the *Irish Times* and at eight London Underground stations which are visited by more than 600,000 people every weekday. I also announced a new, improved web site designed to help recruit doctors, nurses and allied health workers for Queensland. Let the record show that the opposition seeks to deride every attempt to recruit doctors in this state. Let the record show that they are simply trying to undermine every attempt we make to get doctors into our hospital system. The web site provides overseas clinicians with essential information about working and living in the Smart State. For the information of the House I table my full report, together with a number of annexures which are contained in that box. I seek leave to have the full details incorporated into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

This website details Queensland's favourable pay and working conditions for clinicians, job vacancies, and the unique features of our lifestyle.

It's a one-stop shop for enticing foreign doctors, nurses and allied health professionals to actually take the next step and make the move to the Smart State.

The site has a link to another new Queensland Government website, www.coordinatorgeneral.qld.gov.au/ workliveplay which tells potential migrants about handy information in each of Queensland's regions, such as job vacancies, house prices, leisure and entertainment.

Queensland Health has already recruited more than 270 extra doctors since last June and on this mission it was possible to narrow the scope of positions we need to fill.

So when it came to the seminars we intended to run in Dublin, Birmingham, Leeds and London, the Australian Medical Association and recruitment agencies were asked to closely examine the qualifications and experience of doctors who expressed an interest in working in Queensland and select only those with the qualifications and experience we need in our public hospitals.

About 150 of these specially-selected doctors attended the four seminars.

The presentation took about an hour after which I invited all our guests to talk to one of our experts who would answer any questions they had. Jim O'Dempsey of the Medical Board of Queensland always had the longest queues waiting to speak to him and a separate room was made available for him to deal with the queries.

Each of us spent up to an hour answering questions and telling doctors about Queensland Health, our hospitals and our wonderful lifestyle.

We also held a similar seminar in London for a small group of nurses who are interested in working for Queensland Health.

Our recruitment of doctors from Britain will be improved as the result of a meeting in London with executives of Britain's General Medical Council.

I witnessed the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the General Medical Council and the Medical Board of Queensland for the electronic exchange of Certificates of Good Standing.

Certificates of Good Standing have to be provided before a foreign doctor can start work in Queensland and at the moment it can take weeks for a certificate to arrive here, leaving doctors in limbo and patients waiting.

We cannot afford these delays and deterrents and the MoU will accelerate the process dramatically.

My program also included a variety of meetings and functions to show how British and Irish hospitals are creating new positions in the health workforce to deal with the shortage of doctors and specialists.

Nurses, physiotherapists, radiographers and science graduates are among the people being trained in various hospitals to cut waiting times for patients while maintaining safety standards.

It was emphasised that these developments were only made possible by the co-operation of everyone involved in the particular service and by people in the new roles working as part of a team.

It was also viewed as important to have detailed protocols for the new roles.

At the world-renowned Papworth Hospital, for instance, a consultant cardio-thoracic surgeon said that specially-trained non-medical staff played an essential role in surgery during heart bypass operations at the hospital.

I was told that people who have not trained to be doctors are trained to become surgical assistants and that they routinely cut veins out of legs for use in heart surgery while the surgeon operated in the chest cavity.

The consultant, Mr Samer Nashef, told me: "Surgical assistants are truly wonderful!"

And at Chapel Allerton Hospital, Leeds, waiting lists of up to four years for consultation with an orthopaedic surgeon have been reduced to about 17 weeks by training physiotherapists to deal with an initial consultation.

During a meeting with senior representatives from some of the Deaneries it was agreed that Queensland Health would work on designing a special web page offering short-term placements suitable for British doctors seeking to work overseas as part of their training program.

The Deaneries are the organisations responsible for postgraduate training in the UK.

What we are aiming for is postgraduate British doctors spending up to a year training in Queensland public hospitals, with the training being recognised by the Deaneries as part of their training program.

This would be a win-win for both the UK and for Queensland.

A rotational training program with Queensland Health would offer postgraduate UK doctors the opportunity to work in diverse environments and gain experience in key speciality areas.

And Queensland would gain extra doctors to help ease the shortage of Australian doctors.

I was grateful to the Irish Deputy Prime Minister, Mary Harney, for fitting in a visit to the Merrion Hotel for a 30-minute meeting with me immediately after the doctor recruitment seminar which we held at the hotel on Saturday, May 13. We discussed a wide range of issues of mutual interest.

I also thank Richard Alston, High Commissioner to the United Kingdom, Anne Plunkett, Ambassador to Ireland and the Holy See, and Penny Wensley, Ambassador to France, for informative briefings in England, Ireland and France.

Former British Prime Minister John Major was unable to attend the function to celebrate the opening of the renovated Queensland House but said he would like to talk on the phone. We spent about 10 minutes on May 15 talking about issues of interest to Queensland and the UK.

The Ireland and UK section of the mission ended with about 60 business and political leaders attending the official opening of the renovated Queensland House at 392 the Strand. It gave me an ideal opportunity to talk about the investment and business opportunities in the Smart State.

Instead of leaving the next day to arrive back in Queensland on Friday, May 19, I extended the mission by a day so that I could advance Queensland's business interests in France, one of our major European trading partners.

On May 18 I held a meeting with M Xavier Poupardin, Director, Overseas Subsidiaries, Eurocopter, a subsidiary of EADS, the French aerospace giant, regarding investments in Queensland.

The Ambassador to France, Ms Penny Wensley, then hosted a business lunch involving:

M Jean-Georges Malcor Directeur Général, Marine Division, Thales
Mrs Veronica Comyn Director, Ingeus
M Renaud Favier, Director for International Affairs, Renault
M Jean-Louis Tauzin, Director, Ingeus France
M Laurent Cheminau, journalist, La Tribune
Mr Robert Dolk, Director for Developer Countries, BNP Parisbas
M Xavier Poupardin, Director, Overseas Subsidiaries, Eurocopter
M Patrice Dauvin, President Director-General, SITA
M Alain Bovis, CEO Armaris

This was a wonderful opportunity to talk about the Smart State to influential French business leaders.

It was a great tribute to Queensland winemaking that in the capital of one of the world's traditional wine-making countries, the Ambassador chose to serve the 2003 Ballandean Estate Sauvignon Blanc and the 2000 Ballandean Estate Shiraz to the French business leaders.

I then travelled to the Paris offices of Ingeus which has won a major contract with the French Government to work with long-term unemployed people and find them employment. I wanted to see for myself how the company operates so successfully. The Queensland Government provided assistance to Ingeus through its European Trade and Investment Office.

Finally, I travelled to the Paris office of Pro-Natura where I told Pro-Natura that the Queensland Government will provide Innovation Fund money for a unique international study of insects and fauna in South East Queensland to help identify signs of climate change.

The Queensland Government's commitment of $356,000 will help a multi-national team of more than 30 biodiversity specialists conduct the survey of plant and insect life along a 1000m altitudinal line in Queensland in October 2006 and April 2007.

I table a full report of 93 pages on the mission and I once again thank all those who made it such a great success.

Tabled paper: Report by the Premier (Mr Beattie) on an overseas trip titled *Report on a Health Recruitment Mission to the United Kingdom and Ireland 11—17 May 2006 and a One-Day Business Mission to France 18 May 2006*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Cyclone Larry, General P Cosgrove

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.42 am): I am pleased to announce that General Peter Cosgrove will address the parliament on Thursday at 11.30 am following consultation with you, Mr Speaker. I have asked the general to provide this address to inform members of the progress on the massive rebuilding and recovery program which we are undertaking following Cyclone Larry. I will also take the opportunity at that time to outline details of the Cyclone Larry concert.

Larry was a category 5 cyclone and one of the most destructive to ever hit our nation. Fortunately, no-one lost their life as a direct result of the cyclone. However, the damage to homes, buildings, crops and farms was extensive. To help get the recovery and rebuilding process underway, I appointed General Cosgrove—former chief of the Australian Defence Force and former Australian of the Year—to head the Operation Recovery Task Force. He readily accepted this major challenge and has proven to be the ideal man for the job.

The general has been on the ground up in Innisfail since 25 March overseeing the work that needed to be done. Significant progress has been made under his leadership and some of the achievements to date include restoration of water supply, restoration of sewerage services, provision of emergency housing, distribution of emergency relief phase 1 payments, establishment of one-stop shops and establishment of a building coordination centre.

As the general indicated yesterday, from the end of next month he will no longer be permanently based in Innisfail. This is not a surprise as it was never the intention when we appointed him to lead the Operation Recovery Task Force that he would live in the region permanently. The recovery process is well underway and he will continue the terrific job he has been doing by making regular visits to the region to view progress on the comprehensive rebuilding plans he has put in place. In addition, he will continue to oversee the work of the Operation Recovery Management Group based on the ground. The Operation Recovery Management Group comprises a range of state and Australian government departments including the Department of Housing, Department of Communities, Queensland Transport, Queensland Health and the Department of Public Works.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Water Supply

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.44 am): As the House is aware, studies show Queensland's economic success and envious lifestyle are set to continue to attract thousands of people to our region—so much so that in just two decades the projected population for south-east Queensland will have hit more than 3.9 million. The Queensland government is implementing its plan to ensure that the projected four million south-east Queenslanders will have all the water they need in 2026 and well beyond.

In the face of the worst drought on record for south-east Queensland, climate change and a rapidly increasing population—

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I warn you under 253.

Mr BEATTIE: In the face of the worst drought on record for south-east Queensland, climate change and a rapidly increasing population, my government has a detailed, long-term plan to secure water for the south-east. To specifically address the drought, we are working on bringing forward infrastructure such as recycled water and desalination that otherwise may not have been required for several years.

Within the next two decades it is now estimated that we will need to provide a total of at least 560,000 megalitres of water each year to keep homes, business and industry thriving. The Queensland government will meet the growing demand for water through a multipronged approach. For example, we are attacking waste and excess; we are investigating new technologies including recycling and desalination; we are also better utilising the water in existing dams by creating the Water Commission and building a grid system to ensure everyone in the south-east has assured access to water; and we are working on initiatives to help individual south-east Queenslanders to make a difference by giving them the tools and assistance to harvest their own rainwater and make big cuts in the amount they use on a daily basis. All of these initiatives will provide us with more than 100,000 extra megalitres each year. But that still will not be enough to ensure water security for all of us for not just the next five or 10 years but also for the decades of booming population and climate change ahead. We still need to build dams.

I note the opposition is still planning for the short term. We have taken the time and made the commitment to the long-term future of south-east Queensland. Children being born in 2006 will still be benefiting from the hard work we are doing now in half a century. If the worst drought on record has made anything clear, it is that we need big water storages to get us through the hard times. The proposed dams at Traveston on the Mary River and the proposed dam on the Logan River meet this need. Traveston has been chosen because it is the only site remaining in south-east Queensland that will allow us to build a megadam—a dam to meet the region's needs for the next half a century and beyond.

One and a quarter million extra people means that within 20 years we need to find about an extra 300 million litres of water each and every day. That is an additional annual consumption of at least 110,000 megalitres. Our plan yields much more than this, with more than an additional 300,000

megalitres per annum to be provided by my government's initiatives. That gives us water security for a growing population up until 2050 and beyond.

My government is making the tough decisions now to ensure the current water situation in south-east Queensland never happens again. Today I can announce that the government is establishing a special-purpose company to deliver the new dams, similar to the successful model used for the Burnett River Dam. Queensland Water Infrastructure Pty Ltd will comprise a series of project teams dedicated to delivering this vital infrastructure by the end of 2011. Queensland Water Infrastructure will adopt a three-phase approach to delivering the two new dams. Phase 1 is preliminary evaluation, which is now underway. That involves geotechnical surveys, preliminary design, a scan of any environmental, infrastructure and community impacts, and an early economic cost-benefit assessment.

By August Queensland Water Infrastructure will have a full complement of consultants and advisers on board ready to do the phase 2 work of a detailed impact assessment and business case analysis. We aim to have environmental and other approvals in place by early 2008 so that a three-year construction program can begin later in that year.

I know that some people affected by the proposed dam have voiced frustration at the limited information currently available. I give them this commitment: the necessary evaluation process is now underway and we will keep them informed. Over recent months, as the current drought became more severe and the potential long-term climate change consequences became better understood, the government has been weighing up the supply alternatives. As soon as we made that judgement, we let the people affected know that the government is considering building a dam on their land.

We could have done a detailed assessment in secret without letting anyone know, but that is not how my government operates. When we knew that Traveston and Tilley's Bridge were serious options, we respected the right of everyone affected to be informed. We will continue to inform the community as more detailed analysis comes to hand.

There will be public consultation on the draft terms of reference for the environmental impact statements later this year. The draft EIS reports will also be released for public comment, and this will contain a complete set of information on the dams and their impacts. I say to the people in the Mary and Logan valleys that we will talk with them, and assist them in every way possible to deal with the impact of these investigations and do what we can to minimise the disruption to their lives and livelihoods. The people of south-east Queensland would expect us to do nothing less. The people of south-east Queensland would also expect us to deliver the dams to ensure we have enough water for our growing community to the middle of this century and beyond.

It was interesting that while I was in Britain the press were talking at great lengths about the drought hitting England as a result of climate change. One of the proposals they are looking at is dragging icebergs up the Thames. I have to say that that sounds a little bit extraordinary. But if anyone thinks that water restrictions are a matter just for Queensland they are wrong. In Britain they have announced that they will bring in water restrictions for parts of England as a result of climate change and drought. Climate change is affecting the world and my government is moving to deal with it here.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Violence in Indigenous Communities

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.51 am): No-one could be immune to recent media reports of violence in Indigenous communities and the impact this has on women and the most vulnerable, young children. In 2001 my government commissioned Justice Tony Fitzgerald to investigate the incidence of violence and alcohol abuse in communities on Cape York. His report found alcohol abuse, substance abuse and violence were tearing Indigenous communities apart. In addition to upholding the rights of women and children to live without fear of abuse, the action taken by my government tackles alcohol misuse head on, and we are bolstering crisis support services. Importantly, we are working collaboratively with Indigenous communities, local councils and the Australian government to develop locally owned and shared solutions to these horrific problems.

Unlike the Northern Territory, however, tribal law is not an option in Queensland. I want to categorically stress that the full force of the Queensland law will be felt by any person who harms a child in this state—full stop. Also, unlike other jurisdictions, we have taken a tough and often controversial position to introduce alcohol restrictions. These are either in place or being introduced into 19 discrete Indigenous communities, and will be supported by health and other initiatives to combat alcohol addiction.

I am heartened to learn that the federal Indigenous affairs minister, Mal Brough, last week recognised that alcohol management must be part of the solution. Overall in Queensland, there has been a 33 per cent reduction in the quarterly average number of hospital admissions for assault since the restrictions were introduced.

My government has also implemented significant child protection reforms. We spent $10.9 million this year on a range of Indigenous child protection initiatives, with funding to increase next year to $14.5 million. We have established four child safety service delivery hubs, on Palm Island, Mornington Island, Cooktown and Thursday Island, with another being established in Mount Isa later this year.

An early years strategy is under development. My government has committed recurrent funding of $8.5 million for an intervention initiative to help families before they come to the attention of the child protection system. Among practical measures to address Indigenous family violence are: $18 million for a safe havens project, a joint state-Commonwealth program in Cherbourg, Coen, Mornington Island and Palm Island; and $1.4 million to support Indigenous healing centres, providing services to people affected by violence and crime.

My government believes that some of the building blocks which will help make a real difference to the lives of Indigenous women and children are these, but there is more to be done. Our Indigenous communities must show strong leadership and commitment to working in partnership with government over the long haul. It also requires the highest level of political will from governments around this country. That is why the Queensland government has called on the Prime Minister to ensure this matter is placed squarely on the COAG agenda for our next meeting.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Queensland Economy

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.54 am): The Queensland economy continues to perform strongly in 2006. Those indications are very sound for investment. I seek leave to have the remainder of my speech incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Queensland's unemployment rate has been anchored around the 5% mark since late 2004 and has been lower than in the rest of Australia for the past 22 months.

Over the year to April 2006, 28,600 more Queenslanders were employed, bringing the total number of people employed in Queensland to more than 2 million for the first time in history.

This constituted 24.4% of national employment growth over the same period, 4.9 percentage points higher than the States population share.

Our economy continues to benefit from continuing growth in global demand for the States energy and mineral products.

Over the year to March quarter 2006, the total value of overseas merchandise exports from Queensland increased a staggering 49.3% compared with a year ago.

This is the highest annual growth on record and almost three times higher than the 16.6% annual growth in the rest of Australia.

Robust labour market and external conditions have also resulted in strong growth in household and business income.

This in turn is expected to support the growth in domestic economic activity in 2006.

For example, the volume of retail turnover in Queensland increased at an annual rate of 5.6% in March quarter 2006, compared with 1.7% growth recorded in the rest of Australia.

Business conditions also remain strong.

Driven by strong business confidence and rising overseas demand, Queensland is on the way to achieving another year of double-digit growth in business investment.

In the first half of this financial year, business investment in Queensland increased at an annual rate of 14.1%.

The latest Construction Outlook Report published by BCI Australia for March quarter 2006 shows that Queensland dominates the commercial market among all States and Territories, with almost $2.6 billion worth of commercial projects in the pipeline, more than double that in New South Wales.

Even more significant is the overwhelming dominance of Queensland in the civil engineering sector.

A total of $7.3 billion worth of civil engineering projects in Queensland are currently in the concept and design stage.

Queensland also maintains a strong position in the community and industrial segments of the market, with a total of $325 million worth of projects planned, ranking the State fourth after Victoria, New South Wales and the ACT.

The latest BCI outlook for the residential sector is also consistent with other indicators of dwelling activity which show that Queensland continues to be the strongest growing residential market among all States and Territories, with $2.9 billion worth of residential projects in the pipeline.

As a whole, the value of proposed construction in Queensland in March quarter 2006 was more than that of the rest of Australia combined.

Mr Speaker, I am confident that the Smart State economy will continue to perform strongly in the remainder of 2006.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Premier's Literary Awards

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.54 am): Today I urge any of Queensland's aspiring authors to nominate for the 2006 Queensland Premier's Literary Awards. There is $225,000 in prize money. I seek leave to have the remainder of my speech incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Across 14 categories, the Awards are the richest and most diverse of their kind in Australia.

These national prizes recognise, support and enhance the arts around the country.

They give authors the chance to gain recognition in the literary community, as well as earn financial assistance to support the development of their craft.

I encourage all Australian writers to enter the Awards, and I look forward to announcing the category winners in Brisbane in September.

Nominations are open in the following Award categories:

Fiction Book Award—$25,000
Emerging Queensland Author—Manuscript Award—$20,000
Unpublished Indigenous Writer—The David Unaipon Award—$15,000
Non-Fiction—Dymocks Literacy Foundation Award—$15,000
History Book Award—$15,000
Children's Book Award—$15,000
Young Adult Book Award—$15,000
Science Writer—Department of State Development, Trade and Innovation Award—$15,000
Poetry Collection—Arts Queensland Judith Wright Calanthe Award—$15,000
Australian Short Story Collection—Arts Queensland Steele Rudd Award—$15,000
Literary or Media Work Advancing Public Debate—The Harry Williams Award—$15,000
Film Script—Pacific Film & Television Commission Award—$15,000
Television Script—QUT Creative Industries Award—$15,000
Drama Script (Stage) Award—$15,000

The 2005 winners were Tim Winton for The Turning (Fiction Book Award), Geoffrey Bardon and James Bardon for Papunya—A Place Made After the Story (Non Fiction Book Award), Hedley Thomas for Sickness in the System (Literary or Media Work Advancing Public Debate Award), Jacquelin Perske for Little Fish (Film Script Award) and Patrick Holland for The Long Road of the Junkmailer (Emerging Queensland Author—Manuscript Award).

Nominations close at 5pm on Friday, June 2, 2006.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Death of Mr R Farley

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier) (9.55 am): I wish to mark the passing of Rick Farley, a great Queenslander who died on 13 May. Born in Townsville and educated in Brisbane, Rick's early experience in politics, journalism and as spokesperson for the Cattlemen's Union fitted him well to go on and broker some of the most important agreements in Australia's modern history. Rick became executive director of the National Farmers Federation in 1988. This was at a time of intractable disputation between landowners, conservationists, Indigenous Australians and industry. In this climate, Rick managed to deliver outcomes by focusing on mutual interests. This was a quality that characterised his entire career.

With Phillip Toyne, of the Australian Conservation Foundation, Rick convinced then Prime Minister Bob Hawke to provide $320 million, which became $1 billion over a decade, to transform the Landcare movement into a national organisation, signalling a fundamental shift toward sustainable land management. Then in 1993 Rick was instrumental in negotiations over native title legislation in the wake of the High Court's Mabo decision. Of great and lasting significance to this state, he negotiated the Cape York regional land use heads of agreement between our Indigenous Queenslanders, landowners and conservationists in 1996. I seek leave to incorporate more details in *Hansard* as a fitting tribute to Rick Farley.

Leave granted.

The fact that this agreement is still in place 10 years on, and still delivers major achievements such as the recent Kalpowar and Marina Plains land use agreements, is as much a credit to Rick Farley's foresight as it is to the commitment of the stakeholders involved.

Rick Farley believed the only deal that sticks is one where there's something for everyone.

My Government will continue to work on this enduring legacy through the Cape York Tenure Resolution Implementation Group, which is chaired by the Minister for Environment.

We can gain an insight into Rick Farley from some points he made in an Australia Day address in 2003. He said:

"Unless we use natural resources in a sustainable way, we are mining the future. Unless the relationships between our citizens are respectful and inclusive, we are a divided and diminished society."

I am sure that all Members will join me in conveying a message of respect for Rick Farley, and condolences to the family who survive him.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Environment, Profile and Trends Report

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for State Development, Trade and Innovation) (9.56 am): Today, I table the *Queensland environment industry: profile and trends report 2006*, a key part of the Beattie government's Smart State Strategy.

The report provides Queensland with two important insights: the global trends that are driving the growth of the environment industry and a profile of the Queensland environment industry highlighting its strengths, capabilities and challenges. Queensland's environment industry is enormously diverse—one which has grown from largely focusing on pollution management to the manufacture and supply of sustainable technologies to the increasing demand for new, smarter and resource efficient water and energy technologies to resource management. It is also an industry that is crucial to sustainable development in the Smart State and one which underpins much of the economic activity of Queensland, especially construction, infrastructure and mining.

This report is the first detailed study of our state's environment business sector. The industry survey component of the report is based on responses from over 800 Queensland companies. The fact that so many companies took the time and effort to respond to the survey is clear evidence of the vitality and growth prospects for this sector. This is a period of unprecedented growth and opportunity for the Queensland environment industry.

As the report states, the world market for environmental goods and services was valued at $US515 billion in 2000 and is forecast to rise to $US688 billion by 2010. The local industry can best be described as highly innovative and optimistic about its future. It is mostly made up of small to very small businesses with their headquarters here in Queensland. Nearly 90 per cent of companies have fewer than 20 employees but the industry had revenues of some $1.3 billion in 2003-04 and employed over 10,000 highly skilled individuals.

In the same period, over 240 companies—nearly one-third of the industry—exported goods and services to more than 50 countries, and 300 companies indicated that they would be exporting this financial year. The road ahead looks promising and this report looks at where we are going with this industry. In Queensland we have the knowledge, the technologies and experience to turn environmental challenges into business opportunities for the sustainable development of Queensland and indeed the world. I predict that we will continue to see this industry grow.

Tabled paper: Report by the Queensland government titled *The Queensland Environment Industry: Profile and Trends Report 2006*

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Deputy Premier titled *Environment Industry*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy

Hon. H PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Water) (9.58 am): The Queensland government and local councils in the state's south-east are developing and implementing a plan to meet the future water needs of this region. This plan, the South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy, is the only comprehensive plan for water security in south-east Queensland.

Yesterday, the coalition released a cobbled-together document. How can we take the coalition seriously when its document states that the region's largest dam—the Wivenhoe—is 1,000 times smaller than it actually is? The members opposite should have a look at their document. The coalition wants to build four dams with a much smaller yield than the two dam sites that the government is currently investigating at Traveston and Tilley's Bridge. Indeed, the coalition's water shortage in terms of dams is in the order of 60,000 megalitres per annum. That is the coalition's water shortfall.

The shadow minister admitted in the *Courier-Mail* that the coalition plan lacked dam space. This is a complete contradiction of the claim by the opposition leader yesterday. The funding shortfall is also a major issue.

Mr Horan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba South, I warn you under standing order 253.

Mr PALASZCZUK: The coalition admits that the costings for three of its four dam projects are based on 1999 figures—figures that are seven years old.

Our government is committed to a regional water grid. The coalition makes no firm commitment. Indeed, the Mary River dam projects at Amamoor and Borumba were envisaged by the Borbidge government to provide increased water supply available to meet Sunshine Coast and Mary Valley demands. For the people of Brisbane, it means that these coalition dam projects are not for them. Brisbane residents will miss out.

I also read with interest where the coalition document stated that it would 'provide extra financial assistance to local governments to fix water main breaks and leaks'. Our government has already committed $32 million to a joint program with the local councils to address water main losses. How can the coalition claim to be interested in fixing water main breaks when one of its members exacerbated the problem? It cannot.

Last week, the *Courier-Mail* reported that the Brisbane City Council's budget for water main maintenance was reduced from $9 million in 2003-04 to $8 million in 2004-05 and down to $7 million for this financial year. The juggler—the member for Chatsworth—was involved in preparing those council budgets. Last financial year there were 2,500 water main breaks in Brisbane. That is almost seven per day.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, I warn you under standing order 253.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Water titled *South-East Queensland Water*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Public Housing, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Councils

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Public Works, Housing and Racing) (10.02 am): Recent media reports highlight the many complexities faced by governments at all levels in improving living conditions in Indigenous communities. I welcome the genuine interest of the new federal minister, Mal Brough, in this issue.

Councils, including the Hope Vale council, have a deed of grant in trust, which means that they have full responsibility for their own housing construction, maintenance and repairs, housing allocation, waitlist management and rent collection. They have had that responsibility since 1984. Since 1999, this government has allocated more than $210 million to these councils. However, throughout these communities there are millions of dollars outstanding in rent arrears—money which should have been used to fund housing maintenance.

The reality is that many Aboriginal and Islander councils are failing their own communities by not managing their own housing construction, maintenance and tenancy programs. In fact, in July last year I directed the Department of Housing to write to all 34 councils offering to assume responsibility for tenancy management and housing construction. We are the only government in Australia to have done this. The response has been mixed, although all councils acknowledged that there is a severe backlog of housing maintenance work and unmet housing need in their communities.

I made it very clear to these councils that continuing as they were was not an option. From 1 July this year, a new model of housing delivery will be implemented in these communities. As part of the preparation we have nearly completed an audit of every house and tenancy on every community. That is 3,500 houses and there are about 200 to go.

The audit will allow us to prioritise repairs and maintenance. Q-Build will manage this work and around $4,000 per house in state funds has been set aside. The second priority will be upgrades of existing properties. Under the new model, funding for new stock will be provided on a matching basis. For every $1 of rent collected, the state will match that $1 for upgrades and new housing. Councils will also be required to implement transparent and accountable rent collection and housing allocation processes.

I have made it very clear that if they do not make significant improvements I will not rule out withholding funds from councils who refuse to take responsibility for their housing situation. Our priority remains working with the councils to improve the situation in these communities.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Public Works, Housing and Racing titled *Aboriginal Housing*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Police Resources, Indigenous Communities

Hon. JC SPENCE (Mount Gravatt—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services) (10.04 am): Recently, a lot has been said about policing levels and law and order issues in Indigenous communities in Australia. In Queensland, we have a good news story to tell when it comes to police numbers in this state's Indigenous communities. Queensland's Indigenous communities have some of the best police to population ratios of anywhere in Australia. I table these figures in parliament today. The national police to population ratio is one police officer to every 440 people. In communities such as Kowanyama it is one officer to every 112 people. On Palm Island it is one officer to every 131 people. At Doomadgee it is one officer to every 124 people.

The Beattie government has not only increased policing numbers in our Indigenous communities but also put in place brand-new infrastructure to assist police to do their job. Last year the Premier opened the brand-new Hope Vale Police Station, which was constructed at a cost of more than $1.264 million. Next year we will open a new police station, police house and watch-house in Wujal Wujal, the planning of which has already cost $140,000. The replacement police station on Palm Island, together with the new Palm Island PCYC, represents a total government investment on Palm Island of more than $6 million over the past three years. I also table a list of this government's investment in policing in these communities. I do not have time to talk about the work of the PCYCs today, but I can say that they are also doing an enormous amount of work in Aboriginal communities in this state.

This government has also put in place alcohol management plans in Indigenous communities. We now have the most far-reaching alcohol management plans of any state in Australia. We have over 140 police liaison officers in Queensland, most of whom are Indigenous. In 2003 the Queensland Police Service developed a pilot program to assist people with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds to gain entry into the police academy. This initiative, called the Justice Entry Program, has resulted in 22 Indigenous people becoming police officers. Currently, eight Indigenous people are training as police recruits. Applications are being received all the time. The program is now being offered on an ongoing basis and, hopefully, will help increase the number of police officers with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds.

As well, the Department of Corrective Services is in the process of putting in place new community corrections offices in Doomadgee, Mornington Island, Normanton and Thursday Island. These offices will establish for the first time a permanent community corrections service in the lower gulf and Torres Strait. They will provide a high level of supervision and case management of people in the community who are on court orders. This is designed to help us reduce the overrepresentation of Indigenous people in Queensland prisons. This improved supervision will provide a real sentencing alternative for judges and magistrates.

We all acknowledge that Aboriginal communities are places that are affected by violence and alcohol abuse. This government is working very hard to address the harm and despair that is occurring in these communities. Mal Brough has called for more police in Aboriginal communities. We need to remember that more police will also have the effect of causing more Aboriginal people to come into contact with the criminal justice system, which will further increase Aboriginal representation in our prisons. It is already the case that, although Aboriginal people make up just 2.4 per cent of the population, they account for more than 25 per cent of the prison population. Most of these people are in prison for violent and sexual crimes. I welcome the federal government's new-found interest in Indigenous affairs and policing in these communities, but the Beattie government has been working on these problems for the past eight years.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Police and Corrective Services titled *Aboriginal Communities*

Tabled paper: Document detailing police to population ratios in Indigenous communities in 2005

Tabled paper: Document detailing Queensland Police Service capital works expenditure in Indigenous communities between 2003 and 2006

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Asbestos Roof Replacement Program

Hon. RJ WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for the Arts) (10.08 am): Twelve months ago, our government announced an ambitious capital works program for Smart State schools—the $120 million Asbestos Roof Replacement Program. Our government was the first in the state's history to comprehensively address this issue and to provide funding to replace every asbestos roof in every Queensland state school. Over the past 12 months, the minister for public works and I have been working with our departments to accelerate this program.

In fact, 304 asbestos roofs at 115 state schools throughout Queensland have now been replaced, and the number is increasing every week. This is a tremendous result in the first 12 months of the program, and we intend to keep up this rate of work, weather permitting. Today, I am also pleased to announce that a schedule of roof replacements has now been prepared for the period between June and November this year, before the Christmas school holidays. We anticipate that in this period a further 177 school asbestos roofs can be replaced at state schools throughout Queensland, pending weather and the ongoing availability of skilled tradespeople. I seek leave to incorporate a list of these schools in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Asbestos Roof Replacement Program (ARRP)
Replacement Schedule
June—November 2006

In south-east Queensland:

Acacia Ridge State School (8 roofs);
Balmoral State High School (7 roofs);
Beaudesert State High School (7 roofs);
Biggera Waters State School (1 roof);
Burleigh Heads State School (4 roofs);
Caloundra State School (4 roofs);
Cavendish Road State High School (7 roofs);
Everton Park State High School (7 roofs);
Grovely State School (2 roofs);
Humpybong State School (6 roofs);
Indooroopilly State High School (4 roofs);
Jindalee State School (3 roofs);
Macgregor State High School (7 roofs);
Mt Gravatt Pre-school (1 roof);
Mt Gravatt State High School (8 roofs);
Mt Gravatt State School (3 roofs);
Musgrave Hill State School (2 roofs);
Nambour Pre-school (1 roof);
Nambour State High School (6 roofs);
Nambour State School (6 roofs);
Oxley State School (4 roofs);
Samford State School (1 roof);
Sandgate District State High School (8 roofs);
Serviceton South State School (4 roofs);
Stafford Special Education Unit (3 roofs);
The Gap State High School (7 roofs);
Upper Mt Gravatt State School (5 roofs);
Woodridge State High School (7 roofs)
Wooloowin State School (2 roofs).

Outside south-east Queensland:

Alpha State School (2 roofs);
Belgian Gardens State School (2 roofs);
Benaraby State School (1 roof);
Bowen State School (1 roof);
Bowen State High School (4 roofs);
Builyan State School (1 roof);
Cairns West State School (1 roof);
Calliope State School (1 roof);
Camooweal State School (1 roof);
Gladstone Central State School (2 roofs);
Gladstone State High School (4 roofs);
Hannaford State School (1 roof);
Kingaroy State High School (1 roof);
Mackay State High School (7 roofs);
Ravenshoe State School (3 roofs);
Thabeban State School (1 roof);
Townsville State High School (1 roof);
Trinity Bay State High School (4 roofs);
Urangan Point State School (1 roof);
Walkamin State School (1 roof);
Yungaburra State School (2 roofs).

Mr WELFORD: This latest schedule means that by the end of November this year—18 months into the program—as many as 480 asbestos roofs in 160 schools will have been replaced since the Asbestos Roof Replacement Program began in June 2005. This is over half of all of the school asbestos roofs that will be replaced under the program. I am sure all members will agree that this is an outstanding result. We will continue to press ahead with this replacement work and get the job done as quickly as we possibly can.

Tabled paper: Document detailing the Asbestos Roof Replacement Schedule June to November 2006

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Education and Minister for the Arts titled *Asbestos Roof Replacement Program*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Child Safety

Hon. MF REYNOLDS (Townsville—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety) (10.11 am): Recent *Courier-Mail* stories made a number of incorrect allegations of systemic failures in the Department of Child Safety. I will not let these claims go unanswered.

Let us put the facts on the record. We care for approximately 6,000 children. They are in our care because they have been failed by their families, not the government. We do have some children in care who commit crimes. These children represent a mere 1.4 per cent of the children in the care of the department. We are talking about abused children here—children who are often unwanted, children who have often been unloved, children who have sometimes been horribly hurt, children whose childhoods have been stolen. Some have challenging behaviours. Many of them have been abused and horribly neglected. Some are angry as a result. Some children run away from their carers. Some commit crimes—sometimes horrific crimes. However, this is not representative of typical children in care.

The headlining of $1 million for one child gives an extremely inaccurate portrayal of the broad costs of caring for abused and neglected children. Most of the 6,000 children are in foster care, with each placement costing in the range of $12,000 to $20,000. There are a small number who have suffered horrific abuse, and they require a level of very expensive specialised care. A small number have major disabilities requiring extensive medical assistance. Some have major mental health issues. There were 22 children on packages ranging from $250,000 to $550,000 in the year 2004-05. Those packages have been reviewed by KPMG. They were found to be absolutely necessary to deal with the disability and mental health issues involved.

We employ psychologists, psychiatrists, therapists and other medical interventions to help abused children. I make no apologies for providing intensive therapy to individual children. Failure to do so would guarantee these children becoming lifelong problems for society. These young people's hope in life is the reformed Department of Child Safety. I give this pledge right here and now to the 6,000 children who have been abused or neglected by their parents and who are in our care: the Beattie government will not abandon you when you need us most. We will continue to invest the resources required to ensure that you can have a fair go and have a fair crack at life. That is what the Beattie government is about.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Child Safety titled *Courier Mail Allegations*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mental Health Service

Hon. S ROBERTSON (Stretton—ALP) (Minister for Health) (10.14 am): During the past couple of days there has been some media coverage of a mental health patient who is subject to a forensic order. While I am concerned about the rights of the patient in a case such as this, I am equally aware of the feelings of the families of victims and the interests of the broader community.

The person who has been subject to media attention over the past two days was granted limited community treatment by the Mental Health Review Tribunal on 17 March 2006. This occurred under condition that he was at all times escorted by either his father or both of his parents. On each occasion, he was reviewed by his treating team prior to his release to ensure that he was fit to be under the supervision of his parents. He is currently granted up to six hours community leave at any one time for the purposes of rehabilitation. Since 17 March, he has had 12 periods of leave in the community, at all times escorted by his parents. The person remains at all other times in the high-security facility at The Park—Centre for Mental Health. His parents have surrendered their passports in accordance with an undertaking given by them, and the person is not permitted to have access to alcohol, illicit drugs, any firearm or weapon and is not permitted to drive a motor vehicle.

A notification order has been in place for the victim's mother since April 2002. She has had regular contact with the Mental Health Review Tribunal since that time and has made several submissions. She was informed of the upcoming review in February this year and chose not to make a submission. She was then informed by letter from the Mental Health Review Tribunal of the conditions of leave on 22 March 2006. This is part of the normal process used by the tribunal in accordance with the Mental Health Act.

One month prior to the tribunal hearing, the person in receipt of the notification order is advised of the hearing date and is invited to make a submission but this is not compulsory. After the hearing, a letter is sent which informs the recipient of the outcomes of the hearing including the conditions of any leave. In this case, there have been no reported breaches of any of his restrictions. At all times since 2002 his care has been supervised by the treating team at The Park—Centre for Mental Health.

I first became aware of the details relating to this person on Sunday as a result of a report in the *Sunday Mail*. There is currently no requirement to notify either me or the Director-General of Queensland Health. As a consequence of the events of the past few days, I have requested that there is to be a comprehensive review of the Mental Health Act to ensure that the victims of crime and their families are always consulted in cases such as this and prior to any release into the community. I also want the review to consider whether it is in the community's best interests to be informed of the release of such people. I have also asked that the role and function of the Mental Health Review Tribunal and the Mental Health Court be part of this review. I have discussed the leave provision with the Director of Mental Health, and he has informed me that the leave provisions relating to this person have been revoked today until such time as the family of the victim have been further consulted by the treating team.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Health titled *Mental Health Act*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Tarong Energy, Apprentices and Trainees

Hon. RJ MICKEL (Logan—ALP) (Minister for Energy and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy) (10.17 am): Government owned corporations place emphasis on providing skilled jobs for people in their areas of operation. I am pleased to advise the House that, as part of this philosophy, 12 young Queenslanders recently started work with Tarong Energy in the South Burnett region. The nine new apprentices and three new trainees have been inducted into the workforce. It is Tarong Power Station's largest intake of talented local school leavers and brings the total number of apprentices and trainees at the station to 27. All of these young workers are from local communities around Nanango and Kingaroy, ensuring that not only are they receiving vital skills, training and employment but also they can contribute to strengthening their own communities.

Providing skilled jobs is one of the most powerful things Tarong Energy can do to keep talented young people living and working in the South Burnett. The apprentices and trainees will be employed through the Wide Bay Group Training Scheme and will cover the electrical and mechanical fields, as well as the administrative area. They bring the total workforce at Tarong and Tarong North power stations to about 350. Maintaining a highly skilled workforce is essential for the Tarong Power Station to continue providing the reliable supply of electricity that underpins Queensland's booming growth.

The Queensland economy is going gangbusters and this is creating the demand and the opportunities for these jobs. Through programs such as Tarong Energy's, and similar initiatives by other government owned energy entities, the Queensland government is helping us to keep up with the growth and address an acknowledged nationwide skills shortage in the energy industry.

Energex and Ergon Energy are employing a record number of apprentices and, along with Powerlink Corporation, are also involved in the Queensland Electricity Transmission and Distribution Group. This group offers Queensland power engineering bursaries to first-year students who undertake degree-level studies at particular Queensland universities in areas of engineering relevant to the power industry.

We are providing jobs and training for young Queenslanders, strengthening communities across Queensland, boosting our state's skill levels and ensuring the continued supply of reliable and cost-effective electricity.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Energy and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy titled *Tarong Energy Apprentice intake*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Cyclone Larry, National Parks

Hon. D BOYLE (Cairns—ALP) (Minister for Environment, Local Government, Planning and Women) (10.19 am): Cyclone Larry left a trail of destruction and many people out of work after hitting far-north Queensland. I am pleased to inform the House that on Monday about 100 far-northerners started paid work with the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service to clean up national parks and forests that were damaged by Cyclone Larry. This program is a $3 million initiative which is jointly funded by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Employment and Training.

The workers, including 12 women, come from Tully, Babinda, Innisfail and Atherton and include many people who would usually work on banana farms. This Beattie government program is keeping them employed in their local areas. They will be given appropriate training for their work, which will include using chainsaws and other machinery to help QPWS staff clear fallen trees from walking tracks and roads, basic carpentry to repair picnic tables, backburning to reduce the risk of fire and establishing feed stations for our precious and endangered wildlife.

Rangers have already done extensive work to open 43 of the 63 parks that were closed after Cyclone Larry. These workers will help to open more walking tracks and camping sites, which are very important to the local tourism industry. The tourism industry and local businesses rely on these parks. We need to reopen them quickly to avoid any further significant impact on the local economy.

The first areas to be targeted include the key visitor destinations of Dunk, Brook and Hinchinbrook islands, parks at Mission Beach and on the Atherton Tableland, and access roads and walking tracks at Misty Mountains near Innisfail. I am really pleased that the EPA, along with the Department of Employment and Training, is able to provide jobs for people who have been affected by Cyclone Larry.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Environment, Local Government, Planning and Women titled *State employs far Northerners to clear up National Parks*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries

Hon. TS MULHERIN (Mackay—ALP) (Minister for Primary Industries and Fisheries) (10.21 am): Profitable primary industries for Queensland is a vision that I share with an evolving Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries. Its focus is now market-driven, with an increasing emphasis on the total food chain, from research and development through to securing new markets overseas.

The Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries will recruit 100 people with the latest skills and training to add to the department's world-class expertise in food and agribusiness. This project is in line with the whole-of-government Workforce Skills Alignment Scheme, which matches staff skills and capabilities with current and future service delivery needs. The department will be recruiting new staff, especially graduates in trade and enterprise development, sustainable production, research development and extension.

As part of the program, the department will also offer voluntary early retirement to staff. We do not know as yet the number of staff who will take up the offer or whose application will be approved. There will be no forced redundancies. I assure all members that the department will maintain its current staffing levels and services in regional areas.

Staffing levels, especially in the area of biosecurity and in regional areas, are crucial to the enviable reputation held by Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries. That reputation has been unfairly tarnished by misinformation being spread by members from the opposite side of the House. A lack of knowledge of the facts and an outdated knowledge of the changing role of Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries has perpetuated a myth that the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries has randomly slashed staff numbers.

These are the facts. In 2005-06 Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries staff numbers are almost identical to those of 1998, when Labor came to government. Of the more than 3½ thousand people who are employed, including in Forestry, by Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, the number of staff employed in the biosecurity area has increased by more than 25 per cent.

As I said, the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries is a constantly evolving office. As issues change and as the focus shifts, the department adapts accordingly. These are not ad hoc decisions. Our stakeholders are consulted. Like the government, the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries does not dwell on the past but moves ahead with clear goals in mind.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Primary Industries and Fisheries titled *Staff Recruitment.*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Disability Services

Hon. FW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Disability Services and Seniors) (10.24 am): Queensland adults with an intellectual disability, who have complex support needs, and their families and carers will benefit from a Queensland government investment of $33.5 million in specialist service provision over the next six years. The care of people in this group is very complex, demanding and sometimes expensive to ensure that they receive the level of care that they need and deserve.

Disability Services Queensland's Accommodation Support and Respite Services provides a specialist residential service tailored to the needs of adults with an intellectual disability who have severe and profound support needs. The service provides accommodation and support to 577 adults in a variety of residential settings. It operates eight centre based respite services which support more than 400 children and adults with an intellectual disability.

The accommodation support and respite services are delivered in a professional and accountable environment which safeguards the rights of people with a disability. The services offer an optimum level of independence and opportunity, reflecting individual support needs. The changes within the department's Accommodation Support and Respite Services are closely linked to the ongoing reform process across the disability sector.

Also, I have recently appointed retired Supreme Court judge Bill Carter QC to report on the options available for providing support and care for adults with an intellectual disability who exhibit severely challenging and threatening behaviour. Mr Carter will report on the range of legislative support that is currently available and which is needed to ensure that the safety of clients and the community is balanced and protected. People with this profile are not criminals. However, because of their behaviour they sometimes risk ending up in the criminal justice system if not cared for appropriately. Current systems do not necessarily provide the specific support and care required by the very small proportion of the population who act in this way.

Through significant budget increases each year since 1998, the implementation of the disability sector quality system and the introduction of new disability legislation, the state government is improving the quality of disability services and protecting the safety of people with a disability while they receive those services.

Tabled paper: Copy of ministerial statement by the Minister for Communities, Disability Services and Seniors titled *Specialist Disability Accommodation Support Service for Queensland.*

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Minister for Police and Corrective Services, Tenant

Hon. JC SPENCE (Mount Gravatt—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services) (10.26 am): I need to correct a number of assertions that appeared in the last edition of the *Sunday Mail*. The newspaper followed up a story it ran last year which reported on a previous problem tenant of mine.

This man was charged with stalking and threatening violence against the independent property management body which I had employed to manage a rental house. Last year, when the paper first ran the story, and then last weekend, when it ran a second article, a number of inaccuracies were reported. The story reported the man's claim that police had overreacted when they arrested him. As I said in parliament on 22 November, I did not have a role in this man's arrest. I was informed after the event.

Subsequently, I asked the police commissioner to advise me why six police officers were involved in this man's arrest. I was informed that was because of his previous violent criminal history in New South Wales. The police commissioner advises me that police take into account a person's previous criminal history when they assess what level of force is needed to arrest a person. Police informed me that there was also an internal warning on this man's file to indicate that he was prone to violence. I am advised that this was also considered when the police prepared to arrest him. Police informed me that their records indicate he also has two previous restraining orders in two states other than Queensland and that the latest retraining order, which was issued last week, brings it to three in total. Police informed me that, due to this man's previous violent convictions, they did not overreact, as this man states.

I reiterate that I had no part to play in any involvement by police in the arrest of this man. I had previously informed parliament of the facts of this case—facts that can be corroborated by many other parties. I am not about to go over these again, as it is all on the public record in *Hansard*. However, I will say that charges being withdrawn by the DPP after a defendant accepts a lesser penalty is not the same as charges being dismissed. Police inform me that it was not their decision to withdraw the charges.

Last weekend's article suggested that this man had a win. This man actually received a five-year restraining order in the District Court. It is unfortunate that balanced and fair reporting has been sacrificed in favour of unsubstantiated allegations of a person who has been subject to retraining orders in three states and who has an extensive criminal history.

SCRUTINY OF LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Report

Hon. KW HAYWARD (Kallangur—ALP) (10.29 am): I lay upon the table of the House the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee *Alert Digest No. 6 of 2006*.

Tabled paper: Scrutiny of Legislation Committee *Alert Digest No. 6 of 2006*

Mr SPEAKER: It is now question time.

Mr LINGARD: I rise to a point of order. Once again the government has used the standing orders to stop the opposition making any statements in this House.

Mr SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. I go by this clock. It is 10.29. If I was to call you, you would get one minute.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mental Health Service

Mr SPRINGBORG (10.29 am): My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. As the minister is aware, the Prime Minister has put mental health on the national agenda. In the year 2000 the Premier promised that mentally ill killers, such as Claude John Gabriel, would never again so easily obtain leave. Can the minister assure the people of Queensland that this promise has been kept?

Mr ROBERTSON: I outlined today in a ministerial statement a number of concerns I had about the reports that came out over the weekend in relation to a particularly serious matter. I have put on record my concern recognising that victims, and indeed families of victims, have as many rights as those who are subject to forensic orders. I reflect, of course, on the debate in this House back in 2001 which was when the most recent substantive amendments to the Mental Health Act were put in place with the support of both sides of the House—both sides of the House. There was a range of provisions with respect to how forensic patients would be monitored, including the rights of victims or families of victims to be notified when the Mental Health Review Tribunal was considering matters of interest to those victims or families of victims.

I note that the provisions that went through at that time went through with the support of both sides of the House, which is why I was able to outline today in relation to this particular case that the Mental Health Review Tribunal had previously notified the family of the victim in question that the patient in this case was coming up for review and, of course, that the family was invited to make submissions. In this case—in the most recent case—that family chose not to, I am informed. Nevertheless, they were informed of the results of the consideration of the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

In terms of those provisions that were put into the Mental Health Act, with the support of both sides of the House, those provisions seem to be working. Nevertheless, I do share the concerns of the Premier about whether we can do better and whether the Mental Health Review Tribunal is working to standards which are reflected in community opinion. That is why I have undertaken the review of certain provisions of the act and the workings of the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition for the second question, could those members with computers please turn the sound off. We keep hearing the messages coming through.

Mental Health Service

Mr SPRINGBORG: My second question without notice is also to the Minister for Health. I refer to newspaper reports that a mentally ill killer has been released back into the community and is frequenting areas within metres of where he previously killed. I also refer to the minister's ministerial statement where he indicated that a serious mentally ill patient—probably this person in question—had been released into the supervision of his parents. Can the minister assure the parliament that the parents of the mentally ill killer released into their supervision have a track record of complying with previous release orders?

Mr ROBERTSON: In relation to the provisions contained in the review by the Mental Health Review Tribunal of March this year, I am advised that this particular patient on 12 occasions has been released under supervision into the community and on each of those 12 occasions the provisions that are contained in the order have been abided by. I, of course, understand the background of the question which the Leader of the Opposition is asking, which is why I have taken such a keen interest in this particular matter since there were media reports over the weekend. It is based on that keen interest and the sensitivity of this particular issue that I have announced the review into certain provisions of the act and the activities of the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

I re-emphasise that as a result of the information that has come to light over the last couple of days, the Director of Mental Health, in terms of his statutory power to request a review of the Mental Health Review Tribunal, has now required that those provisions that were contained in the order of 17 March be revoked. Until such time as this matter is further looked into there will be no further access by this particular patient to release for periods of time in the community.

Water Supply

Mr LIVINGSTONE: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House the initiatives the government is undertaking to address the important issue of water security and supply?

Mr BEATTIE: Yes, I can. As we all know, water is liquid gold and ensuring that we have enough to support continued population growth is one of the great challenges our state faces. Bear in mind that we have also had one of the worst droughts in 100 years and significant climate change. That is why we have brought forward a number of projects, as I spelt out to the House this morning.

We cannot make it rain, as we know—more's the pity—but our government is on the front foot working hard to manage existing supplies as well as plan for the future. As part of the Queensland Future Growth Fund, the government announced two new dams and two new weir projects. This is in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars we have already committed for new infrastructure ranging from weirs to water pipes. We are also committed to making better use of our existing water supplies by reducing losses by leaks. We have signed an agreement with all the councils to achieve that, and we have put money into it as well as money coming from the councils. This will promote uptake of water efficiency fittings, appliances and other water conservation measures. And, yes, we have encouraged the use of water tanks and we will continue to do that. We think that is a very important part of our strategy.

We are planning for the long-term needs of our community not just looking at quick fixes or ad hoc measures. For example, the South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy is a partnership between the government and councils to address the water needs for the region for the next 50 years. In addition to our dams, just a few of the other initiatives we are committed to include $100 million for an initial order of pipes for the first stage of the western corridor recycled water scheme and providing recycled water to Tarong and Swanbank power stations freeing up to 110 megalitres per day. This is part of a water grid. That is what we have to provide, a water grid for the south-east corner where they are all connected.

A government member interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Yes, that's right, similar to electricity, so it is connected and we can rely on one another. We have also put in $14 million to support the investigation of the proposed expansion of the Gold Coast desalination plant at Tugun from 55 megalitres per day to 120 megalitres per day and $1 million for the redesign of the southern regional pipeline to transfer 120 megalitres per day. Although our comprehensive water action plan is going to work, we are undertaking a raft of other initiatives as well, including securing water for the environment and users through catchment based water resource plans; encouraging water trading to provide access to water when supplies are limited; planning for future water needs by developing regional supply strategies, drought management practices and, where appropriate, building new water storage and supply infrastructure; making smarter use of existing supplies by reducing water usage, adopting water conservation measures, re-using and recycling water; protecting water quality so that our water is fit for drinking and growing crops while protecting river catchments and the environment; and introducing education and enforcement programs to make sure all users get a fair go, dams are safe and the environment is protected.

Mr SPEAKER: I welcome into the public gallery teachers and students of Beenleigh State School which is in the electorate of Waterford and which is represented in this parliament by the Hon. Tom Barton.

Mr Schwarten: The minister for police used to teach there.

Mr SPEAKER: They tell me that the Minister for Police and Corrective Services used to be a very good teacher at Beenleigh.

Water Supply

Mr QUINN: My question is directed to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Water. I refer to the fact that Brisbane is facing level 3 water restrictions in about two weeks and we will run out of water in 2008 if no rain falls in the catchment areas, and I ask: since his government is committed to building two new dams which have not been part of any water planning in the past and therefore have had no preliminary work done on them, does not this mean that these dams will not be able to provide one drop of water until 2015 at the earliest?

Mr PALASZCZUK: In the first instance, the opposition claims to build three new small dams and raise the Borumba Dam to supply around 85,000 megalitres of water, which is well short of what we require. Let us have a look at the coalition plan. How can the people of Queensland trust the coalition when the second page 1 of the document states—

A Coalition Government will also re-assess the existing policy that provides that one-quarter (285 megalitres) of Wivenhoe dam remains unfilled. We will commission a study to see if it is both safe and feasible for extra yield ...

The amount of 285 megalitres is 1,000 times short of what one-quarter of the Wivenhoe Dam is. It is only about 291,000 megalitres.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Callide, you have been warned once. This is my final warning.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Our government stands by this document. This is the document that has been prepared by the state government and by the local councils to look at water supply in Queensland in the short term, the medium term and the long term. We as a government stand by our record in building dams. Have a look at the experience in building Paradise Dam. We said that we could build Paradise Dam in five years. What did those opposite say? They said there was no way and that it could not be done.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, you have already been warned once.

Mr PALASZCZUK: We built that dam in four years.

Mr Messenger interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Burnett, I warn you under standing order 253.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Our Premier has given the commitment again this morning that both new dams—the dam at Traveston and another dam in the Logan—will be built by the year 2011. When I look at our document, I believe this document. When I look at the opposition document, I see that it is full of holes. When it comes to dam building, we have a tried and proven record of getting the job done.

In conclusion, the dams proposed by those opposite will be subjected to exactly the same constraints as the dams that are proposed by us. Paradise Dam was built on a greenfield site from go to whoa, as will be Traveston and the dam at Logan.

Time expired.

Water Supply

Mr HAYWARD: My question is directed to the Premier. The Premier has provided a comprehensive analysis of the initiatives the government is undertaking to address the important issue of water security and supply. Can the Premier outline the alternative?

Mr BEATTIE: We have had a look at the program outlined by the opposition in its flimsy five-page document released yesterday. Five flimsy pages outline initiatives that we are supposed to believe will address water security and supply for the next 50 years. I say 'supposed to' because they do not.

On the other hand, the initiatives we are undertaking through the Water Action Plan and the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan map out a suite of comprehensive actions that will take us up to 2050 and beyond. In fact, unless the opposition plans on pinching all of our initiatives to address water demands, its strategies on new supply options—on the assessment that we have had done—may take us through to only 2015.

The proposals by the opposition would yield perhaps around 90,000 megalitres per annum. By comparison, our two dam proposals are expected to yield somewhere in the vicinity of 150,000 to 190,000 megalitres per annum. In other words, those opposite are one dam short of a plan. Their options for Amamoor and the raising of Borumba in the north are likely to yield only enough water to service Gympie and parts of the Sunshine Coast—only parts—a fact acknowledged in the 1997 Borbidge government plan itself. That is one of the reasons we have already ruled them out, because they do not deliver the water we need. It is very simple.

We need water for the whole region, not just part of it. We need a regional grid to move water from areas of supply to areas of need. Where is the opposition's commitment to the south-east Queensland water grid, supported by the 18 mayors of the region? The 18 mayors supported the grid. The opposition did not; it is not in their document.

Mr Seeney: It is so.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Callide, this is your final warning.

Mr BEATTIE: What is the purpose of the three new dams and the raising of Borumba Dam if the coalition will not connect them with pipelines and existing storages? What is the point of having the dams if they do not connect them? We will, and it is exactly what our plan will deliver. I hope they have a part 2 to the water policy, because otherwise they are going to have to sit down straightaway and start a new one that really does plan for the future and is not just some political gimmick.

It is clear that the opposition have not planned properly. They have not planned for adequate storage capacity growth, and they obviously have not planned for the damage to people's livelihoods and the environment caused by their dam proposal. This includes the destruction of about 2,400 hectares of pristine state forest. The flaws in the opposition water policy that I have outlined are obvious, and I have not even touched on the litany of errors in their document, including numerous incorrect facts and figures. It is a very flimsy document that is light on detail. It is apt that the artwork featuring the Queensland coalition plans is written on the back of a post-it note, because judging by the content it appears that the whole document has been. This document will not provide anything in any serious way beyond 2015. The opposition's problem is that they think water is a joke. We think it is essential.

Water Supply

Mr SEENEY: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Water. Neither of the two dams that the minister proposes as a solution to SEQWater crisis have been part of any planning process. Indeed, they were not even mentioned in the document that was waved around before. They have not been part of the planning process for the last 12 years and no land has been purchased by the government at either of these sites. This is in marked contrast to the other long-planned-for dam sites, where extensive areas of land have been acquired by successive governments over many years. Can the minister confirm that land values in the proposed dam areas have been running at $30,000 per hectare and that the initial cost estimates within his department have supported the view that is being expressed by local real estate agents that the cost of land resumption alone will run to something like $1.5 billion should his plan proceed?

Mr PALASZCZUK: There are about four parts to that question. I will try to answer each part. In the first instance, let us be real about this. We have in south-east Queensland historic challenges. We have climate change and we have unprecedented population growth. We need water for our future, and that is why the government has embarked on a strategy that is two-pronged. The first is to supply the immediate needs of the south-east corner and the second is to supply the long-term needs of the south-east corner up to the year 2050. That simply is part and parcel of our strategy.

As to the second part of the question, where the honourable member asserted there would be no properties purchased in either the Traveston area or the Tilley's Bridge area, the latest information I have from the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Water is that two properties in hardship cases have been purchased in Traveston, and I am waiting to have confirmed that a third property has been purchased. So, once again, his information is deadset wrong.

In relation to the other issue, which is the cost of the land and whether it is going to be inflated and so on, the department will be working with people in the Traveston area and will be standing in the market to purchase properties. We are going to stand in the market to purchase properties. What that means is that when properties come up for sale the government will purchase the properties. We have allocated $50 million for the purchase of properties of people who are experiencing hardship. The process that the department is entering into by standing in the market is no different from the process that the department entered into when purchasing properties in Wyaralong or Glendower or Amamoor. It is absolutely no different.

The government operated in exactly the same manner in the Paradise Dam area, and the government did build the Paradise Dam in four years and not in five as we anticipated. I stand by what I say. I believe that the government is in a very good position to be able to achieve its result of having the dam completed by the year 2011.

Federal Government, Infrastructure

Ms NOLAN: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: can Queenslanders trust the federal government to deliver the infrastructure that this state deserves?

Ms BLIGH: I thank the honourable member for the question and for her very keen interest in the infrastructure that is needed in a rapidly growing state, particularly in her own area where roads such as the Ipswich Motorway are in serious need of upgrade and there is no federal support on the horizon.

Members will be aware that I have expressed concern for some time, particularly as a result of the federal budget, about a clear lack of spending on vital infrastructure in Queensland by the federal government. I can advise the House today that my concerns are now official. ABS data and Treasury analysis of that data confirms that federal funding for engineering construction projects in Queensland has dropped by four per cent every year for the last three years. At the same time, private investment, including projects such as roads, bridges and electricity infrastructure, has jumped more than 20 per cent every year over that period. This government's investment record in similar projects during the same period rose by 11 per cent. Whether it is the state government or the private sector, we see everything moving forward in Queensland.

When it comes to the federal government, it is actually going backwards. We have the strongest growth in the country and yet the federal government's spending is declining by four per cent every year. We have to ask ourselves why? Why is there no money for the Ipswich Motorway? Why is there no money for the upgrade of the Gold Coast Highway? I do not understand, I say to myself. Then I read the *Courier-Mail* on Saturday and the answer is absolutely clear: seven federal Liberal members from Queensland, and what do they say? They were given a chance to say that there should have been more spending on infrastructure in Queensland as a result of the federal budget and six out of the seven—Gary Hardgrave, Peter Slipper, Peter Dutton, Margaret May, David Jull and Minister Ian Macfarlane—all said water and transport were primarily state responsibilities and Canberra was under no obligation to help. Canberra must have different obligations in New South Wales and Victoria because they do not mind funding roads in those states. It is just Queensland it will not spend money on. Gary Hardgrave—

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gregory, I have warned you three times. I now warn you under 253.

Ms BLIGH: Gary Hardgrave, when asked the question of whether some of the federal surplus should have been spent on infrastructure in Queensland, said, 'You've got to be joking.' I wonder if that is what he says when Peter Costello asks him. When the Treasurer goes to the federal Liberal members of parliament for Queensland and says, 'Should we be spending on infrastructure in your electorate and what should I be putting money aside for?', they are obviously saying, 'Don't worry, Pete. You go spend it in another state. Don't you worry about our electorates. We don't need it here. You go and look after Victoria. Why don't you spend it on the Hume Highway?' With friends like these in Canberra is it little wonder that Queensland is suffering? With friends like these, who needs enemies?

Traveston Dam

Miss ELISA ROBERTS: I ask the Premier: with regards to compensation for landowners affected by the building of the Traveston Dam, has he taken into consideration and included the additional compensation which will be required for those people who will have to be moved to allow for the new Mary Valley Highway as its current position will see the majority of it flooded?

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the honourable member for Gympie for her question. The position about compensation is very clear and it has been on government statute for some time. We will follow the program in relation to compensation for people affected by the dam. If there are any changes in relation to roads, then the same compensation laws apply. The laws in relation to compensation are very clear: if the government needs to resume a property for the construction of a road, then it will resume that property and appropriate compensation is paid. In fact, it is provided for under the federal Constitution. If a property is required for resumption as a result of the construction of a dam, then that will also be compensated.

Mr Lucas interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Not only that, as the transport minister reminded me, we pay the legal and valuation costs as well. There is a whole mechanism involved.

Mr Lucas: There's provision for appeal.

Mr BEATTIE: It involves appeals and assessments. People will be treated fairly. I know that the people in the honourable member's electorate are very concerned at the moment. She has represented those concerns to my office and she has continued to demonstrate those concerns in the House. I know that—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Do members opposite think it is funny that the member represents their case? That would be typical of the National Party. All they want to do is score a few cheap points when the member for Gympie is genuinely interested in her constituents. I say to the member for Gympie: ignore this National Party rabble down here and continue to represent the people whom you represent.

Let me complete my answer to the member. I know there is genuine concern and I know that she is genuine about this issue. Through the process that we have set out I will make sure that she is continually informed. We will do everything we can to treat her constituents fairly. I know they are going through a great deal of pain at the moment.

The important thing here is that, when it comes to dams, size does matter. The truth is we need to build these dams and we need to build dams that will provide for the future infrastructure of Queensland. There is not much point having a few small weirs that are going to produce nothing; we have to produce an appropriate dam that will look after the future needs of Queensland.

I say it again: when it comes to dams, size matters. We are going to build this dam because we have to provide water for the south-east corner. Unfortunately, that does mean that some people will suffer both personally and through inconvenience. I am sorry that they will. The truth of the matter is—and I have said this before and I know this will not make me popular—that I have asked them to make this sacrifice on behalf of all Queenslanders. I give a commitment today that we will treat them fairly and properly, and we will do everything we can to assist them through this difficult time. I say to the member for Gympie again: I will make certain through Henry Palaszczuk, the minister for natural resources, that she is regularly briefed. If there are particular issues in relation to people who want to sell their properties, we are prepared—as members know, we have put money on the table already—and we will go out of our way to assist them.

Bruce Highway, Federal Budget

Mr WALLACE: I refer the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to the additional federal funding of $48 million in Treasurer Costello's budget to upgrade a 15-kilometre section of the Bruce Highway south of Tully. I ask: what will this funding mean to progress the project to help avoid severe and prolonged flooding closures of the National Highway?

Mr LUCAS: One thing that we on this side of the House are is consistent. We welcome good funding initiatives when they present themselves and we are more than happy to criticise those that are not. We stand up for the interests of the people of Queensland.

In the budget one area of federal road funding—indeed, the only area of federal road funding in Queensland—that I think was good news was the additional money between Cairns and Townsville for flood mitigation works. There was additional money made available for the Tully-Murray work as a result of cost escalations there.

It is very important that we here have an understanding of federal road funding announcements—when money is received and the like. Some people seem to think that a media announcement constitutes an approval to actually undertake road construction or, indeed, that the money has actually arrived. In December 2004 the state government jointly announced with federal roads minister Lloyd the commencement of the planning study for Tully-Murray. That indicated that the planning study would be completed this year. In fact, on 23 March I announced it jointly with the federal minister, indicating the recommended corridor alignment. Construction will be finished by the end of 2009. It is one of the wettest areas of Australia and is very complex in terms of flooding.

All new federal funding in the 2006 budget was to be available to Queensland immediately to invest until needed but would not cover the final cost. This is the Commonwealth government's way of getting out of cost escalation in the construction industry which confronts it and others as well. That is an exception to the usual process. What normally happens is that Queensland cannot start construction works or, indeed, claim reimbursement until the paperwork is formally approved by the federal minister and his department. That final approval is generally not provided until the planning and design processes are complete and the federal government agrees to project scope, timing and costs. The federal government announcing funding for a project does not allow the state government to immediately start construction. For example, funding for stage 3A of the Ipswich Motorway and Logan Motorway interchange was approved by the federal government in December last year. The bulk of the money for the $320 million six-laning from Wacol to Darra certainly does not yet have formal federal approval. In 2007-08, $142 million is to be provided and $142 million is also to be provided in 2008-09. If those opposite do not believe me I will table the Warren Truss letter which clearly indicates the timings for federal road funding for the Ipswich Motorway corridor.

The money is not there yet. Initial money has been provided as part of those projects. Just remember this about the federal budget: 10 minutes saved in a journey twice a day, five times a week, 48 weeks of the year saves just over an hour and a half a week or is an effective pay rise of going from a 40-hour week to a 38½-hour week either by having more leisure time or more time at work to earn more money. That is why the federal government has failed people in this budget.

Tabled paper: Letter (and attachment), dated 9 May 2006, from the Federal Minister for Transport and Regional Services (the Honourable Warren Truss MP), to the Minister for Transport (the Honourable Paul Lucas MP) relating to funding for Queensland under the AusLink Investment Programme

Water Infrastructure

Dr FLEGG: My question without notice is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Water. Given that the minister's two-megadam policy is going to cost taxpayers well over $2 billion to build, what does he estimate Brisbane residents will have to pay per kilolitre when they finally get this water sometime after 2015?

Mrs Carryn Sullivan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pumicestone, do you mind?

Mr PALASZCZUK: I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. Could I please ask him where the $2 billion figure came from? Where is it from? He does not know.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you are provoking them by asking them questions. You have been asked a question, please answer it.

Mr PALASZCZUK: If the honourable member cannot tell me where the figure came from then that question is based on a false premise. Whilst I am on my feet I point out that I have in front of me the Queensland coalition's document on fixing the water crisis. It states that the Wyaralong Dam would have a yield of 35,000 megalitres of water per year. This is my bible.

Dr Flegg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Moggill!

Mr PALASZCZUK: If I open up my bible and have a look at the detailed investigations for Wyaralong Dam, December 2005, I find that the estimated yield is 55 megalitres per day. That is about 20,000 megalitres per year.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, take your a seat, please. Member for Moggill and other members of the opposition, you have asked your question of the minister. The minister is trying to answer. The next one who interjects will be asked to leave the chamber.

Mr PALASZCZUK: So there is another hole in the document produced by those opposite. Let us talk about pricing. If we talk about pricing we need to talk about an MP who blasted the cheap price of tap-water. An article states—

'Drinking water in south-east Queensland is too cheap,' the federal government's water policy adviser claims. Malcolm Turnbull yesterday said it was difficult to see the justifications for the region's water prices. In some cities it is more underpriced than others. 'In south-east Queensland, for example, it is significantly lower than it is Sydney,' Mr Turnbull said. 'Proper water pricing would enable big cities to afford all the water infrastructure they need.' He has called a meeting of state water ministers next month to tackle Australia's water crisis.

Does the Liberal Party agree with the federal parliamentary secretary on water that water pricing in Queensland is too low? Do they agree with that? There we are.

Chroming

Mrs CARRYN SULLIVAN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police and Corrective Services. Yesterday the minister joined the Premier to announce an expansion and extension of a trial that enables police to detain people who are inhaling volatile substances, or chroming, and take them to places of safety. What other work is the Queensland Police Service doing to tackle this dangerous practice in our communities?

Ms SPENCE: I thank the member for Pumicestone for the question. I know that this is a subject that she is very interested in. She tabled a petition on this matter in parliament about six weeks ago. Some members would be aware that yesterday the government announced an extension of the trial that gives police the powers to take individuals who are chroming to their homes, to a hospital or to a place of safety. We have had this trial going in some parts of Queensland since June 2004. Yesterday we announced that we will extend that trial to the Caboolture-Sunshine Coast area and also Rockhampton for the first time.

In the past, police have reported their frustration at being unable to do anything when juveniles were chroming in their presence. They have had the power to destroy the harmful substance, but they have not necessarily had the power to take further action. This safe places trial has been welcomed by police around the state. That is why we are extending it.

I want to talk today about another community initiative that is being undertaken by the police at Oxley. Members would be aware that we encourage police around the state to engage in community policing initiatives. The Oxley police have a great initiative going. It is called Project Spraysafe. What they have been doing is engaging with 28 local retailers of paint products to monitor the supply and demand of chrome based products.

We have the retailers asking their customers purchasing spray cans for their name and address, and these are being recorded. I am told that 98 per cent of customers are obliging. In return the police are monitoring the registers of people who are buying spray cans in those areas. Police tell me that they have reduced the incidence of volatile substance abuse in the Oxley district by 49 per cent over the last five months. So I think it is a good indication of how a community policing initiative can really solve one of the community's most difficult problems.

In the next few months the police in Oxley will be delivering 300 posters to other retailers around the district to get them engaged in this particular project. I am sure members would agree that we really do have to tackle this problem of teenage chroming at all levels. The CMC last year did an examination of how our safe places trial was working. There are a number of new initiatives that the government intends to engage in over the months ahead so that we can give all our effort and attention to this difficult problem.

South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy

Mr HOBBS: My question is to the minister for natural resources. The minister stated this morning that he stood by the South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy document. Can the minister advise the House where in this document the Traveston and Rathdowney dams are mentioned?

Mr PALASZCZUK: I thank the honourable member for the question. I was asked a similar question by the opposition during the last sitting of parliament. This is not a picture book; they actually have to read it.

Mr Hobbs: It's your bible.

Mr PALASZCZUK: It is.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Warrego, I warn you under 253.

Mr PALASZCZUK: It is great to be able to photocopy a map and then add to it, but those opposite have to read the finer detail. I have been speaking about short-term, medium-term and long-term actions. The member has a copy—beautiful. Open up to page 17 and find that at the very bottom there is a note which says that medium- and long-term actions are subject to outcomes of more detailed investigation as the South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy is further progressed.

Mr Cummins interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for small business!

Mr PALASZCZUK: It says that project design and delivery will depend on outcomes of technical, social, economic and environmental investigation. When does the medium term commence? Around the year 2010. When do we intend to have these two new dams on board? In 2011. One more time: this is not a picture book; they have to read it. They should not worry about photocopying maps. That is not hard to do. They should read the finer detail. I gave the opposition the challenge to read this document previously and they have not read it.

As I explained in my answer to a previous question, this document has a hole in it and that hole is Wyaralong Dam. The opposition claims that Wyaralong Dam has about 35,000 megalitres of yield. In this document it says that it has a yield of 55 megalitres per day. I ask the members opposite to multiply that figure by 365. That figure equals about 20,000 megalitres per year. So the opposition is 15,000 megalitres out.

The members opposite cannot spell 'Wolffdene', they do not know the capacity of the Wyaralong Dam and they cannot read a document. How can the people of south-east Queensland trust them with this document? I tell the members opposite to go back to the drawing board and rewrite it. If they want to do that, they should come to me and I will help them.

Public Housing, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Councils

Mr O'BRIEN: My question is to the minister for public works and housing. The minister has indicated that a number of Aboriginal councils in deed of grant in trust communities were willing to work with the state government to implement the new Indigenous housing model. Could the minister advise the House which councils have done this and why?

Mr SCHWARTEN: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing support of the communities. Most of these communities are located in the member's electorate and he is tireless in his efforts to try to get good housing outcomes for all of them. This is a very difficult issue that he has managed very well. I sincerely congratulate him on that.

Three communities have taken up our offer: Kubin, Wujul Wujul and Napranum. They have indicated that it is beyond their capacity to manage housing. I applaud those communities for arriving at a decision that I arrived at some time ago. The reality is that some communities are doing the best they can and are getting good outcomes. But I have to say that they are very much in the minority.

As I said earlier, there are 3,500 houses in these communities and we have looked at about 3,300 of them. Some 90 per cent of those houses are in a state of disrepair. That is why I am glad to see the federal government finally coming on board to try to resolve this issue.

It is a fact that one of the audit findings was that one in three taps in these communities has been left to run for the sake of a simple tap washer. I do not have to tell honourable members what that means. The ongoing damage, let alone the environmental waste that this has caused, indicates that the management of housing is beyond these communities.

I was pleased to see in today's *Australian* that Palm Island supports the proposal. However, this morning I was a little disappointed and confused to hear Erykah Kyle on ABC Radio in Townsville say that she did not support it—that she opposed it. But the Doomadgee and Lockhart River councils have indicated that they want to grasp the hand of support that the state government is offering.

We need to fix this anachronism. In Queensland, we do not ask any other councils of similar size to build and manage properties of this nature. But we have asked these councils to do that and we should not be too surprised that they have failed—and I say 'failed' quite deliberately, because there is no other impression that one can gain.

I believe that we have a solution to this situation that will provide a way through. Doing more of the same is not going to get us anywhere. The depreciation of these assets simply cannot be tolerated anymore.

Traveston Dam

Mr WELLINGTON: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. I listened to the Premier's answer to the question asked this morning by the member for Gympie about compensation. I ask: as land values in the area of the proposed Traveston Dam have suddenly changed, can the minister clarify what date he will use as a gauge for determining appropriate land values? Will it be a date prior to his recent announcement on the proposed dam or another date?

Mr PALASZCZUK: The government has announced an allocation of $50 million for land acquisition for the Traveston and Tilley's Bridge dam sites that the government is investigating. The government has already indicated—and I have already said this in an answer to a question that was asked today—that these funds will be available to initially address any hardship cases. From the latest information I have, I believe that we have already settled with three people. Hardship cases may include landowners who were planning to sell or who were in the process of selling their property when the government made the announcement that it was investigating these sites. I am advised that the department has made commitments—and I have gone through that. I am also advised that there are—

Dr Flegg: You're on top of this, Henry.

Mr PALASZCZUK: It has been a long morning, but I am enjoying it.

Mr Seeney: So are we.

Mr PALASZCZUK: That is good. Keep it up. I am further advised that fewer than 20 landholders have registered as possible hardship cases. Currently, the department is dealing with these landowners. In terms of other land acquisitions, the government has indicated that it is standing in the market. I have mentioned that previously. Landowners can register their interests through the hotline on 1800243585.

In dealing with those property owners, the department will value the properties on the basis that the properties are on the market and that they are not affected by the dam. The department has offered landholders the ability to liaise with the landowners' valuers and legal representatives and to cover any reasonable costs incurred by the landowner in engaging the independent valuers. In short, the government has made a commitment to work with the landowners in a fair and transparent manner in acquiring the necessary land.

At this point, I say that of all the members of parliament on the opposition side, the two members who have been hammering at my door have been the member for Gympie and the member for Nicklin—especially the member for Gympie. She is very concerned about the plight of her constituents. I can identify with her, because I went through this process in my own electorate when close to 70 homes were resumed to build the road to Springfield. I can understand the trials and tribulations that the honourable member for Gympie is going through, just as I went through. I sympathise with her representations. This week she has arranged for another deputation to meet with me in relation to the proposed dam at Traveston. Previously, she has made forceful representations to me.

Bowen, Electricity Supply

Ms JARRATT: My question is to the Minister for Energy. The Whitsunday area, which includes the town of Bowen, has experienced significant growth in recent times. Can the minister advise of any plans to upgrade the electricity supply in the Bowen area?

Mr MICKEL: I thank the member for her question. We are aware of the huge commercial and industrial growth in northern Queensland. Certainly, the Bowen region has experienced that growth. A series of challenges faces the electricity industry in Queensland. Population growth is one of them. The other one is commercial and economic growth. Queensland is contributing marvellously to the economic output of this nation. Our growth in Queensland is twice the national average. Bowen is part of that enormous success story. In the energy sector this year, we are providing $2.275 billion in capital works.

The member asked specifically about Bowen. I am pleased to inform the House that more than $1 million will be invested in upgrading the Ergon Energy substations in the Bowen region to ensure that that area's electricity supply keeps pace with growth and increased demand. Work will be undertaken to increase capacity and improve the reliability of the electricity supply to businesses and residents in the region. The work is expected to be completed within the next few months so that the upgrades will be in place well before the high-demand period of next summer.

I was aware also of the member's concerns about trying to attract Chalco to the region. I want the member to assure the people in Bowen that Powerlink recently announced more than $350 million in new high-voltage electricity infrastructure to boost supply of electricity to the region and underpin ongoing growth and development in that region. I know the member has been assiduous, as have a number of government members, unlike the opposition, in trying to attract Chalco to her region. She can be assured that when the Chalco representatives come to Bowen the infrastructure will be in place. Should they choose the Bowen region, the electricity infrastructure will be in place to meet those energy needs.

I want to say in closing for all regional members that at the energy ministers meeting the other day I would not, and this government would not, have a bar of retail electricity prices being set by Canberra. We are going to stand up for people in Queensland, particularly regional Queensland. Why would a federal Treasurer who lives in Melbourne—an area one-sixth of the area served by Ergon—have any understanding of the concerns of the people in Bowen about electricity prices? We will be setting the uniform prices of electricity, not some distant bureaucrat in Canberra and certainly not a

Treasurer based in Melbourne. In other words, we will stand up for Queensland when it comes to the setting of electricity prices. The Premier and I will not be handing over that power to Canberra. We are going to stand up for Queensland because we know that the Queensland economy is going gang busters.

Helensvale Railway Station

Dr DOUGLAS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. I refer to the government's decision to close the Helensvale Railway Station in the Gaven electorate at 8 pm. Can the minister confirm that, as a consequence of this penny-pinching policy, levels of vandalism have escalated, including attempts to block the railway line, and that over $28,000 worth of damage has occurred at the station in just the last month alone?

Mr LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is wonderful to hear from a person who, shortly after he was first elected, wanted to hark back to the days of Russ Hinze. He said that he thought Russ Hinze was a great person on the Gold Coast and he wished there were more people like him. If those are the days he wants to go back to, I am more than happy to do that. Let us go back to 1965 when the coalition government—the government comprising people such as Russ Hinze, who turned up later—not only closed down the Gold Coast rail line but also sold off the right of way. That is what the coalition did. If members go to Currumbin they can see where the police station was built—smack bang in the middle of the right of way where people used to catch the train to Coolangatta.

I was at the Gold Coast last week seeing the final touches being put to the track laying on the Ormeau to Coomera section of the Gold Coast rail line. If members go to Maryborough they can see Downer EDI and Bombardier physically building the IMU railway stock—24 of them—that will go on the Gold Coast line. We are investing $1.1 billion in the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan—

Dr DOUGLAS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Could I have my question answered?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for exposing his ignorance to his electorate. We are investing $1.1 billion in the Gold Coast rail line, which the coalition government ripped up. That is what the coalition government did—and so did people like Russ Hinze, whom the member idolises. Not only have we Ormeau to Coomera; in September this year we will be starting the triplication from Salisbury to Kuraby. Why is that important? Because that is about Gold Coast trains being able to go straight through and around the Beenleigh trains. Then we have our program of other duplications on the Gold Coast—such as Robina to Reedy Creek. We announced recently that we have acquired land around Reedy Creek station from Delfin-Lend Lease to look at further improving that area. That was going to be commercial land. Now we have the ability to make it residential land, which will dramatically improve the amenity of that area.

If those opposite do not want to invest money on the Gold Coast, if they want to support the thugs and the thieves—the Russ Hinzes of the world—who do not give two hoots about public transport and who were in local and state government when they pulled up the Gold Coast rail line, then we will actually represent the people of the Gold Coast. That new rolling stock will be rolling off the line early next year to come into service in the first half of next year. That will be a wonderful initiative for the Gold Coast and pales in comparison to any commitment that you have, buddy. You might want to catch a train one day. You might learn something about it.

Political Candidates

Ms LIDDY CLARK: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the House of the activities of political candidates in Queensland in recent times?

Mr BEATTIE: This is a matter for the Leader of the Liberal Party. This is about standards of candidates. I am aware of a report in the *Queensland Times* of 13 May—10 days ago. That means that the Leader of the Liberal Party has now had 10 days to disassociate himself from his candidate. The report states—

A Liberal Party candidate may find himself banned from the Ipswich Showgrounds after a series of allegedly drunken incidents on Thursday night.

…

The allegations include that Mr Choat was 'staggeringly drunk; that he suggested women throw their knickers on the bandstand during the performance of the US Navy 7th Fleet Band; and that he said he would campaign using women in T-shirts two sizes too small with his name emblazoned 'across their ...

I will not read that. The report goes on—

He said the complaint was about 'intolerable behaviour' in front of women.

A committee member had complained about his behaviour. The report quoted Jim Stuart, the Ipswich Show Society general manager, as saying—

'If it had been reported to me at the time I would have had security remove them from the premises,' Mr Stuart said.

…

'The person who reported it to me was quite distressed. The language and references were quite disturbing, more so in the company of ladies.'

Mr Choat allegedly distributed his Liberal Party business cards while obviously drunk, and also identified himself as a TAFE employee.

One noted member of the show circuit said Mr Choat was 'bombed'.

'They're on show the same as our sports people,' he said. 'If it's good enough to ban footballers for their public behaviour it's good enough to ban political candidates.'

So what has Mr Quinn done about this as Leader of the Liberal Party? Obviously nothing. But what did the candidate himself say? The article states—

Liberal Party candidate for Ipswich West Sean Choat said while at the show he had had 'a few beers but was definitely not inebriated'.

When presented with allegations of disorderly behaviour yesterday, Mr Choat said his statement regarding women's 'knickers' was 'taken out of context'.

'What I did say was that years ago you would have had women taking their underwear off and throwing it at the sailors,' Mr Choat said.

That is a very high standard for Liberal candidates! The article goes on—

He said the allegation that women would campaign for him in too-small T-shirts was 'absolutely ridiculous'.

'That would be absolutely an insult to women,' he said.

Mr Choat said he only ever drank mid-strength and light beers.

'I was up at 6am this morning ... I didn't have a hangover.

…

Mr Choat said he had been 'told where to go' into the committee room and did not gatecrash the function.

'I'm terribly sorry if someone's taken ... 'I'm the first to admit I'm a little bit unorthodox ...

Mr Quinn: It's a political beat-up.

Mr BEATTIE: You have to understand what they said out there at the show society. The report quotes Mr Stuart as saying—

'We're a non-political organisation and he was drunk and handing out Liberal Party material,' he said.

I would hope that today the Liberal Party leader will disassociate himself from his candidate and publicly apologise to the people of Ipswich.

Time expired.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I welcome to the public gallery teachers and students of the Beenleigh State School in the electorate of Waterford, which is represented in this parliament by the Hon. Tom Barton.

Redcliffe Hospital

Mr ROGERS: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health. As the minister would be aware, full sterilising facilities have been not been available at the Redcliffe Hospital since January this year and instruments have been shuttled to other hospitals. Operations have been cancelled when instruments have not been available on time. I ask the minister: how many operations have been cancelled at Redcliffe Hospital because sterilised instruments were not available?

Mr ROBERTSON: I thank the member for the question. I am aware of the problems with the sterilising equipment at Redcliffe Hospital, and everything that it is possible to do has, in fact, been done. The first problem, as I understand it—and I was briefed on this during a recent visit to Redcliffe Hospital—was locating the source of the problem, and quite exhaustive investigations were undertaken. But, unfortunately, that took some time.

I am advised that all sterilisers have been validated and that full sterilising services have now returned to normal at Redcliffe Hospital. Biological testing and steriliser validation was completed on Friday, 19 May and all seven sterilisers are now in use at Redcliffe Hospital.

It is regrettable that the breakdown of sterilisation equipment affected some planned surgeries. However, this situation has since been rectified. All orthopaedic surgeries that were cancelled as a result of steriliser breakdown have now been rescheduled and major orthopaedic surgery continues to be performed at Redcliffe Hospital.

It was unfortunate that this problem arose. As I said, exhaustive investigations were undertaken and, unfortunately, that resulted in some inconvenience to patients who had operations scheduled. However, everything was done to ensure the interests of patients were looked after while the necessary repairs were undertaken.

Mr SPEAKER: The time allocated for questions has expired.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Mental Health Service; Water Policy

Mr SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.30 am): This morning in parliament, we again heard an absolute confession from the health minister that this government has put the people of Queensland in unnecessary danger. I refer members back to the year 2000. The Premier was running around this state, following the release of a mentally ill killer, saying that Queensland's laws would be changed to ensure that it never happened again.

In parliament today, the minister hid behind a veil of secrecy to try to justify and explain away incompetence and the infliction of danger on the people of Queensland. I say to the minister that the people of Queensland have a right to know. The people of Queensland have a right to know who is actually stalking the streets. Just because a person is a mentally ill killer does not mean that the community loses its right to protection. It does not mean that secrecy is supreme over the government's responsibility to protect the community.

A few years ago we heard a lot of pontificating from the Premier when he was seriously embarrassed following the release of Claude John Gabriel. Today in this parliament, we have heard about a situation where the same thing has happened again. People out in the community are very, very concerned.

What was also revealed today was this: we now know that this leave was revoked on 17 March and we now know that this mentally ill killer was released into the supervision of his parents on no less than 12 occasions. Why would the government revoke that leave if there had not been a big stuff-up?

This government said that it would not happen again, and it did happen again. That is proof positive that this Premier's words, when it comes to protecting the community, are not worth the paper they are written on. If this government had accepted the amendments moved by the coalition when the Mental Health Act was amended in this parliament in relation to supervised leave and the minimum standards for leave of those particular people, this would not have happened and we would not have this heartache being inflicted on people.

Can the government, even for one moment, seek to justify why a mentally ill killer can be released back into the community and be walking only a few metres away from where that person had killed somebody? Can the government justify why a mentally ill killer should be released back into the community and be allowed to walk within a few metres of where that person had killed somebody? There is no justification for it whatsoever.

Again, if this had not just been another Beattie government stuff-up, why did it have to revoke this leave on 17 March and why was that person given leave on no less than 12 occasions?

This government is no longer fit to govern. This government is incapable of protecting the community. It talks about protecting the community at large, but it does absolutely nothing. Frankly, nothing has changed since the Premier promised to fix these laws in Queensland following the circumstances surrounding the premature and controversial release of Claude John Gabriel in around 2000.

We have also heard in this parliament today a lot from the government about water policy. This government does not have a water policy. This government's water policy is absolutely and completely ad hoc.

The minister stood up in here earlier and said that he had something which he called 'Henry's bible'. 'Henry's bible', or his water resource plan, did not even mention a dam at Traveston on the Mary River and it did not mention the dam at Tilley's Bridge. The minister has this marvellous running sheet—the thing that gives Henry his prompts for the day. Yet he did not even mention it. He had nothing. There were no prompts at all. He turned to the page that mentioned Traveston and he said, 'I will skip over that and I will talk about something else.' Then he turned to the page where he thought it mentioned Tilley's Bridge and he thought he had better skip over that one, too, because it did not say anything, either.

Then he went on with a whole lot of bluff and bluster about how the government will do this, how it will consult and so on. This morning he was asked a number of questions about the government's water plan in Queensland; namely, how much will it cost. Did he pass or did he fail? He failed. It was a big fail. He had absolutely no idea. How much will it cost? He does not know. How much will it cost to acquire the land? He did not really know but he thought that they may be acquiring three properties, in the case of hardship.

Yesterday I was at Kandanga. I can tell members that there is a little old lady dying of cancer in a house just across the road from where we were. They have been trying to negotiate a hardship sale for her and they cannot even get the government to sign the contract. This lady has three months to live. They cannot get the government to sign the contract, and the lady has three months to live. No private buyer will purchase that property because it will be under water or it will be secured by moat. We will have New Orleans on the Mary. That is what this government will do.

We have heard enough humbug from the minister for natural resources in this place about what the government does or does not know. He was also asked this morning in this place what the water will cost. Did he pass or fail? He failed. He had absolutely no idea whatsoever. He said that with the effluxion of time 'one day, maybe, it could be, we might work that out, if we can ever build this dam.' He had absolutely no idea about that.

We have the same sort of ad hoc process when it comes to environmental planning. They have no idea. Yesterday, I and the shadow minister for national resources stood there near the drilling rig. Do you know what? They have been drilling for four days and they have not even cut through the sand yet. Anyone who knows anything about building dams knows that when there is 70 metres of sand, there is a big problem when it comes to building dams.

Mr Hobbs: Do you think it might be the biggest sieve in Queensland?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I think it will be the biggest; certainly, it will be the dam that drains the most water out—if they ever build it, as they hope. It proves that we have a government that cannot even do the basics. We have a government that cannot even get the basics right. We have a government that is failing in its priorities all the way along. It will flood the Bruce Highway. It will flood the cemetery at Kandanga. When people ask what will be done about the cemetery the government says, 'Well, bad luck.' It will not do anything about that. It will flood the railway lines. It will flood the powerlines.

We know that the properties up there are worth, on average, $30,000 per hectare, not to mention a sawmill which could potentially run into tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars. This government has no idea. It knows that it cannot build this dam and it should stop perpetuating the hoax on the people of south-east Queensland. It should stop the misery which it is perpetuating on the people of the Mary Valley—quite frankly.

Yesterday, the coalition released its visionary water policy for south-east Queensland. It is a water policy which can deliver results for the people of south-east Queensland. It is a water policy which will have short-, medium- and long-term solutions. Where we are poles apart from this government is that we can actually build the dams. We have a track record of building dams.

The minister stood up before and talked about the Paradise Dam. The only reason this government accepted the Paradise Dam was because the coalition government approved it in 1998 and said it could be built within five years. Well, the government took about seven years to build it, but it could not go back on the approvals which had already been put in place by a previous government.

The coalition's policy stands in stark contrast. The land has been acquired for four dams in south-east Queensland. We do not have to go through the heartache of the Land Appeal Court process because, frankly, when one has the land, one does not have to worry about squabbling over the cost of compensation. Similarly, a lot of the preliminary studies are done of the environmental and social consequences. The dams, starting with Wyaralong and Borumba, can be—and will be—completed within the first five years of a coalition government.

Let us also look at what the short-term solutions are. Today, this government talked about megadams, which it can never hope to build and it knows that. It is all about perception. But what is it going to do in the short term? Nothing! What is the coalition going to do in the short term? Easy! What we will do is establish two funds containing $200 million in total which will go to providing incentives for householders and businesses and industry to put water-saving devices in their businesses and homes, whether they be shower heads, dual-flush toilets or flow-control valves. But in the case of industry, importantly, incentives will be provided to use recycled water, freeing up fresh water for domestic use in our cities and towns across south-east Queensland. Where is the government mentioning recycling? Nowhere! It is saying it is investigating it. We have almost 200,000 Olympic-size swimming pools of recycled water that is going into the ocean. There will be no ocean outfall under a coalition government; that will go into industry to free up other water. Rainwater tanks will be mandatory creating water overnight. That is the coalition's solution. It stands in stark contrast to a government which has no idea.

Family Budgets

Ms NELSON-CARR (Mundingburra—ALP) (11.40 am): With fuel driving the spiralling cost of supermarket items, consumers are more at the mercy of the major supermarket chains than ever before. I strongly believe that retailers need to be more accountable for prices being charged in the current economic climate. Transportation and grocery costs are unavoidably linked but, nonetheless, some mark-ups appear out of proportion, even allowing for the high prices being charged for fuel.

Figures released towards the end of April showed that vegetables cost 15 per cent more than at the same time last year. But farmers were not seeing an increase in their profits, largely because the two major supermarket chains dictate what they pay the farmer as well as the end price to the consumer.

As consumers we need to start asking questions about what we are charged for groceries, many of which are rapidly becoming out of reach for families on low and limited budgets. I was taken to task in the *Townsville Bulletin* earlier this month by Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association executive director Ian Baldock. He said that I had a hide saying that retailers needed to be accountable. He said the public will hold retailers accountable if they are pushing their prices too high. How the average family would go about doing that I am not quite sure. How does the average shopper hold retailers accountable? How and when would the shopper spare the time to make the effort? Most people just cop it on the chin. One defence is to avoid items that appear marked up excessively, but with essentials that is easier said than done, especially these days for people with young children when there is greater public awareness of good nutrition and the need for healthy eating.

In addition to reporting my comments and those of Mr Baldock, the *Townsville Bulletin* of 6 May also carried an interview with a Townsville mother of two, Sarah Cusack, under the headline 'Making Ends Meet'. Mrs Cusack said she had re-evaluated where her family spend their money and said they had been discussing how best to cut back on using the car. But she said that, more often than not, there was still no money left at the end of the week, even after balancing their shopping budget of $160 plus $15 for nappies.

Mr Wallace: And the federal government is going to take away the subsidy.

Ms NELSON-CARR: That is absolutely right. I feel for the Cusacks and countless families in a similar predicament no matter where they live, in north Queensland or elsewhere. Families are hurting, especially when the recent quarter of a per cent rise in interest rates is factored in. It makes a mockery of Prime Minister Howard's election promise to keep interest rates in check. Frankly, I cannot imagine a worse time to raise interest rates. Even for those without a mortgage, the flow-on effect of the quarter per cent rise will almost certainly lead to a spike in rents.

We were told that the federal budget was aimed at families. Well, it certainly does not look like Australian families took the message to heart. The ACNielsen poll published in the *Age* and *Sydney Morning Herald* on Monday showed support for federal Labor was up by three percentage points to 54 per cent and that Labor was leading the coalition on a two-party preferred basis. Families are hurting out there, workers fear for their jobs because of the draconian industrial relations legislation and fuel prices are going through the roof, as are the prices of groceries. A second interest rate rise is being tipped before the end of the year. Did the budget make a difference? Judging by the ACNielsen poll it made a difference all right, but in the opposite direction to that which the federal coalition was hoping for.

Speaking of differences, how different is the world of today to when the Hawke government proposed the Australia card two decades ago? The proposal was, of course, killed off in a referendum, but John Howard's smart card or access card, which has many similarities to the Australia card, has been received with barely a whimper. I am amazed that the Prime Minister's remarks about the smart card not being compulsory were accepted at face value and not taken to task. Not only welfare recipients but every Australian who claims a Medicare rebate will have to have one, as will people who attend a bulk-billing service. According to the Australian government's Medicare web site, there were 20.5 million people registered for Medicare benefits as at 30 June 2005. In the 12 months from July 2004 to the end of June 2005, over 236 million Medicare services were processed. With Australia's population not much more than 20 million and with pretty well all Australians registered for Medicare benefits, how can the smart card not be compulsory if it is essential to have one to claim on Medicare from 2010?

It was inevitable that Australia would introduce some form of high-tech identity card, because that is the way of the world. But as for the smart or access card not being compulsory, in truth most of us will not be able to function without one.

Commercial and Recreational Fishing

Mr HOOLIHAN (Keppel—ALP) (11.45 am): Fishing is one of the great relaxations for Queenslanders and a great contributor to the economy of the Smart State. Over the past two or three years both the commercial and the recreational fishing fraternities have been constrained by changes to fishing areas, bag limits for taking fish and changes to our reef and coastal zones. Even though some people believe that the restrictions went too far, they accepted them and worked within them. The local Indigenous people in Keppel, the Darumbal, also acknowledged that this accorded with their attitude towards the care of the environment. Even though they were entitled to take resources outside the terms of the act for their own use but not for commercial use, they worked to ensure that our environment would be protected. Most fishers also worked with the local Boating and Fisheries officers, who are respected for their integrity and were prepared to work with all people who enjoyed the fruits of the ocean.

That all went pear-shaped in about 2004, and the last episode was a Court of Appeal decision early in 2006. As a result of that decision—and if anyone has not bothered to read its 50 pages they should do so before they try to make any criticism or comments—some locals are relying on the findings to try to circumvent our fisheries laws. The decision was so convoluted that the Boating and Fisheries Patrol now has difficulty enforcing the act.

The case in question was Stevenson v Yasso. Yasso was apprehended on a Zilzie beach in possession of a 50-metre monofilament gill net. He was charged with possession of a commercial fishing apparatus as its size was in excess of the recreational size allowed. The magistrate made findings which discharged Yasso, but an appeal by the Crown to the District Court was upheld. Yasso claimed that a degree of aboriginality excepted him from the provisions of the act in ownership of the net, but the Darumbal people, relying on their own laws and customs, excluded the person from their full acceptance of him as a Darumbal person. They also gave evidence in support of the Crown case.

The Court of Appeal was divided on the subject of aboriginality, and it probably does not have any bearing on the basic argument. As I have indicated, it does show that the act needs attention. The Beattie Labor government has been fully supportive of native title rights—and I do not want this to become an argument over native title rights, although some attention may need to be paid to section 14 of the Fisheries Act.

The real problem relates to commercial aspects of any taking of seafood product. I am aware of the implications of the appeal court decision if nothing is done, but the rogue element has stepped up its actions claiming the decision allowed them all sorts of rights to take any type and size of fish. They have streamed a 150-metre monofilament net from a groyne at Keppel Sands, and I have also received details of commercial netting by them in the Fitzroy River. I have also been informed of the commercial sale of their catch.

As a result of the disagreement among the members of the Court of Appeal, it became obvious that the act needs attention. A belief that that disagreement gave some right to people to rape our resources has been the major basis for the current spate of breaches. We have stranded our Boating and Fisheries officers in no-man's-land, and that has to end. The act needs amendment to refine the commercial aspects. There is not one law for one people and one for another, as has been claimed by people in my electorate and elsewhere.

The doctrine of the separation of powers states that we legislate, courts adjudicate and our departments administer our legislation. If acts need attention, we fix them so that all our citizens benefit from our actions and those who want to work in a twilight zone and break laws because it suits them can bear the brunt of the full force of just and equitable laws; so that our administration staff have certainty; and so that the court will have its own certainty.

The Darumbal people do not want commercial activities. Our Boating and Fisheries Patrol needs the certainty I mentioned in the terms of the legislation we pass and which it must enforce, and our resources need the protection which I believed had come from the Great Barrier Reef green zones and other fisheries provisions. Those who seek to subvert any legislation because of inconsistency deserve what they get. The rights of the Darumbal people would be enhanced by clarification of the commercial application of the act and mainly in respect of the native title rights.

On a final note, this difficulty relates only to the peculiar circumstances of this matter. I say to anyone who wants to extend any of my comments to other legislation or start some argument about native title rights—don't. It will only prove that there are too few villages and so many idiots.

Water Supply

Mr SEENEY (Callide—NPA) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.50 am): Yesterday the coalition released its response to the south-east Queensland water crisis—a water crisis that south-east Queensland did not have to have and a water crisis that can be sheeted home to the Beattie Labor government's lack of provision for infrastructure for the future.

The best that the minister responsible could do in the House this morning was to criticise our policy for a small spelling mistake and a typographical error. I take it as a great compliment that the minister has paid to the coalition policy that the most fault he could find was a small spelling error and a typo. The coalition outlined how we would build the dams that the Beattie Labor government has failed to build. We would provide the infrastructure that the Beattie Labor government has failed to provide, and we would do that in a timely and responsible way.

The water policy was about a lot more than building dams. It also included a number of initiatives which no member of the government has been prepared to attack or dispute. First of all, it focused on our commitment to recycling. It is the coalition's long-term vision and often stated vision that we would put an end to our ocean outfalls and we would ensure that all recyclable water is recycled. We would have a zero discharge policy. We would make sure that there is no recyclable water being discharged into the state's waterways.

The Queensland coalition government will inject $300 million into water recycling initiatives to ensure that more waste water is recycled for agriculture and business use. This will comprise funding for our business water efficiency and recycling fund and the western corridor recycled water project. The Australian Water Association estimates that about half of south-east Queensland's water supply needs could be provided by recycled water. Currently, however, less than 10 per cent of the 200,000 megalitres a year that is treated in the region's waste water treatment plants is recycled—less than 10 per cent. That is an indictment on a government that talks endlessly about these issues but does nothing and has no ability to do anything.

It is the coalition's aim to ensure that more than 50 per cent of south-east Queensland's waste water is being recycled by the end of our first term of government. It is an absolute commitment for us to achieve that 50 per cent of water being recycled as the first step towards achieving our vision of a zero discharge situation. The coalition also has a firm policy that recycled water should be reserved for industrial and irrigation uses before any consideration is given to its reintroduction into drinking water supplies.

We will set aside $200 million to advance the western corridor recycled water scheme—a scheme that has been talked about in this parliament by a number of members on this side of the House. The first stage of the western corridor recycled water scheme will provide recycled water to Tarong and Swanbank power stations that will go into local industry, while the second stage of the project aims to deliver remaining water supplies to industry and farmers in the Lockyer Valley and the Darling Downs. This scheme has the potential to free up 110 megalitres a day, or more than 40,000 megalitres a year, of fresh water that is currently being taken from the region's dams. The coalition's funding commitment will ensure that the project is fast-tracked and operational within two years.

We also make a major commitment of $100 million to a business water efficiency and recycling fund. We will assist councils and businesses to develop projects that will replace quality drinking water currently being used on parks, sporting fields and for industrial uses with recycled water. It is common sense. It needs to be done. The fund will also support water swapping between recycled urban water and irrigators' fresh water supplies, and it will support stormwater conservation initiatives. This fund will also assist businesses to undertake water efficiency audits to examine ways to reduce water use and develop water management plans.

The coalition's fund will be modelled on an already successful initiative operating in Victoria. The coalition has an absolute commitment to recycling water. We are determined to make recycling work. It is an initiative that goes hand in hand with providing the infrastructure, building the dams that Labor has failed to build, and it is one of the key points in solving the water crisis that the Beattie Labor government has inflicted on south-east Queensland.

We look forward to the day when there will be zero discharge of recyclable water from south-east Queensland; to when a significant portion of the water used in south-east Queensland for industry, urban irrigation, and parks and gardens is recycled water. That water needs to be recycled so that fresh water can be reserved for urban use.

Time expired.

Disability Pensioners, Mobility Allowance

Mr McNAMARA (Hervey Bay—ALP) (11.55 am): I wish to inform the House of the human impact caused to disability pensioners by the heartless penny pinching of the Howard government. Last week I was privileged to meet Cyril and Grace Fletcher and their son, Bruce. Cyril was a coalminer and worked the mines at Torbanlea all his working life until he was very seriously injured 39 years ago. He suffered horrific injuries at that time. I think we have all been reminded recently how tough the blokes who go down into the ground are, and he pulled through.

Cyril and Grace are now well into their 70s. Fifty years ago their son, Bruce, was born profoundly disabled as a result of a lack of blood flow to his brain during labour caused by an adverse reaction to medication administered to Grace during the birth. Bruce cannot speak. He cannot walk. He cannot use his hands. He is restrained in his wheelchair to stop him falling out of it. He requires and has received from Cyril and Grace 24-hour, seven-day-a week total care for 50 years.

Bruce also suffers from severe claustrophobia and can become so distressed that he will break the back of his wheelchair if he is placed in a confined space without a clear view to the outside world. Although he is profoundly disabled, Bruce is a fully grown man and when agitated displays considerable strength. Bruce's parents have cared for him with a dedication that is both humbling and inspiring, and yet the Howard government has chosen to sink the boot into Bruce and his parents in what I can only describe as the most repugnant policy flim-flam I have ever seen.

Bruce is, of course, a disability pensioner. He has also been receiving a mobility allowance that is provided to disability pensioners who cannot use public transport. Because of Bruce's claustrophobia, he cannot use buses—even those with wheelchair lifts and access. Cyril and Grace struggled to buy a purpose-built vehicle with a special high-visibility bubble in the back in which Bruce can travel without

stress. They gratefully accepted the $71.40 per fortnight from the Commonwealth government by way of mobility allowance which they used to cover the car registration, servicing, insurance and part of the fuel bills. But last year the Howard government decided that the Fletcher family was doing it a bit too easy. They changed the eligibility criteria for the mobility allowance. I table for the benefit of honourable members a printout from the Centrelink web site that confirms that disability pensioners who cannot use public transport now have to also undertake vocational training or do voluntary work or paid work for a total of at least 32 hours every four weeks in order to be eligible for the mobility allowance. Bruce is profoundly disabled. It is a grotesque cruelty to suggest that he work and train or volunteer for 32 hours every four weeks.

Mr Purcell: He'd love to be able to!

Mr McNAMARA: He would love to be able to. His parents would love for that to happen but it is completely unrealistic. He has been stripped of the mobility allowance and his elderly parents, who are pensioners themselves, are afraid that they will no longer be able to afford the vehicle that is so central to what quality there is in Bruce's life. This vicious attack on the poorest, the most needy, the most vulnerable in our society comes at a time when the federal Treasurer has just gloated his way through a budget with a $17 billion surplus. It comes at a time when the head of Macquarie Bank, Allan Moss, has revealed that he is being paid $21.2 million per year. It comes at a time of the lowest unemployment in 30 years, a once-in-a-generation resources boom and a federal government so bereft of ideas for infrastructure spending needs that it gives $100-a-week tax cuts to people earning over $100,000 a year instead.

But there is no generosity for Bruce and Cyril and Grace Fletcher. On 31 January this year the Howard government reduced their household income by $71.40 per fortnight. I do not know how the Commonwealth Minister for Human Services, Joe Hockey, can sleep at night having overseen this 'pea and thimble trick' on people such as Bruce. In the old pea and thimble trick you have to find the pea. In this game there is no pea under any of the thimbles. For the federal government to say that the mobility allowance is available for those who cannot use public transport but then set up rules that mean that those who need it most, such as Bruce, cannot get it is deceitful and cruel.

I call on people with compassion everywhere to lobby the Howard government to restore the mobility allowance to Bruce and to people like Bruce. His parents, Cyril and Grace, are the absolute salt of the earth with generosity in their hearts and a bottomless well of love and care for their son. This kick in the guts from the Howard government is more than they can or should bear.

Tabled paper: Extract from Centrelink website headed Who can get Mobility Allowance

Coalition Policy, Driver Training

Mr CALTABIANO (Chatsworth—Lib) (12.00 pm): Teaching young people how to drive, not just how to get a licence, is the cornerstone of the new policy announcement by the Queensland coalition last Sunday. This policy is a comprehensive position on a new way of licensing young drivers. It introduces the concept that a driver's licence is a qualification and to receive a licence the individual must have undergone certificate training, progressing to an open licence based upon competencies that that driver demonstrates over a 3½-year minimum period. This is a radical change from the way in which licences have been handed out to young drivers in the past. But with 123 total fatalities so far this year alone—more than any other year this decade—it is time for serious action in a way that provides an enduring change to the horrific loss of life on our roads.

Young people are overrepresented when it comes to road fatalities, with those aged 17 to 24 typically accounting for almost 30 per cent of road fatalities yet they represent only 13 per cent of the Queensland population and only 15 per cent of licence holders. It is undeniable that one of the reasons underlying the deaths of so many young people in car accidents is a lack of driving skills.

The new Queensland coalition policy aims to address this lack of driving skills for young people through the introduction of compulsory theoretical and simulator driver training prior to obtaining a learner's permit. The Queensland coalition has a three-phase young driver training scheme. Phase 1 is the attainment of a certificate in driver training and the experience of being in a motor vehicle simulator prior to the application for a learner's permit. At the age of 16½, Queensland young people are eligible to obtain a learner's permit, which must be displayed on the motor vehicle at all times they are driving. A learner's permit entitles the driver to be on the road whilst being accompanied by a supervising driver. Whilst holding the L-plate, the young driver must complete 60 hours of competency based training by a combination of logbook and driver instruction prior to advancing to what will be known as a P1 licence.

A P1 licence will be held for a minimum period of one year and will entitle the young driver to have one passenger in the motor vehicle, no recordable blood alcohol content and two demerit points. If a P1 driver loses their P1 licence, they automatically revert back to an L-plate. During the course of that year on a P1 plate, the young driver must undertake 40 hours of competency based training through a combination of logbook and practical driver skills and then pass a test to move on to a P2 licence.

The P2 licence will be two years in duration and enable the young person to have two passengers, no recordable blood alcohol content and four demerit points. If a young driver loses those demerit points then they will restart at a P1 licence level. During the two-year duration of P2, there is an additional 20 hours of competency based training prior to a final exam before moving on to an open licence. This fundamental change in licensing for young drivers is all about teaching young drivers how to drive rather than how to get a licence. It is about changing the skills of young drivers and changing the attitude of drivers in the long term.

We have seen the parliamentary Travelsafe committees make rafts of recommendations over the years. In fact, in 1996 the Travelsafe Committee recommended that a way to improve driver training was to introduce driver education throughout schools. This program of having a certificate based elective for a range of year 11 and 12 students, allowing them to obtain some of the basic skills such as the principles of driving prior to their obtaining an L-plate, is a way to achieving that competency based training and upskilling at a school based level. I firmly believe that the Queensland coalition has the priorities right for young drivers and road users. This coalition policy will make great inroads into training safer, more skilled drivers and making our roads a safer place for all motorists.

The three phases of the Queensland coalition policy—that of certificate training and driver simulators, a new graduated licensing system and a new graduated licensing demerit point system—will usher in a new era for Queensland youth and will begin the process of changing the culture of young drivers so that the horrific statistics of death and maiming on our roads will be reduced.

The innovative approach taken by the Queensland coalition, with the introduction of simulators across Queensland schools to give young people a driving experience before they get behind the wheel of a car, will undoubtedly prove to be a great winner. This new simulator technology has been in use in Europe and the United States for young people driving cars and in the trucking industry, particularly in Europe. Research from the heavy-vehicle simulators in Europe has resulted in a 15 per cent reduction in the accidents involving heavy vehicles on European roads. It is a demonstrated technology and something that we in the Queensland coalition believe will help young people become better drivers.

We look forward to the implementation of this policy upon the election of a coalition government in Queensland. I firmly believe in—and I am sure that all members of this House will support—this great new initiative for young drivers and look forward to the day when this new approach to licensing young drivers can save lives and make our roads safer.

Toowoomba North Electorate

Mr SHINE (Toowoomba North—ALP) (12.05 pm): As each day goes by we hear a new version of the water recycling policy of the National Party, and today was no exception in relation to the member for Callide. Originally, Mr Horan and Mr Copeland were enthusiastic supporters of Water Futures. Then they opposed it and the opposition announced the banning of recycled water for drinking purposes when it met in Toowoomba. Then last week Mr Seeney said that we can have it, subject, of course, to ministerial approval. This week the opposition says that it will be considered after all.

Mr Lawlor: What will tomorrow bring?

Mr SHINE: 'What will tomorrow bring?,' as the member for Southport rightly asks.

I want to speak about certain matters of importance in terms of the Beattie government's support for our region. On Sunday I represented the Premier at the Hampton High Country Food and Art Festival. It was a great success. It was an opportunity for this area to showcase the region. The Beattie government supports regions as a high priority because of the jobs that are necessary there, the investment that can come there, the services that people deserve and the diversity of culture. Supporting the cultural aspect, $25,000 was allotted from the Regional Development Program of Queensland Events. This was the third time that this festival was supported by the Beattie government via Queensland Events. I congratulate Barbara Plant, the coordinator; her committee; and her many volunteers on the work they did. The gathering, which I think would have numbered some thousands as the day went on, was chaired by Mr Chris Jensen. It was great for me to run into many constituents including Noel Lipp, Greg Tucker, Mr and Mrs Greg Gall and Ian Mibus. Ian previously was the principal of Concordia College and is now working as one of the many volunteers at the function.

Earlier last week I represented the Premier at the opening of the refurbishment and expansion at St Mary's School at Warwick. The state government has contributed $237,000 for the construction of a new prep school. This school is a marvellous school, led capably by John O'Connor. On this important occasion it was great to see that Bishop Bill Morris was present along with Mr John Borserio, the CEO of Catholic Education in Toowoomba, as well as Mr Bruce Scott representing the federal government.

Catholic education in Warwick has been in operation since 1867, when the then Misses O'Mara established the first Catholic school at the Oddfellows Hall. It is amazing how time has elapsed and it is back to being a lay teacher school under the spiritual guidance of Father Hal Ranger. It was great on the day to see former principals attending, including Mr Ron Rosentreter and Mr Terry Hayes.

I am very glad that the state government has supported the introduction of the prep year so well, particularly in my electorate. Considerable amounts of money have recently been allocated for improvements at the Toowoomba Preparatory School, Mary MacKillop School and Holy Name Primary School in my electorate. Our educational responsibilities are not just to the state system. All Queensland children are entitled to the best education that the community can offer them. Put simply, we cannot realise the government's vision of Queensland as Australia's Smart State if we do not have smart people. The only sustainable way to generate a smart community is of course through our education system. That is why it is such a high priority on the government's agenda.

Finally I mention that this coming weekend I will attend the official opening of the indoor basketball complex at St Mary's College, a Christian Brothers school in Toowoomba. This is another example of the tangible way the Beattie government supports education and sport in my area and builds stronger communities. The government has contributed $1 million towards the building of this basketball centre, which will cost over $2 million. I am very pleased that the Toowoomba City Council has also come to the party. Mr Clive Berghofer has also helped out with a substantial loan. I must congratulate the Old Boys Association, capably led by Paul Canning, on their efforts and the great work done on this marvellous project by teacher Craig Ebneter as well as principal John Coman.

Coalition Policy, Coordinator-General's Office

Miss SIMPSON (Maroochydore—NPA) (12.10 pm): The state coalition is announcing today that a powerful Coordinator-General's office will be re-established under a coalition government to drive critically needed infrastructure construction. This is in stark contrast to the Beattie Labor government's bizarre arrangement where the Coordinator-General and his deputy are also doubling up as directors-general of the Premier's department and the department of state development. Labor's arrangement is not in the best interests of rebuilding Queensland after the eight years of infrastructure drought—a drought it imposed upon Queensland at a time of consistently high population growth.

Queensland has faced an average of 2.3 per cent population growth over the last 25 years. But in the last few years there has been no major road projects delivered and there has been no major water infrastructure delivered in south-east Queensland. The only dam that the Beattie government boasts about, Paradise Dam, was initiated by the coalition in its two brief years of minority government.

The positions of Coordinator-General and Deputy Coordinator-General are significant in their own right and must be undertaken by highly capable individuals with experience in major project delivery. People fulfilling such roles should not also be responsible for administering major government departments. It is a divided focus. That is not a surprise for Labor. It has failed to know how to respond to the infrastructure crisis—a crisis it created. Its answer thus far has been through press releases and stunts. But that does not put water in people's taps and does not solve the increasing gridlock on our roads.

Labor has cobbled together the Coordinator-General and Deputy Coordinator-General and the directors-general roles as an alliance of convenience rather than a common-sense approach. It is more about securing higher remuneration packages for the current Coordinator-General and his deputy to give them some pay parity with that which they received in their previous roles in the private sector.

Labor's arrangement is not about having an office of Coordinator-General which is focused on one thing and one thing only—that is, driving timely infrastructure and project delivery. When the Beattie Labor government announced its South East Queensland Regional Plan we welcomed the principles of the plan but warned that its success would depend on timely infrastructure delivery. We also raised the concern of having extremely high population growth in the corridor to the south-west of Brisbane where there is no water and no other infrastructure. Still the state government has failed to answer our concerns about timely infrastructure. Our concerns have proven to be well founded in light of the Beattie government's knee-jerk water announcement to flooding other areas outside of south-east Queensland with no environmental planning and cost benefit analysis having been undertaken. This is allegedly to provide water for new growth corridors.

In contrast, the coalition has a comprehensive, environmentally and socially responsible approach to the growth needs of all of Queensland, including south-east Queensland. It involves plans to boast regional development and to build a network of healthy communities, not just Beattie's unserviced megacities. We have plans to build catch-up infrastructure, which has lagged under Labor, but also to put in place forward infrastructure to support the future needs of Queenslanders.

Yesterday we delivered our position paper on the south-east Queensland water supply to responsibly meet future needs. I applaud the policy of zero outfall. In our first term of government there will only be 50 per cent outfall. We will progressively move towards zero outfall. This involves responsible recycling for industrial and agricultural use and having clean drinking water available for those in our cities and communities.

Our announcements today and yesterday are about getting the priorities right. They are about driving infrastructure programs which are absolutely essential. They are about ensuring that Queensland has an environmentally, socially and economically viable future. Bureaucratic deadlock in delivering infrastructure has weighed the Beattie government down and stymied its approach to delivering the infrastructure plan that has been tabled. We will deal with that with a powerful office of Coordinator-General. That person would not have a divided focus—that is, running the premier's department as well.

Pacific Motorway Upgrade

Ms STONE (Springwood—ALP) (12.15 pm): I have spoken on numerous occasions in this place about the need for the upgrade of the Pacific Motorway through Logan City. This project is extremely important to the residents, businesses and visitors of the Springwood electorate. Members can imagine my joy when the Premier announced in July 2005 at the Gold Coast community cabinet meeting that the state had allocated $392 million over five years to the upgrade of the Pacific Motorway between Eight Mile Plains and Tugan.

Logan City Council fully supports this project and supports a recommendation to lobby the Commonwealth government for matching funding for the upgrade to proceed. These efforts have unfortunately fallen on deaf ears and the federal government has ignored the people of Logan in the federal budget. I still do not see any evidence of those opposite joining the people of Logan to lobby for our fair share of road funding. It is obvious that the Liberal Party does not care about Logan. The Liberal Party does not care about the electorate of Springwood. If those opposite did, they would be lobbying the federal government for this important project.

It is important to note that as part of the National Highway the Pacific Motorway is a road of national importance and has traditionally attracted fifty-fifty state-Commonwealth funding. The federal government even acknowledges on its web site that the Pacific Motorway is part of its AusLink road network. It should also be noted that Canberra grabs $14 billion in fuel excise from motorists every year but it puts less that 16c in every dollar back into Australian roads. I notice that the member for Chatsworth is very quiet now. The opposition should be joining those on this side of the House to support the Pacific Motorway project through Logan and lobby the Commonwealth government for the funding Queensland deserves.

The good news is that, despite no federal funding, the Beattie government remains committed to progressing the upgrade of the Pacific Motorway through the Springwood electorate—in fact, the full length of the motorway in Logan City. The Beattie Labor government understands the needs of the people in the Springwood electorate and knows just how important this project is to them.

Since 1997 indepth planning and consultation has been undertaken by the Department of Main Roads. Since the state government funding announcement, the project team has consulted with state representatives and the community to develop a draft planning layout. Specific consultation activities since July 2005 have included close to 100 personal meetings with potentially affected property owners and stakeholders; the establishment of four project reference groups; two newsletters which have been distributed to 39,000 residents and businesses in the project area; a round of public displays at shopping centres and libraries at the start of planning in August 2005 designed to inform the community; a program of public displays of the draft planning layout for public review and comment in April and May 2006; local newspaper advertising to promote both rounds of public displays; dedicated web pages on the Mains Road web site; and a dedicated free call 1800 number and email address direct to the project team.

The Department of Main Roads conducted a presentation for the Logan City Council works committee on 10 April 2006 and for commercial property owners on 2 May 2006. At no time has the Logan City Council raised objections with Main Roads with respect to the draft plans. So members can imagine the surprise when councillor for division 1, Peter Collins, raised his objections to the plans in the local press. Councillor Collins attended the meeting held on 2 May for affected business owners in Councillor Grant's division and the electorate of Woodridge, a briefing in 2005 for Logan City Council members and also a reference group meeting earlier this year. In April this year officers from the Department of Main Roads gave a presentation to the Logan City Council works committee which Councillor Collins did not attend.

Councillor Collins has had lots of opportunities to raise his concerns about the project yet he has chosen not to do this. Instead he has chosen to grandstand and tell only part of the story of the project. He conveniently forgot to tell the people of Logan that he has not been lobbying his Liberal mates in Canberra for the funding for the project.

Part of the story Councillor Collins forgot to tell was about the major improvements that this project will bring to Logan and, more importantly, to the people of Springwood. I will continue to lobby the federal government to get the funding for this vital project. Residents and businesses are constantly

telling me that they are tired of being delayed due to traffic congestion. They want the project to start as soon as possible.

I thank all of those who have given input to the planning team and all of those community members who have contacted me about the project. Public consultation is extremely important to this project. I will continue to work with the people of Springwood to ensure that their feedback will help refine the plans and ensure the best planning outcome possible for the local community and for Australia's road network.

Driver's Licences; Asbestos Roof Replacement Program; Rainwater Tanks; Dam Proposals

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (12.20 pm): I use this opportunity to again call on the state government to review the very onerous and difficult requirements that Queenslanders have to satisfy in order to obtain a driver's licence. I recall that when the state government introduced amendments to the current legislation relating to new requirements for proof of identification it indicated that those amendments were necessary in order to respond to the increasing terrorist threat in Australia. But since the legislation was amended my office has continually received calls from people who find it very difficult to meet the new and very onerous requirements.

By and large, 95 per cent of people who have contacted my office because of their difficulty in complying with the state government's new identification requirements in order to obtain a driver's licence or to replace a lost driver's licence are women. I call on the state government to conduct an immediate review of the current requirements. I believe that it is reasonable to allow the minister a discretion to approve the issue of a new driver's licence where it can be demonstrated that that is warranted as the applicant is unable to meet the current and very strict and onerous requirements.

I would like to use this opportunity to read into *Hansard* the circumstances of a woman who recently approached my office about this matter. She has also written a letter to me about it. I have written to the minister about her predicament. I do not want to reveal this woman's identity, but I can say that she was living in a long-term de facto relationship and she took her partner's surname. At the time she did that, the only requirement for a change of identity was a simple statutory declaration. Therefore, all of her records, including her Centrelink, bank and transport records, listed her under her partner's name. That relationship ended. Sometime later she married for the first time. The Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages insisted that she married under her maiden name, which she did.

This women is now experiencing great difficulty in trying to prove her identity to meet the identification requirements of Queensland Transport in order to have her licence changed to her married name. I note in this woman's letter to me that she states that the problem with Queensland Transport was that she did not have a paper trail leading back to the 1980s when she used her then de facto's surname of 'S'. The name change was done in another state in Australia by statutory declaration. Earlier this year, this woman got married using a decree of dissolution, which gave her the new surname of 'A'. Therefore, the name on her certificate of marriage and the name on her licence do not match. Queensland Transport has requested that this woman change her name on her licence to 'A' and she has tried to do that.

Unfortunately, this woman has experienced a lot of difficulty in meeting the identification requirements of Queensland Transport. She has produced a certificate of marriage, she has produced the decree nisi—the dissolution of marriage—and she has produced a birth certificate. She has even produced a certificate of name change from the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages. But alas, she is still not able to meet the department's requirements. I call on the minister to review the current requirements. I ask the minister to introduce an amendment to the legislation so that he can use his ministerial discretionary powers, if justified and warranted, to issue the appropriate licence.

Whilst I am on my feet, I also put on the record my appreciation to the Minister for Education for his willingness to bring forward the schedule of schools in my electorate in Nambour that will have their roofs replaced to between now and November this year. This morning the minister tabled in parliament information stating that Nambour Preschool will have one roof replaced, Nambour State High School will have six roofs replaced and Nambour State School will also have six roofs replaced. I understand that this work will start in the immediate future. I thank the Minister for Education for bringing forward these projects. I know that the parents and students involved in those schools will certainly appreciate this work. They will be very understanding as the work takes place.

Before resuming my seat, I use this opportunity to again urge the state government to allocate in this year's budget appropriate funding to provide incentives for residents in south-east Queensland to install rainwater tanks. Many people in the country have been raised on tank water. I believe that in times of necessity—and at the moment there is a sense of urgency owing to the lack of rain—all people in south-east Queensland should share the responsibility of conserving water and not just the people who live in other areas and who are currently facing the possibility of having their land resumed so that

a dam can be built. Only last Wednesday I attended a very emotional meeting at Belli Park in the Maroochy shire, which is in my electorate. The hall was full of people who were very stressed, worried and very angry about the prospect of losing their land to meet the requirements of providing regular, reliable water to all of south-east Queensland. Many asked me, 'Peter, why should we be losing our land?'

Time expired.

Australian Nursing Awards

Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (12.25 pm): Recently, it was my great honour to represent the Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Robertson, and provide the keynote address and present the Australian Nursing Awards at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital. The Australian Nursing Awards were launched in 2002 to provide a vehicle for national recognition of outstanding nurses and skills advancement in the nursing profession. Over the past three years awards have been presented with the objectives to celebrate excellence in nursing practice, to promote the importance of the nursing profession in the Australian community, to acknowledge the commitment given by nurses in their chosen careers, to encourage the skills advancement of nursing professionals, and to create a public awareness of the dedication of the nursing profession.

I was delighted to meet the entrants and to announce the winners of the three categories of awards, which were a professional development scholarship, the National Care Award and the Student Achievement Awards. Nominations for awards were received from patients, families and friends, colleagues, supervisors and universities. The judging panel had the difficult task of selecting winners from nurses of vastly different backgrounds working in different fields of nursing. However, one thing was abundantly clear throughout the awards ceremony: all nurses, assistant nurses and those who were working in the nursing profession deserve praise as they are the backbone of our health system.

The National Care Award Winner for 2006 was Rosanne Squire from Lismore Base Hospital in New South Wales. Rosanne has a 40-year history in the profession. It was a very special day for her because she was also celebrating her wedding anniversary. The Student Achievement Awards went to Megan McLaughlin from the Queensland University of Technology—an excellent university and I went there as well—Sharise Jade Larosa from the University of Tasmania and Karen Wesley from Monash University in Victoria. The HESTA Professional Development Scholarships were awarded to Sonia Bisson from New South Wales, who was awarded $2,500; Angela Castle from Tasmania, who also received $2,500; and Lindsey Donlan from Victoria, who received $5,000.

I was thrilled to be able to celebrate and acknowledge the achievements of these outstanding nursing professionals. Today, nurses demonstrate innovation and excellence in all nursing care settings. Their passion, coupled with nursing research and emerging technology, puts their profession at the forefront of our healthcare system in Australia. Our Beattie Labor government is in awe of nurses' resolute dedication to patients. Their contribution to improving patient services and workforce management in Queensland is paramount. Our government will continue our united partnership with nurses and also the Queensland Nurses Union to further achieve excellence and improved working conditions, patient services, innovation and technologies.

With International Nurses Day also being recognised and celebrated in May, I call on all members of this House to at every opportunity encourage schoolchildren in their electorates to make nursing their chosen career. Nursing is a fantastic, rewarding and challenging career. It is also diverse in its field of expertise.

I would also like to call on all members of this House to encourage nurses who may have left their profession—perhaps to have children or to take up another job—to consider a return to nursing. Times have changed. With our Health Action Plan well on its way to implementation, Queensland Health and the wider health industry needs as many nurses as possible. Our community loves our nurses as they are very caring in terms of our physical needs, in terms of our families and in terms of the wider community.

I would like to pass on my thanks to the West Moreton District Health Service, particularly the community health service, which is led by Ann Schefe and her team. In relation to community nursing, I would like to thank them for their continued commitment to the Springfield women's health group, which has been running for several months now. They have since established a Springfield men's health group, which had its first meeting on Tuesday, 2 May at Woodcrest College. Twenty-six men in all attended this meeting and they discussed urology issues as well as emotional and family wellbeing. They also had their blood pressure and weight checked and they were able to receive advice from doctors and nurses at that meeting. This men's health group is very important because health statistics reveal that men run twice the risk of dying from preventable illnesses than women. Preventable deaths in Queensland are higher than the national average.

Time expired.

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

STATUTE LAW (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

First Reading

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Public Works, Housing and Racing) (12.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to make various amendments of Queensland statute law, incorporating the explanatory notes. I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Public Works, Housing and Racing) (12.30 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill 2006 is essentially an omnibus bill that makes amendments to 49 acts, where the amendments are concise, of a minor nature and noncontroversial. Most of the amendments have arisen through changes to legislative drafting practice, updating cross-references, providing greater clarity, correcting minor errors and making other minor amendments. However, amendments 2, 5 and 6 to the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Act 2000 are slightly different and further detail in this regard is outlined later in my speech.

The rationale for the Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill is to enable legislation to be corrected and updated in circumstances where the preparation of a separate bill is not justified. This allows for the timely and efficient operation of the parliament by amending a large number of acts via one bill. It also provides for quality, up-to-date legislation that is consistent across the statute book.

I will now turn to amendments 2, 5 and 6 to the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Act 2000. Amendment 2 to the act amends section 102B to remove the mandatory requirement for the Commissioner for Children and Young People and Child Guardian to provide a copy of review/appeal rights to a person who has had his or her application for a blue card refused because of a conviction for an excluding offence—that is, a serious child related sexual offence—and sentenced to imprisonment or a lifetime ban from holding a blue card. It is considered illogical for the commissioner to be required to provide these applicants, who are automatically issued with a negative notice for their blue card application, with details of any appeal rights as there are no appeal rights that apply.

Amendments 5 and 6 to the act amend section 122B to allow the commissioner to issue a notification under the section to an employer where a blue card applicant may be working with children pending assessment of his or her application and has had a change in his or her police information. This enables the employer to implement appropriate risk management strategies while the application is assessed. The commissioner currently has the power to issue a notification under section 122B to an employer in relation to a blue card holder who has a change in his or her police information but not in relation to a blue card applicant. While these amendments are considered to be slightly beyond technical in nature, which is why I have specifically mentioned them in my second reading speech, they are not considered to be controversial at all.

Honourable members may also note that the explanatory notes to the bill are contained within the bill itself—unlike the usual practice of providing a separate document. This is for ease of reference as there is a broad range of acts being amended across a range of portfolios. It also reiterates the minor nature of the proposed amendments in that most amendments can be explained in one sentence. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Caltabiano, adjourned.

POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 11 May (see p. 1732).

Mr HOOLIHAN (Keppel—ALP) (12.34 pm), continuing: Before the adjournment of the debate on 11 May I dealt, in part, with the amendments to the Criminal Code and the matter of serious assaults on police officers. I referred to an order against a prostitute on the Gold Coast who has received a substantial reward but still owes a police officer or owes the state $4,500. The rationale for beefing up this offence is so that our police officers can avoid becoming punching bags or victims of people who believe that they can act in any way with impunity. It sends this message to those people who would act

in that way towards our police officers: you will get caught and when you get caught you will go to jail. There is no use in any community or any government recruiting police officers, training them and then putting them in a position in which they become the victim of a cowardly act in public.

The third matter I wanted to deal with relates to move-on powers that can be applied in all public places. As members will recall, these matters were addressed by the Safe Youth Parties Task Force in relation to the methods that can be used to deal with groups of youths invading family parties. However, some concern has been expressed about move-on powers being used indiscriminately or wrongly by our police.

I have to say that move-on powers have been generally available to the police in Rockhampton for a period of time. That has assisted the police and has particularly assisted the Indigenous community to save some of their members from being arrested because they would not move on and were causing difficulties. It has worked well. The Indigenous community and the police respect one another for the way in which these powers have been applied. I think it is a sad indictment of those people who comment that the police will act in that way.

As I mentioned at the start of my speech, I have worked closely with the police for a long time both in public office and as a lawyer. Although there were some who did abuse their position, I have found that in recent times there are very few police officers, if any, who do not act in a very proper manner. After being abused, after being aggressively attacked, both orally and physically on some occasions, police have had to react to the person they have given a move-on order to.

This bill will extend move-on powers to be applied in all public places and also at private functions when homes are used as recreation areas or for parties. These powers will allow the police to make an area safe for those people who want to go about their business in a lawful way. People who are evicted from any sort of public place may be given a direction to remove themselves for up to 24 hours and on receiving that direction they shall remove themselves from that place. If they do not act in accordance with the direction then they have to bear the brunt of the law.

The powers of police are constantly under review. As I said in relation to the amendments to the Criminal Code, we need to give police officers a whole barrage of options in order to make the community safe for those of us who live in it and for those people who, rightly or wrongly, perceive that there is some breakdown in law and order.

One has only to listen to some of the people who ring talk-back radio to realise that there exists a group of people who subscribe to a criminal conspiracy theory—that the law is breaking down, that society is breaking down and that we are all doomed to be murdered in our beds. That is not the case, and that is certainly shown by the proposed changes to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act which are set out in this bill.

I commend the minister for these changes. Also, I encourage her, in her dealings with the police union and the police force, to continue to provide our police with the powers they need to ensure that Queensland's laws are properly enforced. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MALONE (Mirani—NPA) (12.41 pm): It is with pleasure that I rise to speak on the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill. I think all members agree that police need legislative backing to allow them to do their jobs properly. Indeed, as the previous speaker said, the criminality in our community is changing dramatically as we move into a more technological age—in terms of the web, internet banking and so on—and there needs to be a continuous evaluation of the powers available to police. This bill will certainly help in that respect.

This is an excellent opportunity for members to record our personal thanks to the police in our electorates who do such a magnificent job under extreme and very difficult conditions from time to time. My electorate in particular is in a very fast-growing area of central Queensland. It has huge population growth, with people coming in to work on construction sites and so on. That is certainly creating pressures, not only on police but also on public facilities right around the area. As I said, the police have been doing a great job and will continue to do so.

No matter how good the legislation is, there is always a need for sufficient resources. Good legislation is utterly useless unless there are good people, and plenty of them, on the ground to make things happen. There are certainly areas in my electorate which do not have a full complement of officer positions filled. The provision of leave for officers in those positions can become fairly difficult at the single-person stations throughout the area.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the government on the new station, which is yet to be opened, at Sarina. It is almost completed. A bit of extra work was being carried out on the car park as I went past the other day. It is a great station. It is a great change in facilities for the police officers and others who work at the Sarina station. Only a couple of years ago, the police union declared the Sarina station the 'dump of the month'. I must say, I agreed with them at that time. It was, and it had been that way for quite a number of years. We were placing extra police in a station that could not accommodate the existing staff. The facilities were substandard, there is no doubt.

The officer in charge at Sarina, Dave Parnell, has a good team there and he is doing a great job. As I said, Sarina is a growing area. The officers now work in a decent environment. All of the police officers from the Sarina station whom I speak to are very pleased with their facility. Senior Sergeant John Black, Detective Tony Lee, Senior Constable Brian Cumming from the traffic police and all of the team there are doing a great job.

Most members would be aware that my electorate encompasses probably one of the most difficult stretches of the Bruce Highway, from just north of Rockhampton through to the other side of Mackay—the notorious Bruce Highway through the Marlborough, St Lawrence, Carmila areas. We have stations at Marlborough, Carmila and St Lawrence.

I believe that the single-officer station at Marlborough is understaffed. Really, Marlborough needs two officers. There is an area of about 120 kilometres north of Rockhampton and another 100-plus kilometres north to St Lawrence before the next station. It is a reasonably remote area. There is a black spot on that highway in terms of the number of very serious accidents that happen in that region. Currently, Constable John Schilton is the officer in charge of Marlborough police. He and others before him have had to turn out to some very horrific road accidents. There have been bus smashes, semitrailer rollovers and single-car accidents. That area has to be well maintained and well provisioned in terms of police resources.

That area also encompasses quite a bit of regional Queensland and rural communities to the west and to the east, down to Stanage Bay and across to a little place called Ogmore. Not many people live there now but, obviously, it is still an area that has to be policed. As I said, I believe that the Marlborough station should be a two-person station and that should be taken into consideration.

St Lawrence and Carmila are single-officer stations. Those officers are also called out on a regular basis for traffic patrolling and so on. It really is a very busy highway and one of the black spots is also in that area. Constable Peter Cowan is based at Carmila and Senior Constable David Maudsley is based at St Lawrence.

The Bruce Highway will continue to become busier. The Peak Downs Highway, west of Mackay, heads out to the minefields at Moranbah, Coppabella and onward out to Dysart. As a result of growth in the coal industry, that is becoming extremely busy. A lot of fatal accidents are occurring on the Peak Downs Highway.

Constable Gavin HIll is the officer in charge at Nebo. Nebo is becoming quite a regional centre with a large number of accommodation units. The officer positioned at Nebo is very busy, with the wide loads that move through the area. Constable Gavin Hill is responsible, obviously, for a lot of the paperwork involved in shifting those loads through the area. He also has to patrol the highway. That station at Nebo needs to become a two-man station or at least needs the services of an administration officer to help out the police officer in terms of his duties.

The newspaper today has highlighted the dangerous aspects of 12-hour shifts for mineworkers who drive while tired. At least three fatalities have occurred in recent months. Obviously, a lot of that is caused by fatigue. Constable Gavin Hill has done an extensive report on fatigue and driving, and I know that that is being looked at. It probably needs to be highlighted to a greater extent. Constable Gavin Hill is a man of many talents. Currently, he is in Canada representing Australia in kickboxing. He is a pretty all-round sort of character and a great guy.

The Mackay-Eungella Road is also well travelled. We are fortunate to have Sergeant Fred Baguley as officer in charge of the Mirani Police Station. Fred has been a long-term resident of the Pioneer Valley. Fred is an example of the best aspects of community policing. The bill is about supporting police officers in their work in our community and I congratulate the government on supporting the great police throughout our community. Fred Baguley is a typical example of community policing. Fred knows what is going on. He cruises around and talks to people and is doing a great job. Sergeant Dan Graham at Marian is also a terrific guy; his mode of operation is very similar to Fred. He knows the community and works well with it. I make the point that that area is growing very, very quickly and there needs to be provision set aside for new police stations to maintain police numbers in the Pioneer Valley.

There are a couple of issues that I have some concerns with in relation to the SPERS scheme which allows police officers to recognise through licence checks whether people have a criminal history, et cetera. There are some loopholes in that particular scheme whereby people have to be notified if their licence is out of date or has been cancelled. As members know, we have a very fluid population in Queensland. Many people never receive or pretend they have never received notification that their licence has been cancelled. When they are actually pulled up on the side of the road and informed that their licence has been cancelled they will automatically indicate that they were unaware of that, as anyone would do, and thereby the police officer has to let them go because they have to actually be aware that their licence has been cancelled before action can be taken against them. I am not sure how we can get around that, but certainly that is an issue.

Under the CrimTrac scheme, which enables officers to gain criminal record checks not only in this state but also throughout Australia, there is the issue of states not cooperating as much as they should. Certainly there are some loopholes there. I understand there is excessive cost involved in acquiring those records as well as a substantial time delay involved. Police officers have pulled people up on the side of the road and because of the delays and problems in relation to CrimTrac have virtually had to allow criminals to go free. That is an issue that certainly needs to be sorted out in cooperation with other states. It is an important management tool for police officers as well as for their security.

In relation to RBT, an important tool used by police in Queensland for detecting intoxicated drivers, unfortunately there appears to be no provision in the construction of roads to allow for police to operate RBTs safely without danger to themselves or the general public. We have quite a number of large functions throughout the electorate that are on single-lane roads where it is almost impossible for the police to set up RBT stations simply because they are too narrow and do not allow the police to operate safely or, indeed, in a way that is safe for drivers who are travelling backwards and forwards along those roads. That is a worry to us all because once the travelling public get away from that particular event, the roads lead everywhere. Potentially we could have intoxicated drivers heading out onto the highways, or any other area for that matter, without proper detection by the police.

The other issue is the conflict between government departments, in particular Transport, that is caused by insisting that police do these random breath tests. We have the situation where the police are basically forced to endeavour to maintain numbers in terms of breath testing but are not given the facilities to enable that to happen in a safe and effective way.

Another important thing for the travelling public in relation to police issues is the Driver Reviver stations throughout the state. I have spoken about the Bruce Highway and the dangerous section of highway between Rockhampton and Mackay. A very significant Driver Reviver station is based at Waverley Creek just south of St Lawrence. The Department of Transport has been pretty miserly in terms of providing facilities there. At another time I will raise specific issues in relation to that, but it is a critical and specific issue in terms of safe traffic management where people—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Wallace): Order! I have been pretty lenient on the debate. Can you come back to matters relating to the bill.

Mr MALONE: In terms of legislation, it is important for police officers to have the support of the Queensland parliament and it is important for members of parliament to raise the issues which are of concern to the police officer in his electorate. I am endeavouring to present the views of some people who have a very significant profile and who represent the police in my electorate. These people have real concerns about the fatigue management on our roads and in particular the Bruce Highway between Rockhampton and Mackay.

People come down on a volunteer basis to run the facility at Waverley Creek and are given very little in the way of support. They have to open up the signs, which they do not get fuel money for; they have to bring their own milk to make the cups of tea; there are no facilities for them to stop over; the shed that they deliver the coffee and bickies out of is not air-conditioned. In the heat of summer it is almost impossible for them to maintain their presence. I think that is unbelievable.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mirani is getting back to the matters on the bill, is he not?

Mr MALONE: Thank you. It is important. I congratulate all the police officers in my electorate on the great work that they do.

Mr Caltabiano interjected.

Mr MALONE: They do a magnificent job.

Mr Caltabiano interjected.

Mr MALONE: The issue of the highways in my electorate is of concern to everybody.

Mr Caltabiano interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chatsworth, I believe you are next on the list. You might want to wait until then.

Mr MALONE: With those few words, I resume my seat.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 pm to 2.30 pm.

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—Lib) (2.30 pm): The explanatory notes accompanying this bill, the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006, state that the main objective is to amend the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 to ensure police officers continue to perform their duties effectively by utilising legislation that is well balanced and reflective of community requirements. As we have already heard from the honourable member for Gregory, the shadow minister for the opposition, and other members from this side of the House, we are happy to support the intent of this bill and its extensive raft of amendments. There are a few areas of concern in the details, but overall the minister is to be commended for bringing this legislation into the parliament.

Legislation relating to police powers has been subject to ongoing review since 1997, with the passage of the PPRA, which was repealed by an act bearing the same name on 1 July 2000. It is this act that provides the majority of the powers used by police officers in Queensland. With rapid population growth and a society with changing attitudes and values, it stands to reason that these police powers require amendment to remain current. This bill contains what amounts to a couple of hundred provisions which would be cumbersome to individually detail here today.

The major initiatives, as outlined by the minister in her second reading speech, are as follows: the monitoring of the sale of pseudoephedrines; the searching of persons and vehicles without warrant for an offence involving wilful damage; the ability to obtain a warrant to seek decryption details from a person; extending move-on powers to all public places; provisions for the offence of evading police; amendment of section 340 of the Criminal Code, the serious assault of a police officer; domestic violence matters; civilian watch-house officers' functions and powers; and administrative issues.

Before I proceed, let me express my sincere respect and unwavering support for our police officers here in Queensland. My office is in frequent contact with officers at both Palm Beach and Coolangatta stations and the Elanora police beat—all situated within my electorate. The good rapport we have built means that constituents' issues can often be dealt with in a timely and efficient manner. We were sorry to wave farewell recently to Senior Sergeant Mark Anderson, who was the officer in charge of Palm Beach. We congratulate him on his promotion and wish him well at Mudgeeraba. In doing so, we welcome Senior Sergeant Michael Purcell, who has taken on the role in an acting capacity.

Living on the border of Queensland and New South Wales, I know cross-border issues require special attention and good communication between the two state police services and their respective communities. As New South Wales has no entertainment precincts to entertain their youth, crowds flock to Coolangatta, which is under the jurisdiction of Queensland. This puts enormous added strain, which I recognise, on our police resources. It is about time the New South Wales Labor government got off its derriere and provided some night-life activities for young people in their state. It has allowed massive coastal developments over the last few years and pocketed the taxes without investing a cracker in an entertainment precinct with bands or music for the younger population who do not find that the services and bowls clubs offer them enough variety. Police today have to contend with growing populations in their regions, a wider range of mobility, looser family units and young people with more freedom than ever before. It is essential for them to be given sufficient powers to do their job to the best of their ability. It is also crucial to recognise the often thankless and tough job they perform on our behalf.

Section 20 will bring in the monitoring of the sale of pseudoephedrines. As the minister notes in her second reading speech, a huge increase in the sale of pseudoephedrines through pharmacies has prompted the need for this amendment, which will allow police officers entry to pharmacies to inspect registers that pharmacists are bound to keep so as to compare entries relating to this drug against the stock they carry on hand. Commonwealth laws brought in earlier this year have resulted in the sale of drugs containing more than 60 milligrams of pseudoephedrine to require a prescription. One pharmacy I spoke with has said that they are not stocking anything with pseudoephedrine as it is simply too much trouble and it is best not to have anything to do with it. Alternatives are available that are not suitable for the illegal manufacture of drugs.

Pharmacists in general have no problem with police officers inspecting their records and believe that the great majority keep true and accurate records within legal guidelines. They have raised concerns over the way this will be conducted and the process used. They do not want any major disruption of their daily services to customers and patients and ask if the minister could please outline how this exercise will occur.

Stopping the manufacture and circulation of illegal drugs is an unenviable task, as undesirable individuals find new ways to hide their crimes. Communities can help eliminate home laboratories by reporting suspiciously quiet residences and windows blacked out by curtains. The inactivity could be due to shiftworkers, but even they have days off and get about during the day. I remember well night duty and the difficulties associated with trying to sleep during the day. The smart drug addicts visit a range of doctors and pharmacists and scatter their trail so it is harder to track them. A central register should show this up, but still a certain percentage slip through the checking system and are able to continue their dastardly activities, cheating both the public and themselves as they feed their habits.

I move now to the amendment relating to searching persons and vehicles without warrant for an offence involving wilful damage. Countless residents in my electorate are in full support of this amendment, as so many of them have suffered extensive and expensive damage to their property and have complained bitterly that police appear powerless, regardless of the amount of information a resident can provide. It will allow a police officer who holds a reasonable suspicion to search a suspect and a suspect's vehicle without warrant in order to seize evidence which may lead to a successful prosecution for a wilful damage or destruction offence.

A resident in Palm Beach whose family was threatened in their own home by roaming youth on 15 January this year and had his work utility torched outside his home would be very keen to see police given extra powers that would see the perpetrators of this crime brought to justice. A juvenile has been

charged in relation to an earlier incident on the same evening involving damage to the utility, but there is insufficient evidence to charge any person with the arson of the vehicle. This is cold comfort to this man, his wife and young children, as he is thousands of dollars out of pocket and needs a vehicle for work to be able to feed his family.

Some residents are subject to vandalism of their property, ranging from eggs and bricks thrown through windows to torching of wheelie bins and uprooting of letterboxes and plants on a regular basis. One landlord of a local shopping centre has sent me over 30 pieces of correspondence—it has almost become a weekly occurrence—reporting over 100 incidents of vandalism, ranging from graffiti sprayed on walls to toilets being smashed and weighty pot plant holders tipped over. In the majority of cases the perpetrators can be identified by the victims, yet they manage to escape capture or conviction.

Another amendment will extend move-on powers to all public places and, whilst it can be argued that this will simply move the problem to someone else's neighbourhood, it has the potential to prevent large groups gathering at all if police are alerted early enough. Exacerbating the difficult task that officers face on a daily basis is the advent of modern technology that has seen the proliferation of text messaging, which is used extensively in en masse proportions between youth to alert each other of parties. All too often, as we have witnessed on our television screens, the parties these young people advertise are private affairs to which they are not invited. In my electorate we have borne the brunt of out-of-control youth activities and parties, with some of the worst television footage highlighting our suburbs in an unsavoury light over the past 12 months.

What was most frightening about these rages was the increasing degree of rebelliousness and belligerence; the boldness of youth in linking arms and taking over a local street chanting gang war cries; girls urinating in people's front yards, abandoning all modesty. Youth incited to attack police who arrived to disperse them literally had residents in fear for their safety. I digress to say that during the last sittings I heard the honourable member for Gaven mention the 'Palmy Army' as instigators of trouble on our streets. May I plead the case of the real Palmy Army, who are not here to defend themselves, and set the record straight. The real Palmy Army is a bunch of surfers who do great things for our coastal environment and promote a healthy surfing culture. They are dismayed that the name they have long held is being tarnished by a bunch of young hooligans.

The community fear I have just mentioned is not exaggerated as I personally experienced the terror of driving through an out-of-control street party on my way home one evening in November last year. Five police cars arrived to deal with this disturbance which was upsetting residents all around the area. A call from one of the youth at the party was to attack the police. Capsicum spray was used, but still two police were injured and it took two hours to move the partygoers out of the street. Several arrests were made and at least one of the parents wanted to defend their child's actions in assaulting police, which is most disturbing. Worrying also is the number of parents who supply their underage children with alcohol and drop them off at a street address nominated as a party.

This scenario and others highlight the need for extended move-on powers and also tougher penalties for serious assault of a police officer. May I remind the House that it was this side of the House that recommended an extension of these move-on powers. Teenagers post 2000 think very differently to the generations that preceded them. Without getting a firm grasp of this thinking it is almost impossible to alter their behaviour as it stems from attitude and peer pressure. I admit to being quite surprised to learn from young people who spoke candidly about their social lives that they considered it their right to attend a party that was advertised on the net or via SMS text messages. They considered that in itself to be an invitation to an open house. My, how times have changed.

As we have seen many times on our screens, things quickly get out of hand and violence ensues when large numbers of intoxicated people converge on a suburban dwelling. More effort must be put into advertising the option of registering parties with the police initiative Party Safe Program. Those people who were aware of this service and have taken up the option have told me they held parties free from unwanted intruders.

Young people need guidance, love, boundaries and encouragement if they are to develop well physically and emotionally. Due to incidents similar to those mentioned previously and threats of vigilante groups taking the law into their own hands, I have not only hosted public forums for residents to express their anger over destructive episodes, but have engaged the young people in my electorate in separate surveys to find out what they think about recreational activities and also safe driving practices. In addition, we launched a youth community spirit award with cash prizes to recognise young people who do good deeds in our electorate. I would like to acknowledge Chris Holland and Teagan Kelly as recipients of our very first two community youth spirit awards. They are a fine example of the positive deeds that youth can do in our community.

The Palm Beach Community Consultative Committee was re-formed as a positive response to public anger over a host of activities that disturbed their peace and caused considerable damage to their property. We are working diligently with police in a whole-of-community approach in Currumbin to make our region a happier and safer place to live. Once again, we are to commend Senior Sergeant Mark Anderson as well as Senior Sergeant Purcell for the initiatives that they are putting in place to benefit our community in the long term. Understanding the way youth tick is something many parents would

love to unravel. It is not something that youth volunteer of their own accord. That is one of the reasons I am so disappointed with the Safe Celebrations report, which took the best part of the year to prepare. Considering the boasting by the government and members who are part of the task force that this was going to be an in-depth investigation into youth parties across nine areas of Queensland, the public had an expectation that the information gathered would reveal the reasons for antisocial behaviour and methods to curb it. In essence, it did not really tell us much we did not already know, nor gave us information that active local members could not have gleaned for themselves. In choosing such a narrow field as the gatecrashing of youth parties as the sole focus, a task force was, in many respects, a wasted opportunity. It is no wonder the findings of this task force, which did not include a solitary non-government member, reported that youth parties were not a serious problem with less than two per cent of calls to the Police Service being related to young people—either parties or gatherings. This information hides the reality that residents in my electorate face each and every weekend. This information is not as useful as it should have been it and it is deficient by the omission of other factors that are part and parcel of uninvited guests including, hooning, vandalism, graffiti, assault and theft.

According to the record of consultation activities on page 59 of this report titled 'Safe Celebrations', there was only public consultation on the entire southern Gold Coast. Despite the high number of incidents involving antisocial behaviour by some of our youth that were occurring in the Palm Beach-Currumbin region and despite the fact that there are two large high schools in the area, no school focus groups are registered as being engaged in the process. So to listen to members opposite crow about this report in glowing terms, it is no wonder that the general public are getting sick of the spin and grin dealt out by this government. As I have said before, this was a golden opportunity wasted.

As also mentioned earlier, this legislation does not increase the number of police officers to protect us. However, the provisions contained in this bill go a long way towards addressing the serious issues caused by those individuals who break the law and act in an unacceptable manner. It remains to be seen whether the tougher penalties and jail terms outlined here will be handed down by our judiciary.

The minister is aware of a petition, which has already been tabled in the House, that contains nearly 5,000 signatures from the Palm Beach region requesting a 24-hour police station and dedicated tactical crime unit. I know the minister will say that we already have a 24-hour station, but the public's perception of a 24-hour station is that the station is manned, and Palm Beach is not. Our station at Palm Beach shuts at 4 pm, which annoys many people and proves the point that this government is out of touch with what our community places as priorities for their safety.

Southern Alliance Task Force, under Inspector Des Lacy, that the minister has directed to our area is doing a great job and the large gatherings of youth who took over our streets last year have certainly been kept at bay. However, there is still an unacceptable degree of vandalism, underage drinking, hooning, graffiti and general abuse. Left unchecked, it has the potential to get out of control and the severity of crime will increase.

Law and order is the community's problem, and it is a cooperative approach plus abundant education and effective powers for our police that will reduce our crime. It is to be hoped these significant amendments will vastly assist this process. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (2.48 pm): I rise to briefly contribute to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill before the House today. While this bill makes a series of amendments in relation to a wide variety of policing and community safety matters, it is the amendments to the application of move-on powers which have generated considerable community debate. This is not to diminish the import or, indeed, the effect of the other amendments within the bill, but our charter as elected representatives is to be responsive to the community. In this regard, I wish to record my own views on the bill before the House.

The starting point for this debate needs clarification. A point well made by the member for Yeerongpilly was that this is not a debate about whether move-on powers should exist. The plain fact is that they already do. Today's debate is not about revisiting the enactment of move-on powers, and nor should it be. That is a debate that occurred in a time before this parliament and, frankly, has been resolved within the community. To be sure, like many debates about policy matters, it has not been concluded unanimously. Few issues in society are ever so concluded. But it has, nevertheless, been concluded definitively through the parliament.

The powers were first clarified in legislation in 1997 and since that time that legislative action has not been subject to an adverse direction from the people of Queensland. The argument some advance that these powers must be repealed is out of time and, indeed, out of synchrony with the community.

I will not often be front and centre of any perceived law and order auction, but let us be clear about what is before the House today. Stripping away the hunches, suspicions and emotions is in fact sound law. I find compelling the imperative to have uniformity in the application of police powers. This is to the benefit of the community, which can have a reasonable expectation of the operations of powers not based just on circumstance or place. Uniformity also assists police in discharging their duties. The absenting of a judgement or a decision about the situation in circumstances where these laws make a facility available provides for an enhanced ability for that situation to be handled appropriately and clearly. Certainty about application, of itself, provides a cogent reason for supporting this bill.

These laws have a wide potential. That potential I believe is indeed beneficial, while I acknowledge that much of the debate has focused on the potential for adverse application. I believe the laws instil an ability to provide for contextual policing that avoids unnecessary arrest and provides for the facility for officers to defuse rather than escalate situations. This is to the overall public benefit and to the benefit of those citizens involved in any given matter.

This is not merely a sunny disposition but reasoning relying upon, at base, a confidence in the professionalism of the Queensland Police Service. It almost goes without saying—or perhaps it should go without saying but it does, however, seem necessary to state it explicitly—that should such confidence be proved to be misplaced in this context or indeed in any other context then of course that would enliven the attention and the intervention of the government of the day. This is as true of the police as it is of any other instrument of public administration in the state.

As with all laws that pass through this chamber, the practical operation of this legislation is always dependent upon a number of subsequent variables. There is a wealth of academic literature on this point and in this regard laws relating to police powers are no different. The critical and determinative point is this: these laws are subject to ongoing oversight and review.

As such the question for legislators becomes: do we have faith in the officers of the Queensland Police Service to employ these laws as intended, lawfully and in accordance with their commission? Of course we must. If we did not, then we are in very different waters, posing questions of a much more fundamental nature which are not today warranted. Societies, through their parliaments, must always be vigilant upon the exercise of powers over liberty. There is no question in my mind that this parliament is not upholding that vigilance. These laws are appropriate and, under sober consideration, deserve the support of the House. I support the bill.

Mr CALTABIANO (Chatsworth—Lib) (2.52 pm): I am pleased to rise today to speak in the debate on the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006. This bill is a consequence of a review of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and sees some very strong yet necessary reforms of the act. There are a number of amendments proposed in the bill. However, the key amendments that the people of the Chatsworth electorate have indicated to me they are keen to see implemented include the extension of move-on powers to all public places, the additional police powers to search persons and vehicles without warrant for an offence involving wilful damage, the creation of the new offence of evading police and the amendment of section 340 of the Queensland Criminal Code to specifically address the issue of serious assault on police officers.

Across the electorate of Chatsworth there are numerous public places such as parks, shopping centres, town squares and other natural environmental areas that are frequently enjoyed by residents and community groups. However, the enjoyment of these public places has, in recent times, been marred by the presence of gangs of youths who have caused much concern for the users of these public places. Furthermore, the loitering of these youths in these public places has seen these facilities damaged. Drug and alcohol fuelled abuse and vandalism are becoming more frequent and have led to a significant threat to the community, public safety and the property and homes of residents in the vicinity of these popular public places where loitering occurs.

Parks in the area and along some of the sections of the Bulimba Creek network are prominent examples of where youths go to hang out with their friends and where excessive consumption of drugs and alcohol can occur. This is particularly the case for those in the vicinity of the Carindale Shopping Centre. Whilst those people are doing the wrong thing the public is unable to access these parks.

Often when they leave, litter is left lying around and acts of vandalism to play equipment, park furniture and the natural environment are evidence of their visit. The excessive noise from youths lingering in these park areas, especially at night, causes significant disruption to residents in the area. Frequently police will be called to the scene, although, by virtue of it being a public place, unless a crime is in the process of being conducted they have no power to deal with these youths other than to ask them to be quiet.

Shopping centres in Belmont, Tingalpa and the town square at Carindale Shopping Centre are also public places where loitering and vandalism frequently occur. The town square at Carindale has the potential to be particularly affected by this problem. Carindale town square is the home of numerous restaurants and many community events. Frequently the intoxicated few who are loud, obnoxious and abusive have by their presence spoilt the enjoyment of those in these restaurants and at these events. To date the police have been unable to do anything about them.

Move-on powers will be of great benefit to this and other areas in the Chatsworth electorate. These new powers for police will allow them move-on directions for people who are a threat or who are intimidating members of the public. These powers represent the right of all Queenslanders to use public places as areas for safe recreation. The incidence of vandalism would also be decreased with gangs who are causing trouble being moved on or removed before they have the time to be destructive.

Further amendments to this bill will also see that, in a case where the police may have a reasonable suspicion that a person has committed an act of wilful damage such as graffiti or some other form of vandalism, they can, without a warrant, search that person or that vehicle for evidence of the crime. If evidence of a crime is found the police will be able to seize this evidence to secure a prosecution. Presently police require a search warrant to search a suspect but the time it takes to obtain this warrant frequently sees the evidence of the crime disposed of.

This extended search power for police will increase the rate of arrests for wilful damage to business properties, homes and public places and also act as a deterrent to potential vandals. Arguments have been made that the rights of individuals must be preserved and the rights of these suspected vandals are going to be violated by the additional police power. It must be remembered, though, that vandals are criminals. Graffiti on a fence and damage to people's cars, such as scratching a key along the car or smashing windows, are unacceptable. A strong message that our Police Service now has the power to act is being sent out to the whole community. In the interests of public safety and in the interests of keeping our suburbs, public places and private property in good repair and preserving what makes these communities livable, these police powers are absolutely necessary.

Another amendment contained in this bill that will have a significant effect on the livability of many communities is the evade-police offence which will have the additional benefit of reducing hooning in our suburbs. The new evade-police offence is to reduce high-speed pursuits by police that result from a person speeding away from police to avoid being charged with an offence. The amendments to the act will make it a crime to try to avoid police by failing to stop a vehicle or accelerating away when directed to stop by a police officer.

This new offence will see the driver of the vehicle liable to a penalty of $14,000 or three years imprisonment and for a first offence the impoundment of their vehicle for three months. For a subsequent offence of evading police the offender will be required to forfeit their vehicle to the state. Frequently, the people involved in hooning in our suburbs are also the people involved in high-speed police chases. Through this strong evade-police offence our suburbs will hopefully be safer places. Streets in Wakerley, Tingalpa and Carindale where hooning and high-speed, irresponsible driving are tending to be greater problems may experience the decreased presence of hoons as a flow-on effect of this new legislation.

Involvement in a high-speed chase is a very dangerous part of a police officer's job. The lives of officers are jeopardised every time they must become involved in such a chase. Furthermore, innocent bystanders who simply happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time also have their lives jeopardised by these high-speed chases. It is hoped that this bill will result in a reduction of the number of road injuries and fatalities experienced in Queensland every year. Moreover, it is hoped that this tough new legislation will see a decrease in the incidence of high-speed chases as potential offenders realise that they will be facing not only a massive fine but also the loss of their vehicle should they attempt to evade police by failing to stop their vehicle when instructed.

Police, in addition to putting their lives at risk in high-speed chases and dangerous situations, are often subject to appalling behaviour and serious assault by offenders in an attempt to resist arrest or the actions of police. Incidents of police being spat on, bitten or having bodily fluids thrown at them are becoming increasingly common. People who commit these disgusting acts of abuse are now subject to much harsher penalties. Police who are subject to such behaviour are not only suffering abuse at the hands of criminals, but in this day and age their health is being put at serious risk. Hepatitis and HIV-AIDS are diseases that are spread by bodily fluids. Being spat on, bitten or having bodily fluids thrown at them means police officers could be seriously debilitated or their health permanently harmed. This sort of assault and abuse of police officers is completely unacceptable and totally unwarranted. For this reason the Criminal Code of Queensland has been amended to address specifically this issue and to make the crime punishable by seven years imprisonment.

Despite the strong police powers and significantly tougher penalties for some offences, the only risk with this bill is making the provisions effective and workable in our suburbs. The police will need resources to do their job and to enforce these new laws. In the electorate of Chatsworth, there is not even a standard operational police station in the whole electorate. Matters of law and order in the electorate are attended by police from surrounding stations, particularly from Camp Hill Police Station—a fine group of officers ably led by Senior Sergeant Vic Tollenaere.

One of the most important things for my local community is the provision of emergency service facilities. The need for a police station to service the growing areas of Carindale, Carina Heights, Carina, Chandler, Belmont, Wakerley and Tingalpa is absolutely necessary. In addition to this need, there is also a real need for ambulance and fire services in these areas. The logical approach to the provision of these fundamental emergency services is an integrated, 24-hour emergency service centre. For many years I have been lobbying for—and I am on record as supporting—infrastructure development in my local community and advocating for an integrated emergency service centre for the south-eastern suburbs of Brisbane.

The state government has the capability to provide such an integrated emergency service centre. It has the land, which is several hectares at the central location of Narracott Street, Carina, behind the current Police Citizens Youth Club and adjacent to Old Cleveland Road and Creek Road, two of the major arterial roads that go through these suburbs. Since my election many families in the Chatsworth electorate have contacted me about the issue of the safety and security of their loved ones, friends and neighbours. This bill goes some of the way towards giving my local police officers the means by which to do their jobs better. I will continue to work hard to deliver a new, state-of-the-art, 24-hour emergency service centre on the state owned land at the corner of Old Cleveland Road and Creek Road as I strongly believe that this is the best location for such a facility. It will deliver a much higher level of protection for my local community.

As a local family man who has built a home and brought up his children in the area, I share the concerns of my local residents about their families' safety and security. I will continue to advocate strongly for a greater police presence in the neighbourhoods of my electorate, ambulance services that are close by and fire services that are responsive.

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (3.01 pm): I rise to speak to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill. In doing so, I would like to place on the record my appreciation of the police officers in the electorate of Gladstone. Whilst we need to increase police officer numbers, the officers who work in my electorate work tirelessly to provide a safe environment for the residents. Tannum Sands-Boyne Island is a growing area. Although the police station there has been allocated some additional resources, it needs to be a 24-hour station. The area is quite a reasonable distance from Gladstone. At night-time, the residents of that area have to rely on police officers from Gladstone to come to them to attend to disturbances or worse. That is unacceptable. So I again place on the record the need for the Tannum Sands-Boyne Island area to have that 24-hour police service.

This legislation makes a number of amendments that will impinge upon the liberties and freedoms of individuals. I say 'individuals' in a generic sense; I am not referring just to those who commit criminal acts. It is very easy for us to say that the only ones who need to be concerned about this legislation are the criminals. The fact is that with every diminution of our freedoms, a little of our enjoyment and quality of life is undermined. Having said that, it must be recognised that there is that percentage of people in the community who feel no obligation to think about other people. Indeed, they feel no obligation to be constrained by the laws of our country. Because of those people, it is essential that there be sufficient policing powers so that the rest of the people in the community can live in a safe environment.

This bill makes amendments to allow the searching of persons and vehicles without warrants. That is an infringement on our rights. I hope that a clear and transparent obligation of reasonable suspicion is maintained so that these powers cannot be undermined over time.

I believe that the majority of people would welcome the move-on powers, which have been discussed by other speakers. I do not think that anybody enjoys going to a shopping centre and feeling insecure when they are withdrawing funds from an ATM when there are groups of people standing nearby. Therefore, move-on powers have been important in engendering in people a heightened sense of safety and security.

However, from the feedback that I have received I understand that the majority of people believe that the move-on powers affect young people. I would like to put on the record the fact that we have to watch what we are doing with our young ones. When I was a kid—and a few other members are of the same vintage—we had an incredible amount of freedom. When we were young, we could go out and enjoy ourselves. Mum would say, 'Come back for lunch', or, 'Come back for dinner. Don't be out after dark or you'll be in trouble.' Our parents could happily leave us out there to have fun. Today, the young ones do not have that privilege. We have to watch them like hawks, because there are those in our community who, given the opportunity, will harm them. As our young people head into their teenage years, more and more we are constraining their options in terms of enjoyment.

Inherently, kids have not changed. Overwhelmingly, the young blokes are petrolheads. They like to have somewhere where they can ride motorbikes or do wheelies in a car. Those options are being encroached upon. I am not saying that these young people should do that on the roads; they should not. But they usually find some paddock somewhere where they can let their hair down. Their ability to be able to do that is diminishing all the time—and more so if they live in a city area. So the kids are congregating more and more in urban areas—in places such as shopping centres—and they are congregating in places that some in the community deem unacceptable. These proposed move-on powers will once again have the potential to diminish the options that young people, who are responsible, would like to have available to them.

I am not saying that all police officers are going to move all groups of young people on. I am not implying that. I just think that as a guiding principle we have to remember that these kids have to have places where they can get together as a group for healthy enjoyment. All of those options should not be removed.

There are those in the community who love Terry O'Gorman and there are those who hate him. In early May he wrote an article in relation to the minister's proposed move-on powers that appeared in the *Courier-Mail*. It states—

At the moment, move-on powers apply to specific designated areas such as schools, ATM machines and the like. As well, local councils throughout the state are able to apply for areas within a given local government boundary to be declared a move-on zone.

We accept that move-on powers have a role to play in dealing with the gatecrashing of teenage parties and to deal with groups outside licensed premises who are acting aggressively.

…

Frontline legal aid organisations increasingly are getting complaints that the young, the black, the homeless and otherwise marginalised Queenslanders are being given move-on directions in circumstances where a direction is unjustified.

…

The problem with a move-on direction which is given in unjustified circumstances by a police officer is that the direction is unchallengable. There is no court that a person who is the subject of an unjustified move-on power can go to in order to complain about the fact that the move-on direction was unjustified, arbitrary or discriminatory.

The only way a move-on direction can be challenged is if the person so directed chooses to disobey the direction and is then arrested for failure to comply with a move-on direction. Understandably, most people who might wish to challenge an unjustified or arbitrary move-on direction are not prepared to go the extra step of being arrested for failing to obey the direction simply for the purpose of demonstrating that it is an abuse of police power.

Terry O'Gorman goes on to state—

The Police Minister (Judy Spence) would say that there are adequate protections against abuse of move-on directions. We say that in reality there are no protections against such abuse.

I would be interested in the minister's response to the concerns raised by Mr O'Gorman because in many circumstances there is an opportunity to appeal and challenge the application of the law. Whilst it could be said that these groups or kids who are moved on can go somewhere else to enjoy themselves, there are not always options for them.

Young people gatecrashing—or older people gatecrashing for that matter—family parties is unacceptable. That behaviour has become quite destructive and serious injuries have occurred. Police have to have a range of tools to do their job of protecting the community. But we constantly seem to be eroding the few freedoms that people have, particularly those of young people in terms of enjoying their teenage years.

There are further powers in relation to covert search warrants and body searches. At this point I would like to put on the record my thanks and appreciation to the minister for the visit to the women's prison yesterday—thankfully I was allowed out—and also for her ministerial officer, Geoff, who was made available. It was very informative, and the deputy manager and the staff were very helpful. That prison—not that I want too much experience with prisons—appears to be very well run and very tidy. The women who have to be accommodated in that unit have some quite challenging behaviours and problems, and I believe the officers showed a high level of compassion, concern and care for the pain that those women are experiencing.

We have recently had domestic violence week. The Gladstone electorate, as other electorates did, held a memorial service for those who have been killed as a result of domestic violence and those who have ongoing problems because of domestic violence. One of the signs that was put up in my electorate stated, 'Domestic violence hurts everyone.' Another stated, 'Domestic violence kills'. A lady who attended the domestic violence day wrote a poem. With members' forebearance, I would like to read it into the record because she is a survivor of domestic violence and she has done it very tough. She brought her portfolio of poetry in and offered for me to read some of the others, but I will just read this one. Her name is Donna Whitfield. Her poem reads—

When you think of domestic violence
What's the first thing on your mind?
A man and a woman, embroiled in fury
It's a war of another kind.
As in every war, there are casualties
The innocents caught in between
Life long scars, obscure to the eye
Lay deep, and remain unseen.
As a child, I remember it very well.
Huddled, protecting my brothers
My little body, a guarded shield
From my battling dad and mother.
Years went by and the cycle turned
The huddling children were mine
I'm the mother who tried to protect them
By putting myself on the line.
So you see, this vicious cycle
Of unacceptable violence and pain
Is a boundary that never should have been crossed

And should never happen again.
But how do we stop it you ask me.
I don't know that you can
All I know is that God intended
Love between woman and man.

I commend Donna. She was a wonderful contributor to the day and an encouragement to the others who were there either on the day or talking subsequently. There is light at the end of the tunnel. The hard decision might be the one that says, 'I'm going. I'm leaving this relationship,' but there is support and people who love and care for them outside of that relationship.

I commend the women who operate the women's shelter, Louise Lodge. They were the major organisers for domestic violence day. It was well attended. Police Inspector Rowan Bond attended and spoke. It was a day to remind people of the blackness of domestic violence.

There are a number of provisions in the bill, as I said earlier, for strip searches. The minister is aware of my concern in relation to the overuse of strip searching. I ask that a monitoring role be implemented with the increase in powers not only for strip searching but for modified searches in watch-houses et cetera to ensure that those tools that are intended for good purposes are not overly used.

The bill allows for the cost recovery of holding costs when an animal is held by the commissioner as evidence. The commissioner has the ability to require the owner of the animal to pay the costs of keeping the animal for the trial. I want to check with the minister what provisions have been made in relation to court delays that are outside the control of either the prosecuting officers or the control of the person who owns the animal. If the person who owns the animal is the perpetrator, it is a moot argument. But a third party might be asked to pay holding costs for an animal over a protracted period of time. Is anything written in the regulations or has the minister given any consideration to protracted delays? I am not saying this to be critical of the minister, but we have heard a lot about delays with the John Tonge Centre and other processing delays within the legal service. If the owner of the animal is involved as a third party, perhaps it is unrealistic and inappropriate to ask them to pay exorbitant holding costs.

In relation to drug kitchens—I am not sure what the proper term for them is—where illicit drugs are cooked up, the powers to dismantle them and to seize equipment in those circumstances are welcome. The community in general is astounded at the growth in illicit drug production. I think it has to be recognised that it is not only the police who are affected when those kitchens are identified. If these kitchens are in a home in suburbia, neighbours surrounding that home are placed at risk because of the chemicals that they stockpile and subsequently use. There are other service providers who are also affected, such as electricians who are called out to disconnect power. In a lot of those illicit kitchens, irrespective of what the drug is—even in marijuana production—the perpetrators create all sorts of booby traps in terms of not only protecting their crop but also making sure they do not leave too many witnesses around if things go wrong. I think it needs to be recognised that it is not just police who are put at risk; it is neighbours and other service providers, such as electricians, who are the front-line response in those circumstances and deserve not only our protection but also our thanks and appreciation.

I have a question about the provision relating to evading police that I seek the minister's response to. The bill states—

Drivers of motor vehicles sometimes fail to stop when directed to do so by a police officer using a police service motor vehicle to attempt to intercept another motor vehicle when the police officer reasonably believes the driver, or someone else in the other motor vehicle, is committing or has committed an offence.

A police motor vehicle could be marked or unmarked. I seek the minister's response to circumstances that I know have occurred when an unmarked police vehicle has required a woman alone to stop at night and she may refuse to do that. It is a real situation. There are circumstances when people will indicate to a woman on their own that she needs to pull over. Most women now would say point blank that they would avoid doing that. They would drive to a garage or to somewhere safe for that to occur. I wonder whether the minister will give protection in those circumstances so that a reasonable defence for not pulling over will be that the person in the vehicle, particularly a woman alone, failed to pull over in an isolated area because she was afraid for her own safety, particularly if pulled over by unmarked police vehicles, and that this evasion of police or failing to stop in the circumstances will be taken into account before charges are laid.

There are changes to the Crime and Misconduct Act in relation to assumed identities. Without going into detail, I believe that these protections are important. I also believe that police officers and CMC officers who assume these identities in the pursuit of their duties and responsibilities should have the appropriate support, both psychological and other, and monitoring in terms of any acquired addictions or any other acquired emotional problems. The reality of that type of crime fighting is that people must immerse themselves into the criminal situation in which they find themselves in order to gather evidence. It is incumbent on the Police Service, the CMC and other service providers to ensure that officers who assume an identity for that purpose are given the appropriate psychological support, counselling and assistance.

This legislation contains very intrusive powers. It is important that those intrusive powers are balanced with accountability, transparency and a review mechanism to ensure that those powers are not abused. Whilst I support the bill and the continuing need to protect our community, it is important that we have appeal mechanisms and accountability provisions. I look forward to the minister's comments.

Mrs DESLEY SCOTT (Woodridge—ALP) (3.20 pm): It is a pleasure to speak today to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill. This bill gives further powers to police to carry out their sometimes very difficult and onerous duties. Also, it offers them further protection as they may face many dangerous circumstances during the regular course of their work.

It is a sad commentary on today's world that some people are quite prepared to risk their own lives, as well as the lives of members of the general public and our police officers. This legislation clearly states that the government is not prepared to allow reckless drivers or criminals with a grudge against police to cause injuries and possibly death. Those who take responsibility for protecting us and enforcing our laws should, rightly, expect our laws to offer them as much protection as is humanly possible.

We are all too familiar with news stories of criminals who flee a crime scene, taking off in a vehicle—likely as not a stolen vehicle—with police in hot pursuit. While there has recently been a concerted effort to avoid dangerous pursuits, this legislation offers additional safeguards and guidelines.

Once a vehicle is identified as being used to escape from the scene of a crime or as stolen or of interest to police, the police activate their siren and lights. If the vehicle fails to stop, it will be considered an offence. If there are safety considerations, the police may opt to take the registration number of the vehicle and to interview the driver or owner, when located. Should the owner of the vehicle not have been the driver at the time, it is their responsibility to name the driver, unless of course the vehicle has been stolen.

The penalty for evading police will be a possible penalty of 200 points or three years imprisonment for a first offence, or the seizure of the vehicle for a period of three months. Should a second offence occur, the vehicle will be impounded and not returned to the owner. Adequate safeguards have been provided for a driver who is unaware of the police vehicle and for an owner who is unaware that their vehicle has been involved in the commission of a crime. Each case will be considered on its merits. Police will decide when it is important, in order to protect the public, that a pursuit continue.

An assault against a police officer is a very serious offence. This legislation has been drafted to protect police from such despicable acts as spitting, biting or the throwing of bodily fluids. As many serious, life-threatening and contagious diseases can be transmitted through bodily fluids, this behaviour constitutes a very serious crime with the possibility of serious outcomes for the victim. As an acknowledgement of the serious nature of this offence, the extreme stress to the victim and the possible dreadful outcome, a period of seven years imprisonment may be imposed. I applaud these measures that deal with these very deliberate and disgusting acts.

Domestic and family violence is a sad indictment on just how precarious relationships can be. In the one place which should be a safe and peaceful refuge—the family home—we very often see acts of violence and terrible deprivation and suffering. Domestic violence can take up a great deal of police time, particularly when one considers that a serious case may take a great deal of negotiation and interviewing of the two parties concerned. This legislation will allow police to circumvent the process and commence an application by a notice to appear. Should the perpetrator require a cooling-off period, a holding cell at the local police station may be used to save the time needed to transport the person to the watch-house.

Recently, the police minister outlined the success of the Queensland Police Service in disrupting the production and distribution of drugs in this state. Drugs are a blight on society. They have ruined countless lives, caused a huge drain on our health and mental health services and, in extreme cases, caused death.

Those who are involved in dealing out this misery need to feel the full force of the law. However, to produce amphetamines the person involved needs access to pseudoephedrine. This legislation allows police to inspect the register held by a pharmacist and to compare it with their stock, thus identifying any pharmacist who is supplying large quantities for the illicit drug trade.

A further provision will make it a crime not to divulge a password or encryption code when police officers require access to electronic equipment such as computers, mobile phones et cetera when investigating crimes such as paedophilia, stalking, drug-trafficking or identity fraud. Criminals are using more and more sophisticated methods. We must ensure that police are given the equipment and the legislative powers to apprehend those who are intent on breaking the law.

Before resuming my seat, I commend our Police Service for its vigilance and its efforts in protecting our community. In my own area, I am aware that the fight against crime is always ongoing. Our figures show that we are winning, but there is more to be done. Indications are that many of our crime statistics are on the way down. However, the work against illicit drugs continues.

I am aware of many successes in this area. I commend the Logan police district for its ongoing support of our community and its constant fight against crime. I thank Inspector Maurie Alker for his considerable contribution whilst in Logan. Sadly, he is moving on. He will be missed a great deal. During his time at Logan Central, many innovative programs have been implemented and he has taken on a very pivotal role in these. I wish him well. Last weekend, Maurie attended a combined Neighbourhood Watch picnic in the park, which provided our volunteers with an opportunity to thank him for his work.

In conclusion, I thank the minister and those who have worked on this legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr McARDLE (Caloundra—Lib) (3.28 pm): It gives me pleasure today to rise to speak to this bill and to applaud the government for bringing it before the House. I think that every person in this chamber and, in fact, every member of the community understands the importance of police officers—those on the street and those behind the scenes in the stations. They are an integral part of our society and form part of the bulwark against the evil that can at times interrupt the peaceful lives of members of the community.

I will start by making a few comments with regard to domestic violence and the provisions within the bill concerning it. In my opinion, domestic violence is one of the most insidious crimes in our society. For many years, police have been concerned that although they have a role in stopping domestic violence or at least hindering it, they spend many hours on paperwork as a consequence of that involvement. Many police have commented to me that up to four hours have been lost at a time in paperwork at watch-houses and elsewhere as a result of them attending a residence. Of course, that means not just one police officer but two who are down and out of service, and a motor vehicle as well in many cases.

Domestic violence occurs predominantly on Friday nights, Saturdays and Sundays, which is also the same time that antisocial behaviour reaches its peak. So at a time when the community does need police officers in numbers we have an upsurgeance of domestic violence and those same officers are taken from other duties that they could be performing. In that regard, this bill provides relief at least in relation to certain work that the police are required to undertake. An application can now be commenced by a notice to appear with what are, in essence, bail terms imposed or included thereon.

The police are also very mindful that the predominance of homicides in this state derive from domestic violence incidents. They are ever watchful that the role that they play in the domestic violence arena is one of extreme caution in that they do deter people from taking the ultimate step of taking the life of a spouse or a partner or some other third person.

On 5 May I had the opportunity to attend a domestic violence forum in Caloundra at which the guest speakers included magistrate Di Fingleton and Zoe Rathus, the woman who was the driving force behind the Caxton Street Legal Service. Both women delivered excellent speeches on the role that they saw in the community for the courts and also for academia with regard to domestic violence and how we can grow and attempt to tackle the issues that are the root cause of that domestic violence and the consequences of it.

It may now well be time for Queensland to consider family violence courts or domestic violence courts as a specialty area. That is not to say that they can happen, but certainly I feel that we have now reached a point in our jurisdictional growth where we need to consider whether those courts are of use in Queensland and also whether or not we have the expertise and capital funds available to make them work.

An excellent paper on that exact issue is the Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Issues Paper No. 10 by Julie Stewart who, in a fairly detailed document, goes through whether or not specialist family violence courts within the Australian jurisdiction and context are viable. She comes to the conclusion that they are, provided a number of initial hurdles are overcome. I suspect it is something that the Queensland government is looking at and it is certainly worthwhile doing that in the future. If we are going to have an impact upon the effects of domestic violence—not just on the perpetrator and the victim but also on the children—we may need to look at different methods of approaching the issue of domestic violence, perhaps akin to how the drug courts look at drug addiction and how they assist all those involved in that process to readjust their lives and to become better and more informed members of society.

The issue of police numbers generally across the Sunshine Coast has been a passion of mine for some time. The population growth in that region is significant. When one takes into account the Gold Coast, Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast, we have three of the top 10 fastest growing areas in Australia. With that population growth, of course, comes an increase in tourism. It also brings with it more venues such as nightclubs and more alcohol being consumed, which then, unfortunately in today's society, generates into more trouble on the streets, petty crime, hooliganism, hooning and other antisocial behaviours. Caloundra is not unique in that regard.

Recently there was a sale of a Kings Beach property owned by the Queensland police which was the former police station for Caloundra and a police house. That property sold for $1.25 million. I would ask the minister to address in her closing remarks whether or not those funds will be utilised for the benefit of the Caloundra policing district or somewhere else outside of that region.

Ms Spence: It has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr McARDLE: As long as the minister can address it, I will be happy.

Ms Spence: I am happy to, but not in this context.

Mr McARDLE: I thank the minister very much.

The bill goes on to deal with other matters incorporating evading police officers in vehicles. That is very much an admirable provision in the bill. It does, of course, provide the police with a mechanism to protect not only themselves but also other members of the public. I believe it is a provision that will benefit the public at large. No-one likes to see or hear of people who are innocent bystanders or people in a motor vehicle being struck and killed by a vehicle speeding through a red light. This provision will provide the protection that people need to go about their daily lives. It will provide the police with the mechanism to take the action that is required to protect all members of society.

Protecting police against people spitting and other such action, is, of course, long overdue. As I have said on many occasions in the past, police officers are men and women who are greatly respected but, in my opinion, often misunderstood until such time as we need to call upon their services for our own protection and safety. The police put their lives at risk every single day of the week. When they go to a front door and knock on it they simply do not know whether they are going to get a shotgun blast or a welcome from the occupant. The police protection provisions contained in this bill are long overdue and certainly will provide a deterrent to those who would engage in such antisocial behaviour against police officers.

Another provision that is to be applauded is the concept of using civilians to do police chores and, in this case, using civilians in the watch-house. This, of course, allows more police officers to be released into the mainstream of society to do in essence what their primary function is—that is, to police and protect those in society from the few who wish to cause them harm.

The police need extensive police phone tapping powers if they are going to deal with modern criminals. We have heard here today that there are many criminals who act with very sophisticated materials and technologies. If we are going to capture those criminals and bring them to justice then the police certainly need to be equally well informed and resourced. One way of doing that is, of course, phone tapping.

I also commend the Neighbourhood Watches in the Caloundra region. Neighbourhood Watches perform a very important and integral role with regard to policing in this state. They are, in fact, an adjunct to police officers for the very simple reason that people watch over their neighbours; they provide the police with an extra set of eyes and ears.

Finally, I compliment the police officers across the Sunshine Coast and, in particular, Caloundra for the work that they do under very trying and extreme circumstances. These police are few in number, greatly underresourced and are in need of assistance from this government so that they can deal with the needs and necessities of a growing population. Unless they get that financial backing and support, their job will become more and more difficult. With those few words I commend the bill.

Mr NUTTALL (Sandgate—ALP) (3.38 pm): My comments today in relation to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006 relate in particular to clauses 19 and 21 of the bill which deal with the impounding and forfeiture of noisy motorbikes. This has been a very problematic issue in my electorate where we have had young people in particular using trail bikes on government land. Despite our best efforts we continue to have this problem.

I am pleased to say that some of the local police officers have been working with my office and other members of the community to try to resolve the problem of these bikes creating quite a bit of noise and obviously a nuisance to people who reside near the vacant land. I am not one who is critical of young people wanting to ride trail bikes. By all means, I think it is a great sport. For those young people who want to ride and improve their skills in this sport, I think that is a wonderful thing. However, there is a place for it to be done and it is certainly not near suburban neighbourhoods. What this bill does, particularly those clauses, is allow the police to impound those bikes and in certain circumstances those bikes can be forfeited. This enables police to deal with an issue very quickly and very promptly. It is something that will be extremely welcome in my electorate.

There are a number of other provisions in the bill relating to a whole range of police powers which other members have covered. In my view, it is important that we give police the tools to do the job but, by the same token, we have to remain ever vigilant to ensure that those powers are not abused. We have come a long way with a police force that, in my view, is nothing like the police force of 25-odd years ago in this state, where the then government of the day—now the opposition—used the police force to

bludgeon the citizens of this state in a number of ways. We saw that with street marches here in Brisbane, where the police were used as a tool of the government to impose the will of the government of the day. I hope those days never, ever reappear in this state.

While it is important to give police the powers needed to do their job, the bill also has in its title 'police powers and responsibilities'. I am pleased to see that in the bill, because the Ethical Standards Unit within the police force plays a significant role in ensuring that our police officers to the best of their ability perform their duties properly and certainly do not abuse the powers that they have. That is always a danger. We do get the odd bad police officer, but we do have a safety mechanism to ensure that the powers and responsibilities of police officers are used properly.

The police officers in my electorate work very hard, particularly in the area of community policing. Our crime rates compared to other parts of the state are very low. We do not have the problems that a lot of other areas have with gangs, arson at our schools and wanton vandalism. While we have minor outbreaks, in the main the police officers in my electorate work very hard with the community to ensure that we have a safe community to live in. They are to be complimented for that.

Whenever I have needed to talk with my local police officers, they have been only too willing to sit down with me and talk through the issues of the day. This bill, which is fairly extensive in terms of the powers that we are giving to police, will in my view, I hope, help our citizens in Queensland to feel safe in the knowledge that our police have the powers to deal with issues very quickly.

It is unfortunate that we have people in our society who think that they are above the law. I know that police in the past have been very frustrated in trying to deal with those persons. This bill will give police the powers to deal with those issues quickly and take away the liberties of those people who choose to break the law. As I said, I am particularly pleased to see that this bill will address the problem of noisy motorbikes.

Mr MESSENGER (Burnett—NPA) (3.44 pm): I, like my conservative colleagues, am happy to support the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006, because it will ultimately provide greater legislative protection for our very hardworking police officers, who daily risk their lives so that we might have a chance of living a safe and peaceful life. This is wide-ranging, comprehensive legislation. It is more than 150 pages in length and amends a number of significant areas of law enforcement including police move-on powers, impounding motor vehicles, search warrants, domestic violence which increases police discretionary powers to cool-off provisions, powers relating to persons in custody, reporting to the watch-house, dealing with controlled drugs, dealing with dangerous drugs, evidentiary provisions, provisions about evading police officers or car chases, impounding those cars and costs orders if a child is found guilty of evasion. The list is very comprehensive.

I understand that many people who join the police force do so out of a sense of vocation rather than occupation and are highly motivated individuals who have a strong love of Queensland community and families. So it is only right and proper that, with increasing physical risks to our police officers—not to mention mental risks—from transmissible diseases caused by biting and spitting and exposure of officers to offenders' bodily fluids, this House is presented with legislation which is increasing the penalties against people who are stupid, or bloody-minded, enough to assault our police officers.

I have not forgotten the mental anguish experienced by police officers who are waiting for medical test results after being assaulted in the course of their duties. Clause 89 of this legislation amends section 340 of the Criminal Code by inserting a new clause, section 340(2A). There is no doubt that assaults against police are increasing. Anecdotal evidence proves it and Parliamentary Library research shows a number of recent media articles. An article which best sums up this issue was published in the *Courier-Mail* on 27 October last year. It is titled 'Violence against police on the rise'. The figures show that seven police officers are assaulted on the job every day across Queensland. I was quite surprised to think that that many police officers were assaulted. The article goes on to say that in hot spots like the Brisbane CBD and Fortitude Valley violence against police has risen significantly in the past year. The minister herself said that she was alarmed at the escalating violence and warned drunk and violent revellers that anyone who fought police would end up in the watch-house. The minister also said that preliminary data revealed that 2,500 police were assaulted during 2004-05 at an average of nearly seven officers a day. More than 750 of these incidents were serious assaults and 73 officers were the victims of assaults occasioning bodily harm.

It is a very comprehensive article, and I would recommend it to anyone who has an interest in this area. In considering the number of assaults against police, we must look beyond the obvious and maybe drill a little deeper into the issue, which I guess can be summed up as a general lack of respect for authority. It is very easy to ask the question: why is there a lack of respect for authority and how can we reduce the number of assaults against police—indeed, assaults against people such as domestic violence? It is a little harder to supply a definitive answer and a solution, although I strongly suspect that the answer to this question lies in the education of our children and not just in the pages of this legislation before the House.

While I welcome the legislation increasing the legislative protection for police, I will, however, add this cautionary observation: the best strategy for the protection of our police is a comprehensive increase in our police numbers and resources. Page 144 of the Police Statistical Review for 2004-05 shows some very relevant and pertinent figures. In Bundaberg there is an estimated population of around 87,000. As of June 2005, for those 87,000 people there were 132 police officers plus 37 staff members. There were 840 reported offences against the person, 3,665 reported offences against property and 3,153 other offences reported. That comes to a total of 7,648 crimes reported in the Bundaberg-Burnett region.

Interestingly, it appears that the Bundaberg district has lost five full-time police officers. Comparing the 2004-05 figures with the 2003-04 figures, the police numbers were reduced from 137 to 132. The figures show that the police-to-population ratio is now 1 to 663. That is the second worst in the north coast region. I note that Gympie, with an estimated population of 70,000, actually has more police numbers than Bundaberg but with less crime. Bundaberg police should receive a helping hand from the state government as far as extra resources are concerned.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Fouras): Order! I suggest the member gets back to police powers.

Mr MESSENGER: Speaking to the police powers and responsibilities legislation, I would also like to canvass a local situation in relation to the South Kolan Police Station. I can remember that I left South Kolan as a 15-year-old and when I came back it was known as South Columbia because of the huge increase in the prevalence of illicit drugs.

Ms Spence: That is not relevant to this legislation. Our speakers have been relevant and you are just raving on about things that have nothing to do with this legislation.

Mr MESSENGER: I would think that illicit drug production is addressed in this legislation, Minister. We need to make every effort to make it comfortable for our police officers to perform their duties. In that regard, I would echo Mayor Duffy's call for an extra house to be supplied to the police station in South Kolan.

Another pertinent and relevant issue relates to Moore Park. Members of the Moore Park Beach Community Association have alerted me to a serious law and order issue. Russell Stewart, the vice-president of the Moore Park Beach Community Association, has written me a letter asking me to put his association's concerns before the police minister. The letter states—

Our Recent Community Survey showed police presence to be the main concern ie. Lack of frequent police patrols, no permanent police presence and poor response times (up to 2 hours) to reported criminal incidents.

Mr O'BRIEN: I rise to a point of order. Standing order 236—relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member for Burnett to come back to police powers—not the numbers and not the housing; it is police powers and responsibilities that we are debating.

Mr MESSENGER: I welcome your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would like to direct my comments to illicit drug activity, which of course is addressed in this legislation. Mr Stewart says in his letter—

Our principal concern is the apparent illicit drug activity here. Following please find a list of addresses where this is believed to be occurring and a list of car registrations seen coming and going to these addresses.

In order to protect the identity, the basic civil rights and the presumption of innocence of those residents and motorists mentioned in this letter, I will not table the complete letter; I will table a censored copy from the Moore Park Beach Community Association. I will, however, pass on those censored details in confidence to the police minister and I ask that she investigate as soon as possible these serious accusations. The vice-president of the Moore Park Beach Community Association also writes—

Mr Reeves: When did you get this?

Mr MESSENGER: I think it was received in my office on the 19th of this month—quite recently. The vice-president states—

Residents adjacent to the suspected drug houses are frightened therefore our Committee is hoping you can get some action on this problem.

I also ask the police minister to provide my community of Moore Park and, indeed, Burnett and Bundaberg with action and extra resources.

Speaking to the issue of illicit drug use mentioned in the police powers and responsibilities legislation 2006, the manufacture of illegal drugs and the sale of pseudoephedrine, or speed, is addressed in this legislation. As we have heard, it is a scourge on our society. Too much of this drug is being consumed in our modern society with the obvious serious and tragic flow-on effects: ruined health, antisocial behaviour, an increase in assaults for the police and breakdown of relationships and families in society in general. One of the main culprits in the manufacture and distribution of illicit drugs as far as I have been made aware is outlawed bikie gangs and ethnic gangs. I ask the minister to

redouble her efforts in cracking down on these thugs. Queensland streets and schools are now becoming the battlegrounds for renewed gang activity, and the government's attitude of denial, of pretending this is not happening, is not helping the problem.

Tabled paper: Letter dated 18 May 2006 from Russell Stewart to Mr Messenger relating to police presence in the Moore Park area

Mr TERRY SULLIVAN (Stafford—ALP) (3.55 pm): In rising to speak to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill, I acknowledge that policing is a difficult task and there has to be a balance achieved between the rights of individuals and peace and good behaviour for the general public.

My office has a very good relationship with the police at the Stafford Police Station, and I thank the minister for her action in the past to get the new police station. Gradually it is increasing in numbers and in equipment. I know that the senior sergeant, Anthony Graham, is very pleased with what is happening there. It is much more accessible for local residents in the area. We thank the minister for that.

I have been present on three previous occasions when move-on powers have been debated in this House: in 1997 under Minister Russell Cooper, in the 1998 bill introduced by Minister Barton and then the amendments in the year 2000. While the legislation at those times received broad support in the House, there were still a number of MPs who expressed reservations about certain aspects of the move-on powers. There was no unanimous conclusion to that ongoing debate. In many ways the broadening of the move-on powers makes sense. It is somewhat incongruous that a law should apply to one park or one esplanade in one city but not to similar places in the next city. In that regard, the extension of the powers makes eminent sense.

With regard to the move-on powers, I have been approached by constituents, branch members and some community groups who expressed their reservations or, in some cases, their opposition to the extension of those powers. They say that one of the basic freedoms we have is to move around freely in public places. However, they acknowledge that, because other people interfere with the free movement of others, it has been deemed appropriate to introduce limitations as expressed through the move-on powers.

To maintain a balance, certain safeguards have been put in place. This has been debated on the three previous occasions that I have heard this issue discussed in this chamber. The CMC and the PCMC have been given a role of overseeing the practical operations of these powers. One of the key reservations that has been expressed to me is that there already exist laws to cope with unruly or threatening behaviour and that the move-on powers are therefore in some cases not necessary.

It has been suggested that the move-on powers actually prevent arrests. Some solicitors who work with young people have told me that it can sometimes achieve the reverse and that a person is charged with what they call the trifecta. That is, in a situation that a move-on power is given, the young person disobeys it and they are charged. They are also charged with resisting arrest and abusive language because an argument ensues about whether the person should have to move on or not. I would encourage the CMC and the PCMC as part of their review to investigate this aspect of the application of the move-on power.

I ask the minister whether she could comment on one specific element of the move-on power if it is being broadened. I ask whether it is intended that police should use the move-on power to clear the public away from an area where they are witnesses to some other actions that have taken place. For example, at a party or a public space, if the police are dealing with one resident and other people are nearby, is this move-on power seen as a way for the police to clear witnesses away from that area?

I have always thought that members of the general public have a right to witness what is happening with their public servants. They come into this chamber and watch us and they see us at public functions and elsewhere. It would seem against the intent of the law if the police were to use these powers simply to clear all other people away so that there is no-one who can act as a witness to what is happening at that party or public space where the police are dealing with another person. I am not talking about life-threatening situations where there is a bomb, a knife or other major threat, but in those day-to-day activities in public spaces where the police and the public meet.

I would encourage the minister, the CMC and the PCMC to acknowledge the varying views that still exist with regard to this legislation. I hope that the ongoing reviews will look carefully at the practical application of this bill. I thank the minister for giving me, other MPs and other interested people time to discuss this bill with her in recent months. I appreciate that. I look forward very much to celebrating with my local community later this year the formal opening of the Stafford Police Station.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (3.59 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006. I say at the outset that I certainly do not intend to repeat many of the comments that have been made by speaker after speaker. Suffice to say that, on behalf of my constituents and the many people on the Sunshine Coast who have been involved in domestic violence, I am looking forward to the day when these amendments go through and

the police are able to speed up the process by serving people with a notice to appear rather than the current process of summons or arrest. I urge the minister to push these new amendments through as quickly as possible so they become new law in Queensland. I know that many people involved in domestic violence situations certainly look forward to that. I know that some women have had major problems getting parties to attend court due to the requirements that the police have had to comply with.

Before resuming my seat I refer to a matter that is not directly related to this bill. I thank the minister for the allocation of significant dollars to upgrade the Nambour Police Station. The upgrade is moving ahead very well. The air conditioning units have just been installed and the bitumen is going down. We look forward to the minister coming to the Sunshine Coast to officially open the extension. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms MALE (Glass House—ALP) (4.01 pm): It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006. This government is committed to providing our police with the legislative tools they need to be able to do their job in the community. This leads to a safer community for us all. Police powers legislation has been subject to ongoing review since it was first introduced in 1997 and replaced in 2000. This is the role of a responsible government.

In 2003 a review committee was formed to do further reviews. This committee was chaired by John Mickel and comprised representatives of the police commissioner, other QPS divisions, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, the CMC, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, the Office of Youth Affairs, the Queensland Law Society, the Public Defender, the DPP, and the ATSI Corporation for Legal Services. As a member of the police minister's caucus legislation committee, I was also afforded the opportunity to review the process and recommendations on a regular basis and to provide input.

I was also a member of the minister's Safe Youth Parties Task Force that looked very closely at the issues surrounding large gatherings of young people, usually in suburban settings, which sometimes get out of control and jeopardise the safety and good order of residential areas. We made a report to the minister in March this year which included a range of recommendations including getting the department of local government and planning to assist local councils to ensure that public facilities and parks are safe for everyone to use by considering improvements that will reduce opportunities for criminal activities. It also talked about providing treatment programs, enforcement campaigns around underage drinking and the purchase of alcohol, and other measures such as increasing the party safe initiative through the Queensland Police Service. We also recommended that move-on powers be expanded to provide police with the ability to move on individuals or groups of young people who have moved into public areas from an out-of-control youth party. It gives the police the opportunity to move people on before they become rowdy and cause disturbances, in preference to calling in paddy wagons and carting them all off.

This bill applies the existing move-on powers to all public places in the state of Queensland and retains the powers in a number of places that are not public places such as schools. Currently, police officers have limited options available if a person is behaving in a disorderly or antisocial manner in a public place—they can arrest the person for an offence or take no action. The amendments will allow police intervention before an offence is committed. Approximately two-thirds of persons comply with move-on directions and are thus diverted from the criminal justice system. Currently police do not have the power to disperse large gatherings of people who are causing disturbances at street parties in residential areas and must wait for an individual to commit an offence before action can be taken. The amendments will allow police to give move-on directions to large, unruly gatherings of persons in a residential street in response to community complaints.

The powers are not arbitrary in nature. A police officer may only give a direction that is reasonable in the circumstances and only when the behaviour or presence of the person falls within the well defined limits prescribed by the existing legislation. Several people have raised their concerns with me about the move-on powers, and it is predominantly about people believing that the police will use these powers in an arbitrary manner and, more specifically, target young people just because they are young. That is not what these powers are about.

I agree that young people have the right to gather peacefully and preferably in public areas for their own safety. These laws are not designed to move on young people who are simply hanging. They are designed to move on individuals or groups who are behaving in an intimidating or threatening manner towards others. They also cannot be used against people who are in a peaceful assembly, such as in a park, or if they are homeless. They are simply used instead of arresting someone, which is not necessarily needed or desirable, and to let them know their behaviour is unacceptable.

The Police Powers and Responsibilities Act states an officer may only use this power if the person's behaviour is or has been causing anxiety to a person entering, at or leaving the place; interfering with trade or business at the place by unnecessarily obstructing, hindering or impeding someone entering, at or leaving the place; disorderly, indecent, offensive or threatening to someone

entering, at or leaving the place; or disrupting the peaceable and orderly conduct of any event, entertainment or gathering at the place. If the behaviour of the person does not meet this criteria, the police officer cannot move them on.

The bill is making further amendments to strengthen the transparency of the use of move-on directions and to ensure that these directions are not used against someone purely because they are homeless, vulnerable or young. This will include annual reporting of the use of move-on directions in the Queensland Police Service's annual statistical review. The CMC will also review the powers after 18 months.

By ensuring move-on powers apply to all public spaces and recreational areas, it will enable them to be enjoyed peacefully by everyone. I want to note that the CMC will review the issuing of police move-on directions in 18 months time, and the police will be required to publicly report on the move-on directions every year. I think this provides the safeguard that some people are looking for.

This bill also creates a new offence of evading police. To markedly reduce the number of dangerous police pursuits, it is proposed that this bill will establish an offence with enough of a deterrent to make pursuits less likely and less necessary. A person will commit the offence if, while operating a motor vehicle, the person knowingly disobeys a direction to stop the vehicle given by a person recognised to be a police officer. It is proposed that the person will be taken to knowingly disobey a direction of a police officer if police have activated the emergency lights and siren on the vehicle and that a reasonable person could have been reasonably expected to have recognised the person operating the vehicle as a police officer.

The owner of the motor vehicle at the time of the offence will be deemed to be the driver of the vehicle at the time of the offence unless an illegal user, known user, sold vehicle or unknown user declaration is made by the owner identifying the actual driver. It is proposed that the penalty for the offence will carry a fine of up to $15,000 and a maximum of three years imprisonment. It is proposed that the court sentencing an offender for this offence may order impoundment of the offender's vehicle for a period of up to three months for a first offence or forfeiture of the offender's vehicle to the state for any subsequent offences. I believe this is a sensible provision which will create a safer place for residents, motorists and the police.

This bill also has the inclusion of spitting, biting or throwing bodily fluids at a police officer as a serious assault under section 340 of the Criminal Code, which carries a jail term of up to seven years. I am absolutely horrified that officers have to face this type of behaviour when they are doing their job in keeping our communities safe. The worry for them whilst they await results of medical tests because some low-life has bitten them should never happen. I am pleased to see the seriousness with which this offence is now being treated.

Just this month I attended a remembrance service for victims of domestic violence, which was organised by the Caboolture Domestic Violence Service. I spoke about the effect that domestic violence has on the lives of the victims and their families and how we as a community must strive to rid ourselves of this often hidden crime. Silence is not acceptable—we must all take responsibility and reach out. Unfortunately, domestic violence offences still occur too frequently. It is also a big drain on our policing resources.

This bill is proposing to decrease the processing time for police officers by enabling the service of a notice to appear on a person who is a respondent to a domestic violence application. It is proposed to allow any police officer to serve an order. Hopefully, this will facilitate a more efficient service process which will save many hours of police time. I believe that future amendments will be looked at to ensure that police officers can do their work in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

This is a large bill which also includes provisions such as requiring a person to provide their password, code or encryption details to police if their computer is seized in accordance with a search warrant; providing specific powers to watch-house officers to enable them to carry out many of the functions presently restricted to police officers; giving police the power to enter a chemist's premises to monitor excessive sales of pseudoephedrine by inspecting their register and other related items; and enabling police to search people and vehicles without a warrant for an offence involving wilful damage if there is a reasonable suspicion.

As I said earlier, this bill will provide police officers with the powers they need to provide efficient and effective policing and will help to keep our communities safe. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. JC SPENCE (Mount Gravatt—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services) (4.09 pm), in reply: Prior to addressing the issues raised by members during the debate, I would like to express my appreciation and that of the government to all members of this House for adopting a bipartisan approach and supporting this important bill. It is pleasing to obtain such a high level of parliamentary support for such an essential law and order bill. The level of support obtained for this bill is a clear indication that this government has once again got it right in presenting a bill that provides the necessary powers and essential community protection provisions for our police officers.

I would like to thank a number of officers who worked on this legislation for a long time: Inspector Greg Thomas, Senior Sergeant Neal White, Senior Sergeant Michael Webb and Constable David Mahon. I would also like to thank Gary Wilkinson and the Police Union of Employees for their input. I would also like to thank Superintendent Peter Savage and the Queensland Police Commissioned Officers Union. I thank John Mickel, who, before I became the police minister, acted as the chair of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act review committee. Although Terry O'Gorman and the Council for Civil Liberties did not agree with all aspects of this bill, I thank them for their input along the way.

I will now address the issues that were raised by members during the debate. I thank the member for Gregory for his comments in support of the bill. The member commented that the evade-police amendments may not stop people from engaging in high-speed driving and police chases. The member also suggested that before a police officer can charge a person the officer has to catch that person. It is true that an offender must be caught before he or she can be prosecuted. This evade-police amendment allows police to discontinue a pursuit and gain the registration number of the offender's vehicle, which is then recorded by police. The legislation will work because it incorporates the concept of owner onus. Simply put, the owner will have to name the driver of the vehicle or the owner will face the consequences of the law. What better incentive could there be for identifying an offender? This law will work and it will reduce high-speed pursuits.

The member for Gregory also made substantial comments about the need for a police helicopter. I remind him that, sadly, on the weekend a police pursuit was called off but subsequently there was a death. That police chase was called off after 19 seconds. A helicopter in Brisbane would hardly have had time to get into the air to go to Maryborough and would not be of much use in such a situation.

The member for Gregory also sought the assurance that civilian watch-house officers will be properly trained. Currently, civilian watch-house officers must successfully complete a Certificate II in Correctional Practice. That course is endorsed by the Australian National Training Authority. With the advent of these powers, I assure members that the officers will be given additional and necessary comprehensive training in all aspects of these powers. It should be noted that the powers are similar to those used currently by correctional officers and state government security officers. I also thank the member for Gregory for his support for the domestic violence reforms, which are the first step in implementing the CMC's recommendations.

I thank the member for Redlands for his support for the bill. I know that, as a former police officer, he more than most understands the importance of this bill. I thank him for his clarification of the stance taken by Young Labor and the motion he tabled. It is pleasing to note that Young Labor is fully behind this legislation. I thank the member for Yeerongpilly for his support of the bill and the intelligent and insightful statements that he made with regard to police move-on directions.

The member for Lockyer raised a number of points, including one relating to the proposed amendments to sections 28 and 30 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. These amendments include references to section 469 of the Criminal Code, wilful damage. I do not consider these provisions to be overzealous. They allow a police officer who has a reasonable suspicion that a person is in possession of an instrument with which that person has committed wilful damage or is in possession of a graffiti instrument to stop and search that person. This search-for-evidence provision is in keeping with other search provisions of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. If a person has possession of a screwdriver and a person has just run down the side of a car in a car park, then I see nothing overzealous about police searching that person for an implement and arresting that person for the offence of wilful damage. The same applies to a person who is just about to spray-paint graffiti on a person's fence. Of course, a person can have a tool kit in their car. At all times police have to have a reasonable suspicion that an offence has been committed. They do not just want to pull people over and rummage through their car boot to find a screwdriver.

With respect to serious assaults on police officers, the government has created an offence that is designated a crime and which carries a maximum sentence of seven years imprisonment. This offence acknowledges the seriousness with which the government views assaults on police officers. However, it is not intended to impose a minimum period of imprisonment as sentencing is a matter within the realms of the courts. Nevertheless, this will not prevent the government monitoring sentences that are imposed and again reviewing the law, if necessary.

Vehicles impounded by police officers are subject to towing contracts in various regions throughout the state. This means that vehicles can be towed and stored in a cost-efficient manner. Contracts entered into by various tow companies are subject to a tender process. I also add that as a government we have already decided to ensure that hoons pay for all towing and storage expenses incurred by the police when they arrest these offenders. These costs will be incurred by the offenders themselves.

Finally, the member for Lockyer referred to legislation dealing with animal use on roads. These amendments simply replicate the animal related provisions that are contained in the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act. They have been inserted into the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to allow for consistency.

I thank the member for Bundamba for her support of the bill. Recently, I attended a meeting of Neighbourhood Watch groups in her electorate. I know the importance she places on the safety and security of her constituents. I acknowledge that this bill will assist police not only in Bundamba but also in all of Queensland.

The member for Nanango questioned whether a reasonable suspicion applies to the amendments to sections 28 and 30 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. As I have explained previously, a reasonable suspicion is a prerequisite to the use of this search power. As in the cases of all searches of a person, the safeguards contained in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act also apply to section 27, searching persons without a warrant. Therefore, the requirements relating to preserving an individual's privacy remain intact.

I thank the member for Pumicestone for her support of the bill. Recently, I announced a new police district that will incorporate her electorate. On many occasions I have met with her and local police in her electorate. I know that she is extremely supportive of the police in her electorate.

I have already addressed issues raised by the member for Toowoomba South in my reply to the member for Gregory with respect to police pursuits and perceptions of evading detection.

Mr Johnson: What about the breathalyser and the people who go to the police stations to see if they can get a breath test?

Ms SPENCE: I will address that matter later during consideration in detail. I thank the member for Springwood for her contribution to the debate. Police have commented to me on the member for Springwood's unending support for both the Police Service and the programs and initiatives that it runs in her electorate. I welcome her positive statements.

The member for Warrego supported the bill but made the comment that some police do not integrate into communities. I have been to many small towns in western Queensland and I have seen firsthand how local police have become pillars of the community. Obviously, not all police in small towns join in in community activities. However, many do and they are certainly successful when they take this approach.

I thank the member for Mount Ommaney for her support of the bill. I know that she takes a personal interest in issues such as graffiti. Recently she chaired the Safe Youth Parties Task Force. She unfailingly supports her local police. The member for Mount Ommaney and the other members of that task force did a terrific job. They recommended the move-on powers that we are supporting today.

The member for Broadwater supported the bill. Recently, I announced that her electorate will be covered by the new Coomera police district. This new district will mean not only more police but also all the other district functions such as the JAB, the traffic squad, the Dog Squad and the CIB will come her electorate's way.

The member for Surfers Paradise raised concerns with respect to residents and businesspeople accessing their property when a street is closed off by police. It should be noted that police do not close off a street without cause. The legislation allows police to close a street in circumstances when there is a risk to the safety of a person. Clearly, a motor vehicle crash where people are injured or petrol is leaking from a vehicle is sufficient cause for a street to be temporarily closed, as is a siege involving firearms in that street. Allowing residents to drive or walk along a street while an injured person is being removed from a vehicle, until a petrol spill is cleaned up, or until a siege is concluded would be irresponsible. In those circumstances, I do not think the short period of inconvenience caused to a residence or businessperson is unreasonable.

The member for Surfers Paradise also raised the issue of the evade-police provisions in the bill not requiring that a driver be aware that a police officer has given the person a direction to stop. In reality, new section 443ZD applies only to a police officer using a Police Service motor vehicle. In that case, a police officer would usually place the police vehicle in a position behind the offender's vehicle and activate the blue and red flashing lights and the siren and alternate the headlights. Given the brightness of the emergency lights and the noise of the siren, it is expected that normally a driver would be aware of the police vehicle behind him or her and, as a responsible driver, would stop the vehicle.

The government is not in the business of persecuting a person who is not attempting to evade police but honestly, for a number of reasons, does not immediately stop his or her vehicle. It may be the case that the person is hearing impaired and does not stop until the person looks into the rear-vision mirror and sees a police vehicle or that person has the radio blaring and the windows wound up. These people would still be driving lawfully and would no doubt stop at a stop sign or red light. In the evading-police provision we are not talking about innocent inaction, such as the examples I have mentioned. We are talking about people who deliberately try to evade being stopped by police—and there were two deaths just last weekend. For this reason there is no defence in the bill of being unaware of the direction. To create a defence of this nature would create an imbalance that would be utilised by every person who tries to get away from police.

The member for Cook supported the bill and raised the issue of policing in Indigenous communities. As I stated earlier today in the House, the Queensland Police Service offers some of the best policing responses in Indigenous communities of any state in Australia. The member for Cook will also be pleased to note that the nearly $3 million construction of Wujal Wujal Police Station will continue in the next few months.

I acknowledge the new member for Gaven's support of this bill. He knows firsthand, having worked in prisons, of the good work police do. The member for Keppel supported the bill. He is always asking me for additions to the water police in the greater Capricorn area. I hope to be able to make an announcement about that in the near future. I thank the member for Mirani for his comments. I look forward to being in Sarina in the near future to open the new Sarina Police Station.

I acknowledge the member for Currumbin's support for the bill and answer her question with regard to police checks on pharmacists' registers. The Queensland Police Service has a very good relationship with the Pharmacy Guild. I know because I have met the guild and they have told me that. I know that the guild has no concerns about the police checking the register. I especially acknowledge her support of move-on powers and this government's tough and serious stance on youth parties. I remind her that the Gold Coast was ably represented on the youth parties task force by the member for Broadwater and the member for Burleigh and that it was, indeed, the Beattie government that first instigated the extension of the use of these powers.

I thank the member for Mount Coot-tha for his support of the bill. I know that the superintendent of Brisbane West district, Peter Martin, appreciates the member for Mount Coot-tha's support of his local police.

I thank the member for Chatsworth for his comments and I note that he agrees with me that move-on powers will certainly assist in dispersing gangs who gather to cause trouble. In fact, as pointed out by the member, the bill is about good law for decreasing crime and ensuring the safety of the community.

The member for Gladstone raised concerns that move-on powers could be focused more on the young. Move-on powers are not focused on any particular age group, sex, colour or race within the community. They only come into play when a person acts in a manner contrary to public interest as determined by this parliament. A person has two ways to appeal a move-on direction. They can challenge a direction in court if they choose to not comply with the direction or they can go to their nearest police station to query the direction.

Further to the member for Gladstone's concerns, burnouts are a safety issue and will not be permitted on public roads. However, if programs can be arranged to allow young people to utilise existing facilities, such as racetracks, with adequate supervision, then I see no objection being raised.

With respect to animals, police will attempt to return them as quickly as possible to the owner where ownership is not in doubt. This can be done with the agreement of the defendant under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Also, there are adequate provisions in the bill to allow for a court to order animals that are non-breeding stock to be sold and the owner compensated to the value of the animals. Additionally, if an animal has to be held by police, the costs are not going to be greater than if the owner were to maintain the animals. Therefore, an owner would not be out of pocket when the animal is returned.

With respect to the member's comments on unmarked police vehicles, it should be noted that these vehicles have portable flashing lights, distinctive police sirens and signs and alternating headlights. So they will be identified as a police vehicle. As I have previously mentioned, police will use discretion when they use these provisions.

I thank the member for Woodridge for her support of the bill and her hard work on my committee. I thank the member for Caloundra for his support of the bill. I note that he does not understand the police housing policy and has asked for it to be explained. I am not going to do that today, but I am happy to discuss that matter with him on another occasion.

I acknowledge the member for Sandgate's support of this bill and thank him for his comments. I also note the member for Burnett's support of the bill and his support of the amendment of the Criminal Code to include acts such as spitting on police as serious assaults. I particularly thank the member for Stafford for his support of the bill and his great interest in law and order issues. I thank the member for Nicklin for his support of the bill. I know that the member for Glass House, who was on my committee and the safe parties task force, understands this bill in detail and I thank her for her support. I table the explanatory notes to the legislation.

Before I conclude, I will answer the query put to me by the member for Gregory. It is not Police Service policy to provide breath tests to persons who request them at police stations. To do so could provide a false impression to persons that they could drive when, in fact, their blood alcohol level is still on the rise. Therefore, the Police Service could become civilly liable for conducting these tests. The

onus is on the individual to remain under the driving blood alcohol limit. It is not a function of the Police Service to do that. I hope that answers the question asked by the member for Gregory. I commend the bill to the House.

Tabled paper: Explanatory notes to Ms Spence's amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2 (Commencement)—

Ms SPENCE (4.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2—

At page 14, line 17, '8.'—

omit, insert—

'8;

(h) schedule 2, to the extent it amends the following—

(i) the *Cross-Border Law Enforcement Legislation Amendment Act 2005*;

(ii) the *Police Powers and Responsibilities (Motorbike Noise) Amendment Act 2005*.'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4 (Amendment of s 20 (Power to enter etc. for relevant laws))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.27 pm): Clause 4 talks about the inspection of pharmacies and places where drugs, such as pseudoephedrine and other such drugs, are going to be housed. I ask the minister: are these registers going to be inspected at random or will the pharmacists be given regular times for inspections? This is a very important aspect in the fight against drugs and the manufacture of amphetamines and other serious drugs. At the same time I know that some pharmacies will be under surveillance more than other smaller pharmacies in country areas. It probably affects the coastal and larger city pharmacies. I would like the minister to respond.

Ms SPENCE: I am happy to answer that. I would like to put on the record that the Pharmacy Guild in Queensland is working very well with the Police Service on this issue. In fact, we are the first state in Australia where the Pharmacy Guild voluntarily suggested and organised its members to start recording a register such as this. The police advise me that it is their usual practice to inform the pharmacy of their intention to come and inspect the register. They are not out to disadvantage or disrupt any pharmacy's business. Nevertheless, if the police suspect a pharmacist of doing the wrong thing then they do have the entitlement to inspect the register at random. In the majority of cases the police will work with the pharmacist and inform them of their intention to come and inspect the register. On a small number of occasions inspections might happen at random.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5 (Amendment of s 28 (Prescribed circumstances for searching persons without warrant))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.29 pm): Can I just direct a question again to the minister? Clause 5 deals with the prescribed circumstances for searching persons without a warrant. I support this aspect of the legislation, but I do have some questions. In respect to searching for tools which may be used in the commission of offences—the scratching of a car, for example, or tools used in putting graffiti on buildings or whatever—will these powers give police an opportunity to do the same as they do when a motorist is pulled over for a random breath test? Will it give the police the power, at the same time, to do a random search of that vehicle, or will police just execute that authority when they have a suspicion that somebody is breaking the law?

Ms SPENCE: As I said in my summing-up speech, the police must have a reasonable suspicion before they conduct a search. There will not be anything random about these searches. They will not randomly pull people over and search their boots, just to discover a screwdriver and then mount a case against them. They really have to have a reasonable suspicion that the implement will be used or has been used to commit a crime.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9 (Amendment of s 37 (When power applies to behaviour))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.31 pm): Clause 9 is an amendment relating to when police power applies to behaviour. Whilst we have very wide-ranging powers, from the outside it looks as though there could still be some flaws here. I would like the minister to clarify a couple of issues.

The explanatory notes make reference to what is defined as a 'prescribed place'. I would have thought that a 'prescribed place' could be any place at all where a private function is being held, whether it is a private residence, a local hall, a local restaurant or anywhere at all. I think it is of paramount importance that the privacy of any private function be respected. I would like the minister to clarify that further, please.

Ms SPENCE: Schedule 4 of the index of the PPRA actually defines all the prescribed places.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 18, as read, agreed to.

Clause 19 (Amendment of s 59LQ (When application to be heard—motorbike noise order offence))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.33 pm): This relates to an impounding order because of motorcycle noise. It seems that no regulations have been introduced. I ask the minister why there have been no regulations put in place in relation to motorcycle noise provisions. Does this amendment mean that the government will be able to make regulations and commence carrying out enforcements in relation to motorcycle noise as a result of this legislation?

Ms SPENCE: It is quite normal for regulations to be produced after legislation is passed in parliament. The Police Service is working on those regulations. They do not have long to conclude them because we expect this to start on 1 July. This is quite normal with subordinate legislation, and it will be completed in time.

Mr RICKUSS: I mentioned this in my speech. It might even relate to clauses 15, 16, 17 and 18 as well. I wonder if this still encompasses motorcycle clubs that have shelf companies for their vehicles, so there is no real ownership of the motorbike. When some of these motorcycles gangs are pulled up, there is no real ownership. A $2 shelf company owns all the motorbikes, so it is very hard to enforce the penalty. Who gets the penalty? They are quite willing to pay the dearer fine, but no real penalty goes to the person who has committed the offence or who has the noisy motorbike.

Ms SPENCE: The police advise me that they are not really having problems with motorbike noise from gangs. If the member is talking about outlaw motorcycle gangs, they are not the people being targeted in this legislation.

Mr Rickuss: I realise that.

Ms SPENCE: With respect to the fines, if gangs are registering motorbikes to a company—and the police agree that that is possible—the fines will be about three times higher than normal, if that occurs.

Mr Lawlor: Same as a speed camera.

Ms SPENCE: Yes, the same as a speed camera. I do not know that there is any way around that. If the member comes up with any ideas, please come and talk to me.

Clause 19, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 20 and 21, as read, agreed to.

Clause 22 (Amendment of s 59O (Powers for enforcing court order))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.36 pm): This clause is fairly straightforward. However, I would like the minister to clarify one thing. In a one-vehicle situation—I refer here to a family—where police have impounded the motor vehicle or taken possession of it by reason of a breach of the Traffic Act, do any hardship provisions allow the person to have that car returned sooner? The example in the explanatory notes is in relation to the Easter weekend. If a vehicle was taken on Good Friday, the owner would not have it back until the first working day, which would be the Tuesday after Easter. In that situation, I wonder if there is a hardship clause to help that person get their vehicle back sooner?

Ms SPENCE: The answer to the question about an early return of the vehicle is no. In terms of other alternatives in cases of hardship, yes, the court can determine that community service might be a more appropriate penalty than impoundment.

Clause 22, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27 (Insertion of new s 71A)—

Mr JOHNSON (4.37 pm): I seek a minor clarification in relation to 'Order in search warrant about information necessary to access information stored electronically'. I would think that it will now be a criminal offence if that person withholds information from the police, anyway. Can the minister point out

to the parliament what links the legislation in question will now have with interstate and Federal Police—even Interpol, for that matter—in relation to some of the breakthroughs by police in recent times in the apprehension of people—paedophiles and sick heads, as I call them—who violate laws by the use of technology for criminal activity and preying on the vulnerable in society?

Ms SPENCE: Today, for the first time, we are giving police the power to compel someone to deliver up the de-encryption information in their computer. Primarily, this is about solving crimes involving paedophilia. The member is quite right there. If they fail to comply with a court order to give that up then it is an offence under the Criminal Code. What we are doing today is allowing the police to get to the information in a speedier fashion to enable them to identify whether a paedophilia related activity has been engaged in. We are going to be leading Australia in terms of the ability of our police to obtain this information which will result in more prosecutions for paedophilia in this state. That information can be linked into national databases and will assist police elsewhere in Australia in solving these crimes.

Clause 27, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 48, as read, agreed to.

Clause 49 (Amendment of s 371AB (Powers for reportable deaths))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.40 pm): Police officers always work in situations where they have to keep an eye out and be alert for areas of suspicion or doubt in the execution of their duty. Clause 49(5) states—

However, a police officer may not search the place under subsection (4) if the police officer reasonably believes the death was from natural causes.

In a situation where they find out afterwards that the death is not from natural causes, how then is this part of the act put in place by the police? Can the police come back and make it a crime scene if they find out something suspicious following an autopsy? In a country area the police might have to wait four or five days to get a GMO to do an autopsy. In the meantime there could be a situation where evidence may be gone from the scene. We need to be certain that the police are given the opportunity to make certain of these issues at the appropriate time, not two or three days down the track.

Ms SPENCE: If a police officer decided not to search the premises because the officer reasonably believed that the death was from natural causes but subsequently found out or suspected that the death was not of natural causes, then the crime scene powers would come into play and the police officer would do the normal things that they would be entitled to do to restrict entry to a place, stay on or enter the place or seize anything in that place, which are normal crime scene powers albeit after the event.

Every day we ask our police to make judgments and this is one of the judgments we are giving the police the opportunity to make; rather than the alternative that the member is suggesting, which is every time they go to a house and identify a deceased person that immediately becomes a suspicious event and crime scene powers would be forced to be enacted. I do not think that the member for Gregory or anyone else in this House would suggest that we want our police officers to take that kind of course of action.

Clause 49, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 50 to 51, as read, agreed to.

Clause 52 (Amendment of s 372A (Police actions after domestic violence order is made))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.43 pm): This is a very important aspect of this legislation. It has been canvassed fairly heavily today in the chamber and back in the early stages of the debate at the last sittings.

Clause 52(4) states—

The police officer who gives the order to the respondent must—

(a) if the order is given to the respondent at the respondent's place of residence—take all steps necessary to ensure the respondent's weapons licence and weapons are seized immediately; and

(b) in any other case—make arrangements to ensure the respondent's weapons licence and weapon are surrendered to a police officer as soon as practicable.

I raised this in my contribution to the House relating to the macropod industry—we will term them 'kangaroo shooters'. There has been an amount of unfairness in the court system. It is not an issue for police but it is something I do draw the minister's attention to today. There needs to be some honesty and fairness on the part of the court system. A vindictive, vicious partner can further aggravate a volatile situation. Safety of all parties is paramount, and this includes the police. We have an unworkable situation in relation to this aspect of domestic violence. I know of a couple of cases in my own electorate where, because of perjury, the victim then becomes the perpetrator or vice versa.

This aspect of the legislation needs canvassing further, I would suggest, in conjunction with the minister's colleague, the Attorney-General. There are aspects of the legislation that are damaging to fair-minded people who are trying to go about their business in a fair way. The five-year retrospectivity is an aspect of the legislation that is causing great heartache and concern not only to the person in question who is trying to earn a fair, professional living but also to the families of those people in question. That is a fair comment and I would urge the minister as a matter of urgency to look at it further with her colleague, the Attorney-General. I would be only too happy to have further input into it.

I have spoken to the Weapons Licensing Branch and many legal people on this issue and, while none of us condone domestic violence, at the same time there are aspects of it that we have to be aware of. In the area of country policing we have to be protective of the police, too, because they are certainly the ones pushed to the forefront in these cases. We can defuse some of these situations if the law is revisited and there is a more genuine approach to it. It could be that cooling-down period that we are talking about here or other aspects in relation to the illegality of it from the Attorney-General's point of view.

Ms SPENCE: What we are doing today is the first step in implementing one of the CMC's recommendations into reforming the law on domestic violence. This is one more step to enable police to investigate these matters with more efficiency than they have been able to do in the past. I intend to bring a submission, with the minister for communities who has responsibility for domestic violence legislation, to cabinet in the near future to implement further CMC recommendations but, quite sincerely, we would welcome any input from the member for Gregory. If the member wants to make a written submission as to how he would like to see the laws further reformed then we would welcome it.

Clause 52, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 53 to 64, as read, agreed to.

Clause 65 (Insertion of new ss 422A-422B)—

Mr JOHNSON (4.48 pm): No doubt animal theft is an issue that is on the agenda right across Queensland, especially with the price of cattle and sheep and any other livestock for that matter. People think they can make a quick quid from stock theft. I want to draw the minister's attention to not so much the animal's welfare and the welfare of other animals in the possession of the Police Service at the place where the animal is kept, but where large numbers of animals are detected as stolen property. The National Livestock Identification Scheme will certainly be a tool that will assist police in smaller places where the animals have tags on, but with larger holdings such as in areas that I represent, many times those tags will not be put on animals until they are sent to sale.

The old branding and earmarking system still has to be recognised as important in detecting the theft of livestock. The point I am making is that large numbers of livestock, say 200 or 300 head, can be returned to the rightful owner and not held by police—and, in so doing, putting the minister's department to great expense in holding stock. With the photographic technology that is available today, taking videos of livestock and their earmarks and brands et cetera I think will be a huge saving to the police department in getting livestock back to their rightful owners. At the same time, it will save taxpayers a heap of dollars in the process in keeping those stock guarded, whether that be for a court case or for some other determination by the legal process.

Ms SPENCE: I am advised that the police can do one of two things. They can return those animals by agreement or they can sell those animals. I appreciate the member for Gregory has a much greater understanding of this whole process than I do—

Mr Johnson: Don't get me wrong, Minister; I am not trying to have a go at you or anything like that. I am just trying to make a legitimate response in relation to saving taxpayers' dollars.

Ms SPENCE: Sure. Police are not in the business of keeping animals unnecessarily. They can return them or sell them. They can charge the owner for the upkeep of the animals. We are not in the business of making the taxpayer pay for this process, either.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister talked of making the owner pay for the upkeep of the animals. If the animals were stolen and they are on somebody else's property or in somebody else's possession, would it then become the responsibility of the owner to make certain those animals are looked after, or would it become the responsibility of the police department?

Ms SPENCE: If the owner wants those animals back and they are lawfully entitled to them, as I said before, police are entitled to charge the owner no more than it would cost the owner to maintain those animals themselves, if the police were indeed keeping those animals. There is no intention for the owner to be out of pocket. The word 'reasonable' is used in the legislation to enable the owner to challenge the Police Service in those costs.

Clause 65, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 66 to 77, as read, agreed to.

Clause 78 (Insertion of new ch 11, pt 3, div 9)—

Ms SPENCE (4.52 pm): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 78—

At page 75, line 2, '442'—

omit, insert—

'443'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 78, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 79 to 88, as read, agreed to.

Clause 89 (Amendment of s 340 (Serious assaults))—

Mr JOHNSON (4.53 pm): In relation to this amendment to the Criminal Code—serious assaults against police—I would like the minister to clarify what is a breach of this law. Proposed subsection (2A) states—

For subsection (1)(b), the circumstances in which a person assaults a police officer include, but are not limited to, circumstances in which the person bites, spits on or throws a bodily fluid or faeces at a police officer.

Would a serious assault where an officer is hit in the mouth and a tooth is dislodged or an arm is broken not come under the same degree of criminal offence as this law? I would suggest that, if it is not, it should. I would like the minister's clarification on that.

Ms Spence: Can I get you to repeat the last part of your question?

Mr JOHNSON: Where a police officer is assaulted and he may have a tooth dislodged or an arm broken, maybe that is not the same as what we are discussing here in terms of having bodily fluid thrown at an officer. However, I suggest that should also be termed as a serious offence and should be part of this bill. Can the minister confirm that?

Ms SPENCE: It is a fair question. Any assault on a police officer is considered an assault. It will be up to the police officer to determine whether a person is charged under the Criminal Code or under the PPRA. In the PPRA and in the Criminal Code, of course, is the offence of serious assault. This legislation allows the police officer to also charge under the PPRA for probably lesser offences than the more serious assaults.

Mr Johnson: So it will be left to the officer's discretion?

Ms SPENCE: Yes.

Clause 89, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 90 to 114, as read, agreed to.

Clause 115 (Insertion of new pt 5, div 2)—

Mr JOHNSON (4.56 pm): This clause provides for the appointment of watch-house officers. This is a part of the legislation which the opposition certainly applauds and is one that we have built into our policy. Whilst we applaud it, I would ask the minister to clarify a couple of issues. The officers of the minister's department gave us a briefing on this aspect. They mentioned that there would be 12 weeks of training. However, I note that at the bottom of page 157 of the bill under 'Appointment of watch-house officers' it states—

Staff members are appointed under the *Public Service Act 1996* or section 8.3(5) and are not police officers. Also, this section does not affect the powers of the commissioner to appoint watch-house managers. For the definition *watch-house manager*, see the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000* ...

The minister said in her summing-up that watch-house officers would be given similar training to what Corrective Services officers would be given. Are they going to fall under the banner of Corrective Services, or are they going to be an addition to the Queensland Police Service? Will they be secondary staff, the same as administration staff now working with police? What type of training will these people be given? What type of people will the minister be looking for?

When I talk about training, I know that they will be trained. They will have some type of police training, I would think, to be able to manage people in watch-houses but they will also have to be given some corrective services training. With regard to applicants, will the minister be looking at people who are ex-police officers or ex-military officers?

Ms SPENCE: I do not think anyone should have any concerns about the qualifications of civilian watch-house officers. We already have quite a number of civilian watch-house officers employed in our watch-houses around the state. They are under the supervision of serving police officers. Watch-house officers have been begging me for this for the past year because they want to give civilian officers extra powers to assist them to do their job. In terms of training, they will have a certificate III in correctional officer training, so at the very least they will be as well trained as our correctional officers. They will be

better trained than our Corrective Services officers, because on top of that they will get training by the Police Service as well.

I do not think we should have any concerns about the fact that these people are going to be trained. The Police Service will make sure they are. They will be employed by the Queensland Police Service, not by the corrections department. They will be directly employed, trained and supervised by the Queensland Police Service. At the moment we have a high quality of candidates applying for these jobs. A lot of them are ex-correctional officer people and ex-military people. It would be possible—I do not know why anyone would—for a retired police officer to apply for a job like this and they would be a terrific candidate. We are in a fortunate position, even though there is going to be a skill shortage in the future. We have not hit that problem yet and we are getting quality people applying for these jobs.

Mr JOHNSON: Finally, will these personnel wear a special uniform? Will the regulation be set down by the Queensland Police Service, or will they use Corrective Services prison officers' garb?

Ms SPENCE: I will make the offer to the member for Gregory to go down to the Brisbane watch-house and do the tour. I do not know if he has ever been there.

Mr Johnson: No, I haven't.

Ms SPENCE: I extend that invitation to any member of parliament. I have been there a few times. It is the state's biggest watch-house. It is a very interesting place to visit. We already have civilian watch-house officers employed there. They work alongside the Police Service. They are in a uniform similar to police. Obviously, it is not the police officers uniform, but it is a similar looking uniform. It clearly has epaulets saying 'watch-house officer'. They are the civilians who are employed there. The member should take me up on the offer and I will organise a tour.

Clause 115, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 116 to 119, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 2 (Other Acts amended)—

Ms SPENCE (5.01 pm): I move the following amendment—

3 Schedule 2—

At page 163, after line 8—

insert—

'Cross-Border Law Enforcement Legislation Amendment Act 2005

1 Section 23, '*omit*,'—

omit.

2 Section 28, new section 500(3), '1197ZZH'—

omit, insert—

'197ZZH'.

3 Section 30(1), after 'entity,'—

insert—

'*listening device*,'.

4 Schedule 1, item 15, '; and'—

omit, insert—

'; or'.

5 Schedule 1, after item 16—

insert—

'16A Schedule 4, definition *relevant person*, paragraphs (c), (d) and (e), '; and'—

omit, insert—

'; or'.

'Police Powers and Responsibilities (Motorbike Noise) Amendment Act 2005

1 Section 28(1), after '*prescribed offence*'—

insert—

', *relevant court*'.'.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule 2, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Bill, as amended, read a third time.

Long Title

Long title of the bill agreed to.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 19 April (see p. 1164).

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—Lib) (5.02 pm): I rise today to speak on the Liquor Amendment Bill 2006 in my capacity as shadow minister for tourism, fair trading and wine industry development. I would like to begin by congratulating our booming club industry, which held its prestigious awards on Saturday night at the Brisbane convention centre. I am sure the minister will agree it was a wonderful atmosphere. I am sure she was as thrilled as I was to see the level of entries and the enthusiastic supporters, not to mention that amazing illusionist.

In the minister's second reading speech she stated that the bill aims to minimise harm and reduce the impact of late-night trading premises on the community. If, as is stated, the safety of nightclub patrons is a key objective of the bill, the intent has merit and is certainly worthy of some applause. I am as keen as any member of this House to see a reduction in crime, particularly senseless alcohol or drug inspired violence that causes injuries to innocent victims that can be fatal.

Public safety will always be of primary concern to the coalition. We understand the basic rights of people in our community to feel safe and secure as they go about their daily lives and to participate in various forms of entertainment. May I indicate from the outset that the coalition will be supporting this bill even though we firmly believe the situation would not have escalated this far had binge-drinking competitions been banned years ago, adequate transport and infrastructure facilities been provided and there were more visible police on the beat. Indeed, we have witnessed via our media a number of distressing examples of what can happen when alcohol and violence result in unnecessary death or injury. Only last weekend a young Brisbane man lost his life in a tragic situation outside the Royal Exchange Hotel. The hotel, described as a popular drinking hole—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr English): Order! The events of last weekend are currently before the courts.

Mrs STUCKEY: I withdraw those comments. Over recent times we have seen the loss of life in tragic situations at different times—evenings, on weekends—of our young as well as some of our not so young. This is not restricted to Queensland, either. I think there seems to be a problem right across Australia with violence and alcohol related incidents.

Security industry stakeholders have for some time now articulated the need for tougher compliance and regulation of their industry as loopholes and the lax attention from the Office of Fair Trading have seen thuggish behaviour exacted upon patrons by some overzealous bouncers. I note the minister has commented that she is in the process of yet another review about needing to listen to the industry. It is to be hoped that that review will include the security industry.

In my own electorate I have shared tears with constituents who have lost children due to the reckless actions of intoxicated individuals with whom their loved ones have fatally come into contact. Racked with despair, these grief-stricken parents are an all-too-familiar reminder of the lingering and far-reaching effects the loss of a loved one has. So many significant dates such as birthdays and anniversaries bring back a flood of painful memories. When one of your own is suddenly and permanently taken from you, their bright future stolen from you and the hope of grandchildren an impossibility, the world seems to be a decidedly gloomy place. What is most distressing is the fact that, all too often, these tragedies could have easily been averted.

There is an urgent need to address the symptoms that underlie society's frequent usage of alcohol and other substances that cause harm. Early intervention is a great initiative and one that is so often bandied about. It slips off the tongue so easily. Yet, if the government was truly serious about it, it would be taking more proactive steps to deal with under-age drinking, which has now reached epidemic proportions.

Public drunkenness has become far more prevalent within certain generations of our culture. It is almost acceptable behaviour in some circles to go out and 'get wasted', with no thought of the consequences of losing control of your senses and placing yourself at high risk of injury. We are not talking about only youth here but also some adults in their twenties, thirties and forties getting arrested for biting, spitting and other foul actions. The Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006, passed only a few minutes ago in parliament, amongst other things toughens penalties for serious assaults against police. These amendments are expected to assist in the removal of violent offenders from our streets.

Several articles in the press recently have brought our attention to an escalation of irresponsible and dangerous drinking habits. Reports of young women putting themselves at risk do not seem to have had any effect, with long-term side effects ranging from feelings of shame to the spread of infectious disease and unwanted pregnancies. According to a story entitled 'Russian Roulette' in the *Sunday Mail,* police have declared widespread drink spiking a myth, blaming an alarming culture of binge

drinking among young women for a steep increase in sex attacks. Another article quotes a senior traffic officer as registering his concern over women caught drink driving on Mother's Day. The officer was disturbed by the growing trend of women disregarding the laws across the country, acknowledging there was a time when female drivers showed more sense than their male counterparts. Quite simply, in the drink-driving stakes women are catching up to men, and this no feat to feel proud of. Women do not have the body mass of men, which means they cannot consume the same amount of alcohol as males without attaining blood alcohol levels that affect responses and judgement and render driving a vehicle unsafe.

Statistics from a survey conducted by the Drug Foundation and released at the launch of the Good Sports program last week showed equally worrying statistics. A large percentage of patrons, including visitors, drove home after consuming several alcoholic drinks. The program which aims to work with clubs to reduce the incidence of driver related violence, under-age drinking and drink driving helps clubs to change the culture without hitting their hip pocket hard. I am pleased to say that more than 1,500 community clubs have adopted the program through Australia. Organisers of the Good Sports program are hoping that Queensland will embrace the program and come on board.

Choosing a time to cease the serving of alcohol has never proved popular with everyone from the prohibition days in the USA, the amending of the 6 o'clock swill, the absence of any Sunday trading, the 10 pm closing and the now far more liberal laws which, I must say, still cause degrees of dissent amongst some in the community. The primary policy objective of this bill is to amend the Liquor Act 1992 through the implementation of stage 1 of the statewide safety action plan. Stage 1 will see the imposition of statutory 3 am lockout conditions for all licensed premises throughout Queensland with exemptions granted to airports, casinos, parts of licensed premises used for residential guest accommodation, and premises trading on Anzac Day and New Year's Day. These conditions are already in place under legislation in Brisbane and under licence conditions elsewhere throughout most of Queensland.

Stage 2, which I understand we are not debating here, will impose stricter conditions on all premises across the state that trade after 1 am. These conditions will include requirements relating to crowd controller numbers, installation and maintenance of CCTV cameras, mandatory responsible serving of alcohol training for all staff, the development and maintenance of a house policy, restrictions on the frequency and duration of happy hours and the prohibition of drinking competitions or other activities that encourage the rapid or excessive consumption of alcohol.

Perhaps the minister would be kind enough to advise the House when the second stage will be implemented. It does seem impractical that the government would implement the provisions of this bill when it is asking the public for submissions regarding this very act. It has not actively reviewed the 12-month trial of the effectiveness of the 3 am lockouts in the Brisbane CBD in an open, consultative manner with the community.

This bill also seeks to retain the current arrangements for licensees on the Gold Coast during the Indy Carnival, which bears the hallmarks of special purpose legislation. The industry is collectively outraged by the perceived inequities the bill seeks to impose upon them. We witnessed in March of this year the minister's decision to single out for special treatment certain tourism events in the Property Agents and Motor Dealers and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2005.

As I noted in this House on 23 November 2005, as shadow minister I have undertaken extensive consultation with licensees and the general community who will be impacted by this legislation. A disappointing aspect of this bill for the licensees is that it has been tabled in this House immediately upon the cessation of the 12-month trial period of the 3 am lockout in the Brisbane City Council local government area.

The Premier announced on 1 March 2005 that there would be a 12-month trial. But it is highly unsatisfactory that his government and his ministers have failed to undertake widespread consultation with elected members, business and the community at large. I refer to an advertisement in the *Courier-Mail* in April this year inviting public comment to the review of the Liquor Act 1992. It stated—

> ... ensure the Liquor Act 1992 reflects community attitudes, including concerns of alcohol abuse and binge drinking; and consider how the nature of venues that serve alcohol has changed, recent changes in serving practices and the rapid growth of the tourism and hospitality industry.

Whilst this action is commendable and will hopefully furnish the government with plenty of realistic and useful suggestions, I ask the minister: why could the government not combine the introduction of the statewide action plan with the timing of the review of the Liquor Act? Would this not have been a better and more effective use of parliament's time and been a constructive way to ensure extensive participation by the community through adequate discussion of the impact of the 3 am lockouts? There is no mention of expected standards of behaviour or training of security guards found in the advertisement either.

We witnessed the government's knee-jerk reaction last year with a hastily called summit and the subsequent 17-point plan. We saw yet another example of the Premier leading the charge trying to gain more exposure as the self-confessed media tart. Yet what he fails to recognise is that this bill and all of his actions do not properly address the cause, rather only the symptoms.

Alcohol fuelled violence is not something that can necessarily be stopped by imposing restrictive trading on licensed premises throughout the state. Licensees would like to hear from the minister and the Premier as to where they can find any data to backup the decision-making process for applying the 3 am lockout statewide. They ask what specific statistics the decisions have been based upon and why the Minister for Police and Corrective Services came out publicly in January 2006 and announced there would be the implementation of 3 am lockouts statewide when the 12-month trial was months away from even being completed? We have not been presented in the House with any detailed substantiation of before or after data from the Brisbane 3 am lockouts that clearly proves imposing a 3 am lockout statewide will have any beneficial result in regional areas. I request that the minister address these questions in her reply.

I refer now to the clauses contained within the bill. I start with clause 2 which imposes commencement of statewide lockouts from 1 July 2006. This does not provide for any review process or consultation. Further, it will financially impact on operators, particularly in the regions, who have based repayments on the projected cash flows expected from existing operating conditions. It is to be hoped the minister will be able to explain in her reply how she expects licensed premises across the state to cope with the substantial disruption to their trading cash flow that this bill will bring.

I move on to clause 4. This permits the chief executive to impose earlier lockout provisions on individual licences—that is, prior to 3 am. Strong concerns have been expressed over the lack of appeal against these conditions. By implementing this as legislation rather than as a condition of licence, the minister is effectively denying licensees any opportunity to state their case and to have their individual circumstances and implemented safety measures considered.

Clause 5 and clause 6(1) change the act to apply not only in the Brisbane CBD but statewide. Clause 6(3) permits exemptions for casinos and airports. This presents implications for wider ranging issues in our community such as uncontrollable gambling and confined space aggression on aeroplanes. This clause also exempts the Gold Coast City Council area during the Indy Carnival yet does not provide any right of application or assessment for any other major event in this state. As I mentioned earlier, once again we have an instance of specific purpose legislation introduced by the minister within this portfolio.

This Labor government seems to believe the 3 am lookouts are the pivotal piece of a cure-all for late-night aggression and alcohol fuelled violence. The government is not listening to industry because what the industry truly wants is local solutions for local issues. What might work on the Gold Coast or in Brisbane is not guaranteed to be the answer for regional centres. Members from other regions in Queensland will no doubt highlight the problems that blanket legislation such as this will create.

In supporting this bill I question whether members opposite are aware of the additional compliance costs that have been forced on licensed premises? Do they realise how difficult it is going to be for premises, particularly those in regional areas, to actually find qualified staff to meet the oppressive controller ratios under stage 2 of the statewide safety action plan? I ask the minister what consideration has been given to making sure plans are in place to ensure that there are sufficient resources for not only the provision of qualified crowd controllers but also registered training organisations in this field?

The more the government continues to pressure the industry in this way, the more it is damaging business and the more it is damaging jobs for Queenslanders. It sends a clear message that the government just does not comprehend the economic impact on late-night traders. Why is this restriction being imposed with such haste when there has been no serious assessment of the impacts of providing more effective late-night public transport infrastructure which, in itself, is a major key to removing aggression and frustration at closing times at licensed premises?

I realise that policing does not fall under the minister's portfolio. However, Liquor Licensing and the police are inextricably linked. I am sure that the minister would agree with that. For that reason, I am keen to hear what the police minister intends to deliver by way of extra police resources in those regional areas that are now going to be faced with these lockouts. Will there be funding for when stage 2 is introduced requiring CCTV?

Since the inception of the Queensland government's Security Improvement Program, the Premier has previously been on record as stating that $2,662,875 has been committed to the Brisbane City Council. I ask: how much do the Premier and the minister intend to provide in dollar terms for the rest of the state? The Beattie Labor government is not concerned about addressing the underlying problems. However, the coalition is getting the priorities right for Queensland. That includes addressing and seeking ways through a whole-of-community approach to overcome violence related to alcohol-induced states.

We hear plenty from the members opposite about how much the Beattie government does for their communities, but we do not hear a peep from any of them about the merits of preventive education programs such as Life Education, which runs brilliant self-harm abuse and self-esteem programs not

just in Queensland but across Australia. My kids, who are now in their 20s, experienced this program when they were at primary school. To this day they remember Harold and, more importantly, his message.

A gaggle of government members were happy to be pictured with children who suffer from type 1 diabetes on the Speaker's green last sitting week in a show of what I believe was truly genuine support. It is a pity that they cannot vocalise their support for programs that educate our vulnerable children about the dangers of drugs and alcohol and the bonus of healthy eating. It is the fault of all members opposite that an entire generation of schoolchildren have gone through their primary schooling never to learn about the dangers of drugs and alcohol from Harold the giraffe. Why? Because the miserable Beattie Labor government cut the funding to the Life Education project in 1999. None of the members opposite have spoken out about deprivation of harm education for our young.

Mrs Carryn Sullivan interjected.

Mrs STUCKEY: I find the member's comments offensive. I ask her to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr English): Order! I did not hear the comments so I cannot rule whether they were directed personally to the member or not.

Mrs STUCKEY: I notice that the Premier did not do much to promote Healthy Harold day during his Obesity Summit. It saddens me that only 54 Queensland schools took part—

Ms KEECH: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to relevance. I find the matters that the member is speaking about offensive. She is speaking about the Premier. But more than that, it has no relevance whatsoever to the Liquor Amendment Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall allow the member some latitude. She may be making a circular type of argument.

Mrs STUCKEY: What I am saying is relevant to this bill. I am talking about generations of people who abuse alcohol. This program—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I advise the member for Currumbin not to tell me but to show me the relevance. Please continue.

Mrs STUCKEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will do that. Frightening statistics obtained from local schools on the Gold Coast—and not in my electorate—reveal that children try their first drink between the ages of 10 and 12 and have sex, which they regret, between the ages of 14 and 15. Sixteen-year-old girls are quoted in national newspapers as admitting that there was considerable peer pressure to get drunk and have sex. If we do nothing to quell these disturbing trends now, we will have enormous problems in the years ahead as addicted juveniles turn into drunken and aggressive adults.

As I have said previously, last year the Premier held a hastily put together summit which resulted in the 17-point Brisbane City Safety Action Plan followed by amendments to an act that was enacted in 2005. We are now faced with legislation that has been introduced with alacrity. I simply ask why.

Once again, may I remind the minister of her comments on 20 April 2005 which indicate that the consideration as to whether to introduce these changes was based on a matter of timing rather than fairness. The minister stated—

> ... had we introduced this through conditions of licence, it would have taken a very long time for it to come into play and that the best way to do it was through legislation.

Once again, I bring to the minister's attention the concerns that the industry has about this legislation, which denies the right of appeal to licensees. It appears that there is not due consideration given to the individual circumstances of particular locations, nor to individual licensees. A one-size-fits-all approach is not a fair basis upon which to determine licence conditions.

I reiterate the grievance of numerous stakeholders, which I have stated previously in this House, that it is unfortunate that the government has chosen to victimise business owners who run legitimate establishments by imposing harsher conditions on their operating capacity. According to industry stakeholders, it would have been appropriate for the minister to have at least tried to instigate some community forums in a genuine attempt to gain widespread feedback in order to take proactive measures to assist the adults of tomorrow through choices they make today.

While we are on the topic of lockouts, I acknowledge previous comments that the minister has made on statistics achieved on the Gold Coast after the introduction of lockouts. Lockouts only target a very short space of time and do not address the general behaviour in our community that needs to be rectified, and these statistics are not relevant to each and every licensed premises in the state.

I urge the minister to adopt a more cooperative approach with our whole community if we are to gain long-term, critical benefits and reduce the totally unnecessary loss of life and serious permanent injuries we have seen of late. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms STRUTHERS (Algester—ALP) (5.25 pm): The public has called for tough action on reckless drinking behaviour and that is what they are getting. I rise to speak in support of this important bill and I commend the minister and her staff for bringing in such important legislation.

This statutory statewide 3 am lockout for all licensees in Queensland will provide a level playing field and certainty around some of those issues that have been a little uncertain in the past. I commend the efforts that the minister has made in getting tough on reckless behaviour.

It is a very serious issue and it is one that we as a government are taking very seriously. It is certainly important that we have a number of measures in place, and we have. Today I take this opportunity to comment briefly on a program that I was involved in launching last week because I think it has applicability to licensed venues and hotels generally, although it was a clubs initiative. I want to speak briefly about this, although I know other speakers are commenting more on the lockout as it applies to their areas.

The minister might be aware of the Good Sports program which I launched last week on behalf of Minister Tom Barton. I was really impressed with what they are achieving nationally and what we are set to achieve in Queensland. I know that the program has the support of the minister and the Liquor Licensing Division.

Last week I attended the launch of this national initiative of the Australian Drug Foundation. The program will help community sporting clubs to modify and improve their systems and practices around the responsible serving of alcohol. Its aim is to reduce under-age drinking, drink driving, violence and assault, and to change the behaviour and culture of clubs that encourage excessive drinking. It picks up on the point that hotels and other licensed venues need to take into account responsible patron care generally.

One of the aims of the program is to promote better attitudes around the serving of alcohol such as encouraging drinkers to have meals and light beers, and having a range of strategies in place including transport strategies. That is certainly one of the elements that we have picked up through the Security Improvement Program around the Brisbane CBD.

Last week at the launch of the Good Sports program, Brisbane Lions head coach Leigh Matthews—

Mr Cummins: 'Lethal' Leigh.

Ms STRUTHERS: Yes, 'Lethal' Leigh presented a very strong message. And isn't the team doing well at the moment? Go the Lions! Leigh was very strong in his view that clubs—and I guess other venues—will not survive if they do not practise responsible patron care. A key strategy of good sports is a multilevel accreditation program where clubs have to comply with certain conditions such as offering non- and low-alcohol beers, transport strategies and other points that I have mentioned.

One of the disturbing things, and this applies to other industry sectors as well, is that a study conducted by the Alcohol Education and Rehabilitation Foundation of more than 500 young people found that more than 30 per cent of 13- to 17-year-olds had participated in unsupervised drinking at a sports club. In fact, one of the things that was commented on was that a group of 15-year-old boys celebrated a win of their footy team by sharing a slab of beer on the field. That behaviour is not on. I am no wowser and our government is no wowser, but it is certainly important that we have responsible activities promoted in all sports, including footy.

Further, the study found that 71 per cent of these young people had never been asked for proof of age. Another study of club members revealed that 51 per cent of drinkers at sports clubs are consuming alcohol at harmful or hazardous levels. Worse still, the 2000 study of community football clubs showed 13 per cent of 18- to 20-year-olds drank 13 or more standard drinks each time they visited the club. Worst of all, 83 per cent left the club as the driver of a vehicle. This is reliable evidence I am told. If that is the case, that is horrifying. What we are talking about here, not only in clubs but also in the hotel industry, is that a lot of people, despite the calls for people to be reasonable and safe, are still very unsafe in their behaviour when they are drinking.

I commend the Good Sports program to members. I commend members to promote it actively in their local areas. Clubs can contact Kerry McAllister, the Queensland state manager, and she will get them on track and on the Good Sports program so that they can be good sports in their local areas.

I commend this legislation. We need to continue being vigilant. We need to make sure that people have fun, that they celebrate and enjoy activities—whether they be cricket, hockey, netball, football or whatever—with friends and with drinks involved but that they are good sports in how they go about it. I commend the minister for her efforts. I welcome the initiatives the minister has brought together in this bill. I ask the minister to consider further ways in which we can step up activities with regard to all players in this industry sector, those in private hotels and clubs who have been good sports, about how they, as responsible patrons, can play their part.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY (Maryborough—Ind) (5.31 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Liquor Amendment Bill and congratulate the minister on what I think is common-sense legislation. For each one of us, especially as parents, we are regularly horrified by switching on the news and seeing road deaths and violent incidents that are alcohol fuelled. There are people who are not in favour of lockouts at all. Unless we change the culture and become a responsible drinking culture, there will continue to be deaths and violence as a regular feature of our societal norms.

In one respect we say that culture cannot be changed—it is too big a job because they are matters of the human heart. I disagree with that and say that it can be changed. We only have to see the trend of people buying low alcohol drinks. In the old days, drinking light beer would be regarded as a sissy thing to do by men.

Mr Lawlor interjected.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: No, they did not. That is right. With the acceptance of lower alcohol beers, I think the culture is slowly changing. We certainly need to look at a serious change of culture among young people.

I do not want to be a wowser. I love the quote by Herbert Asquith, who said, 'Youth would be an ideal state if it came a little later in life.' It is very easy for us as parents and older people to look at young people and say, 'Gee, they are behaving irresponsibly,' but were we any better when we were their age? Wouldn't we all love to know what we know now but be young again and have a little wisdom as well?

Let me lay my cards on the table and say that not only am I in favour of the 3 am lockout but I would also like to see a 2 am lockout or even a 1 am lockout. The notion of kids roaring around the streets full of beer and bad manners is just a recipe for disaster. In country areas I believe that this is actually a bigger problem. People have focused very much on 3 am lockouts in the city, but let me assure the minister that lockouts are even more important in country areas than in the city because often the police are very thin on the ground and they simply do not have the manpower to be chasing mad drunks around the place.

I was just heartbroken to read the story in today's paper about the young woman who had recently moved to Maryborough from Rockhampton and who lost her life in exactly the circumstances I am talking about. Two brothers had also moved to Maryborough from Bundaberg. They were racing around the streets of Maryborough with police in hot pursuit. The police called off the chase because it simply got too dangerous. Here are a few young people who ended up in Ululah Lagoon and the young woman lost her life.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr O'Brien): Order! Member for Maryborough, is this matter before the courts at all? I would advise caution.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: I am quoting from what was in the paper today. Regardless of who is right and who is wrong, I feel very sorry for the parents who have lost a child—and she was away from home, too. We are all, as parents, very concerned when our kids travel and move around the place, but to lose a child in that circumstance is tragic. Mr Deputy Speaker, I take your point and I do not wish to comment any more on a case that could be before the courts. Suffice to say, it is a tragedy when young lives are lost.

In a former life I had a job as a piano bar player. I worked for a year in a nightclub playing piano and singing. I saw firsthand the culture of binge drinking. I remember one guy—and he shall remain nameless—who would get blind drunk every night of the week and hop in his car and drive home. I saw that happen, as I say, in a former career when I was in my 20s. He used to regularly say to me, 'I can drive drunk no trouble at all.' In country areas, as I said, the police manpower is just not there to deal with idiots on the roads.

In talking about the 3 am lockouts and what they do to the culture, a lot has been said about guys when it comes to peer group pressure and getting drunk and driving, and club hopping from one boozer when it closes to another. This has become a huge issue for girls, and previous speakers have addressed this. The peer group pressure for binge drinking among young girls is just frightening. When we hear about foetal alcohol syndrome and pregnancies that might be a result of getting drunk, that ongoing culture is a really serious issue.

I quote again from another speaker on youth—Quentin Crisp. It is amazing how old wisdom becomes new wisdom. He was born in 1908. He said, 'The young have always had the same problem—how to rebel and conform at the same time. They have now solved this by defying their parents and copying one another.' When it comes to peer group pressure, that is dead right. What happens is that often kids will care a lot more about what their mates think of them if they do or do not do a certain activity than what their parents think.

Time based lockouts are important, as I said. I welcome them in our area. I think they are common sense. To all the people who say, 'Oh, but that infringes on people's civil liberties,' I say so do road deaths and violent incidents. I am sick to the core of switching on the nightly news and seeing yet another person who has been involved in a brawl in the early hours of the morning and who has fallen and hit their head on the pavement and died from head injuries. This has become so routine that it is a shameful situation.

I congratulate the minister. I think any move to restrict the violence and to change the culture—albeit that change might come slowly—is a noble thing. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (5.38 pm): I rise to support the Liquor Amendment Bill currently before the House today. At the start of this contribution I urge caution upon the House not to engage in some sort of reflexive intergenerational wowserism that seeks to reserve this problem to the amorphous group of people known as young people. I think that would be both unwise and untrue. At the start of this debate we should also put a spear through the notion that the sale and the consumption of alcohol is a right. It has always been a practice in society that has been subject to quite heavy regulation—a fact that the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee noted in its report on this bill.

The bill before the House is far from prohibitionism. However, it must be said that the 24 hours of the day need to be shared by all members of society. The practical effect of the 3 am lockout has been a marked increase in safety for people who enjoy a night on the town, and that is why the bill is before the House. To be sure, by itself a 3 am lockout will never solve all the problems for late-night revellers, but it does form a key part of it. It forms part of the suite of initiatives being undertaken by the government to improve safety which started in the city of Brisbane and now, of course, will extend to other parts of the state.

Principal among those is the effort to assist with the safety of taxi ranks. All of us who have been out on the town know that many issues that can arise late at night come from incidents at taxi ranks, as people seek to get home. In that regard, the government's initiatives are very worthwhile and, indeed, I support them. They are initiatives that will soon see improvements made in the Caxton Street precinct, which is within my electorate. In that respect, I know that they will be very welcome.

Beyond that, it is worth noting that the government has already addressed issues in relation to binge drinking, drinking competitions, aggressive discounting of alcohol and advertising. Those are all commendable and worthwhile amendments. I might note, in passing, that those amendments all provide a distinct commercial benefit to licensees and they were supported by licensees because they do not want that in their industry. Competition comes in and undercuts them in seeking to sell cheap drinks to encourage a section of the market and that thereby undermines the whole industry. They know this and they acknowledge it. They support the amendments.

One aspect of these amendments—and I am unsure that it is actually a conclusion of theirs with which I would fully agree—which has some commercial impact upon them is the 3 am lockout, and they do not support it. Well, life is not a golden road. There is give and take. Any suite of objectives will always have both positives and negatives for any particular person at any point in time. It is important to say to the licensees who maintain a continuing concern with the 3 am lockout that there is an element in this where the market is organic. Some licensees argue that a 3 am lockout is punitive because these days people do not go out until midnight when in the past they would have gone out a lot earlier.

In my mind and in my experience, the change in the market of when people went out aligned with a period in which drink prices appreciably increased and fairly exorbitant cover charges were prevalent. While it is the case that lots of people go out to clubs, a key number of people who go out are young people and not many of them have buckets of money to spend on a night on the town. If it is the case that drink prices are more expensive and cover charges are prohibitive, then the reason that people will not go out is that they do not have enough money to go out for a longer period of time. There is an element of misapprehension amongst licensees that their behaviour as licensees has not in fact influenced this market dynamic. It is something that they should probably more soberly acknowledge and distil within their own minds.

For patrons, from what I know and from talking to people, the 3 am lockout has had the marked effect of improving behaviour within licensed premises. In the lead-up to 3 am, people are a lot better behaved for fear that if they are ejected from premises, they will not, in fact, have a second chance—as optimistic or as misplaced as that might be, given their state of sobriety at that point in time. We all know that people always believe there will be a second chance.

Of course, it then has a marked effect post 3 am because people know that there is no second chance. For what it is worth, it is important to note that people who have been out on the town post 3 am might have a view of the world which sees that the magic or nirvana of their perfect night out—if they are not having it at that spot—might exist down the road. Usually, if they go off in search—we might say, with blind optimism—or in pursuit of that goal, then perhaps outside the club a different urge takes over, one that usually sees them with a kebab in hand, or stopping for some of the incredibly greasy pizza available on Brunswick Street in the Valley. Oftentimes, they then forget about their crusade to find another club and make their way home, after deciding to call a night a night. The practical effect of this is divorced a little from some of the arguments that are advanced in relation to the lockout. I think it is worth putting those on the record today, insofar as they clarify the nature of the bill before the House.

I felt compelled to speak on this because, as I have said in here before—at least in a technical sense—I am the youngest member of the House. Perhaps these days I willingly acknowledge that it does not go much beyond the technical claim. However, I have to faithfully report to the House that on Saturday night last, together with my wife, we defied gravity and managed to leave the house for one

hour and 40 minutes, including travelling time, to visit Caxton Street and enjoy a very small period of time out in the real world. It was a participation in a key part of Australian culture and, more to the point, a life-affirming experience to be out in the real world. Having said that, I am sure that the bill before the House today will contribute to the safety of all patrons who are out on Caxton Street, both tonight and into the future. I support the bill before the House.

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory—NPA) (5.45 pm): I rise to speak to the Liquor Amendment Bill 2006, which I support. The member for Currumbin, the opposition spokesperson, has certainly made that clear this evening.

When we talk about liquor, we always seem to end up talking about young people. It seems to me that we target them, that the arrow always seems to point to young people. It is about time we recognised that young people are a very important and integral part of our society. Many of us in this parliament were young once, and some members are young now. My point is that it is very, very important to make certain that we take those people with us when we make changes to rules and regulations that are set out in legislation.

I say to the minister this evening that whilst I support the shutdown laws at, say, 3 in the morning—and we have to support this, we have to make these changes—changes do not always last forever. This evening, I heard the contribution of the member for Mount Coot-tha. There are certainly other people who live within close proximity to some of the places in question and it is paramount that they have a good quality of life and be allowed to go about their business in a proper way, in a quiet way, or whatever way they wish. It is coincidental that only about half an hour or three-quarters of an hour ago the police powers bill was passed in the House, which included powers such as move-on powers.

It is important to look at the community at large and the community as a whole. We have pointed the bone at the Brisbane CBD because of incidents such as the one involving a young fellow who lost his life last year as a result of street violence. We are trying to ensure that we do not see incidents like that occur again. In doing so, we have to think about the people who own these businesses as well as the patrons. We do not have a problem just with liquor in our society. We have a problem with drugs. I again applaud the police minister for some of the changes that have been made recently by way of legislation in relation to sniffer dogs in nightclubs and other places such as sporting events to try to get rid of that bad element.

When we read in the print media and hear in the electronic media how some of our sportspeople are affected by drugs, we have to wonder whether or not we are winning the battle. I think the worst offenders in our society are the parents of some of these young people, who do not give a tuppeny ha'penny damn about the law.

My generation would have a few drinks, get in a car and drive home. When it comes to drink driving and doing the responsible thing, the current generation is more responsible than the last generation. They select somebody who is going to drive and that person does not have a drink; the mates have a few drinks and they are driven home. We have to start applauding our young people before we start knocking them.

At the same time we have to put some of these measures in place so that we can protect them while they are having a nice time out or enjoying themselves on a Friday or Saturday night, or whatever other night of the week it is. Those people who want to prey on them and attack them in their time of enjoyment are the ones we have to target. I believe they are the ones that we are targeting with this legislation.

Whilst I am on my feet, I want to bring to the attention of the minister country events in rural areas. I represent a large western remote electorate. We have many sporting events in our area, especially in some of those smaller remote settlements where they might have a race meeting once a year or a gymkhana or some other sporting event, where a bar is in place. Most times the profits from the bar at these activities—and it is the same with the honourable deputy speaker's electorate and the electorates of many other members in the chamber—go towards the Royal Flying Doctor Service or go towards some other charity within the community such as a kindergarten group or CWA. It is very important that we keep those functions going.

When outside security has to be employed to make certain that these events are run in a proper manner the profit is no longer able to be used for those charities. I believe that our communities are very responsible and genuine in their need to make certain that the events themselves are run professionally and correctly according to the law, such as patrons drinking in the enclosed area. I will give the minister an example. The Betoota races in my electorate is a once-a-year event. Those wonderful people from the Uniting Church Frontier Services come out and conduct the childminding centre for the day. They have fun games for the children so that the mums can go off and enjoy themselves, and the dads are usually involved in the running of the race meeting or in the social activities that follow. These are great events. It is very important that we protect those events and make absolutely certain we are not going to see them shut down because of some idiotic policy that will strangle those community events.

I plead with the minister to keep an attentive eye on these operations because the police in those areas do a damn good job. One thing that we do have in that part of the world is community policing where the locals work very closely with the police to make sure that the law is upheld, whether it is the local scene around the hotel or an event at a local club or whatever. Sporting events are certainly a very important integral part of the social fabric of those communities and it is very important that we protect them.

Whilst we talk about what has happened in Brisbane over the past 12 months, I believe that we have to make certain that the wider community is aware of what the context of the legislation is and what it means to the wider community. It has to be put into local newspapers and across the media. The general public has to be made aware of the situation so that they know it is not a shutdown mentality. It is not about preventing the young people from having a good time, or anybody from having a good time for that matter; it is about trying to protect them in that environment while they are having a good time.

I urge the minister to pay particular attention to some of the events in remote areas. There was a forum in Richmond last year where they discussed liquor licensing. John Wharton, the Mayor of Richmond shire, was instrumental in that forum.

Mr Wallace: He is a good man.

Mr JOHNSON: I will take that interjection from the member for Thuringowa. That situation has also been heeded by the Mayor of Boulia shire, Trevor Jones. These are situations where we have to work together collectively as a community, as local authorities and as a state government to make certain that we are not going to put in place legislation that is going to strangle the social fabric of our communities and the social fabric of Queensland as a whole.

Ms JARRATT (Whitsunday—ALP) (5.54 pm): The introduction of a statewide statutory lockout by this government reflects our very strong commitment to ensuring public safety. While it is a coincidence that this bill follows on from the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Acts Amendment Bill that has just been debated in the House, I do not think it is a coincidence that they are both aimed at providing protection for people in our communities. They are not trying to take away the fun and good times that people have, particularly late at night. I think that is mostly young people; I do not think I have been out late at night for some time, but I am told people still do have a good time late at night. We do not want to take away the fun of doing that. What we want to do is ensure that people are safe and protected until they return safely to their homes.

As my fellow members will recall, it was a spate of bashings and the death of two young people in Brisbane that prompted the development and implementation of the Brisbane City Safety Action Plan. Clearly, no-one would disagree that hard decisions had to be made about the impact of alcohol on the streets of Brisbane at that time. The results of that action, I have to say, have been pretty fantastic. Brisbane licensees recognise the positive effect the action plan has had and have demonstrated very high levels of compliance and cooperation. I commend those licensees who have worked closely with the government to embrace their key role in ensuring patron and public safety in the vibrant entertainment districts in Brisbane city.

Following on from those gains in Brisbane, the government announced the expansion of the Brisbane reform statewide as part of the Statewide Safety Action Plan. The first stage of this plan will see the expansion of the 3 am lockout to all licensees in Queensland. This, we hope, will help to clear the streets of loiterers and stop late-night venue hopping. Put simply, there will be nowhere for people to go once they leave a venue after 3 am except home. It will also create a staggered demand for public transport and that will take the pressure off many taxi ranks.

While it is good to see that most licensees do accept their obligations under the Liquor Act to provide a safe and secure environment for their patrons and members of the public, I am nevertheless saddened to hear that some licensees place the pursuit of the almighty dollar before lives and have lobbied against lockouts in Queensland. Indeed, this has happened in my own electorate and I am disappointed about that.

It should be obvious that the statewide lockout is not about running businesses into the ground or about punishing licensees; it is about saving lives and making the streets safer. The lockout, as I have said, is not the end of early morning revelry. Clubs with the appropriate permits will be able to continue to trade to 5 am. No premises have gone out of business as a result of the lockout, nor has there been a long-term decline in patron numbers. However, as the minister has pointed out on a number of occasions, permission to trade after 3 am is a privilege, not a right. This privilege comes with responsibilities and if licensees do not accept these responsibilities they simply cannot expect to be able to trade over this high-risk period.

The Queensland community has made it clear that it supports the use of appropriate management tools such as lockouts to control patron behaviour and to safeguard patron and community safety. The government has listened to the people of Queensland and will continue to work to meet its responsibilities to protect the safety of Queensland. That is an action to be commended.

While I am on my feet I want to commend the people in my own electorate who form the public safety task force, and that comprises members of the police, licensees, taxi providers, the local council, security providers and others as the need arises, who meet regularly once a month at the very minimum to discuss growing and evolving issues in the community to do with drinking and licensed premises.

They act decisively in most cases to rule out problems before they begin, but we cannot stop people being unruly and having a little bit too much to drink. There have been lots of discussions about how that happens, but sometimes it is very difficult for people serving behind the bar to recognise that a person is becoming quite intoxicated until they go outside into the fresh air, where often the trouble erupts. Having to deal with these patrons sometimes puts our police officers in a pretty unsavoury position. The public safety task force works very well and very hard in trying to stamp out these types of behaviours. I want to congratulate the task force for its ongoing commitment to the safety of people in the Whitsunday electorate.

I do, however, feel duty bound to put on the record a concern that has been raised through the task force about the impending 3 am lockout, and that is the timing that coincides with the 1 July ban on smoking indoors. Many of the premises in Airlie Beach, in particular, have not had built into their premises areas that will be suitable for smokers to go out onto a balcony, for example, and have a cigarette during that 3 am to 5 am period. There is a concern, particularly on behalf of security providers and police, that this may result in some aggravation when people go outside to have a cigarette and are told that they cannot re-enter the premises. Personally, as a reformed smoker, I think they should just give up smoking, but it is probably not going to be that easy and I ask that some consideration be given as to how we can address the issues that may arise from those circumstances.

Other than that, I think this legislation will be accepted gladly, particularly by the police in the Whitsundays. They are looking forward to putting some order into the streets late at night in the Whitsundays. I commend the minister, her department and the people who have worked so very hard in bringing this legislation to the House. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—Lib) (6.01 pm): I rise to speak to the Liquor Amendment Bill. The bill seeks to impose a 3 am lockout condition on all licensed premises in Queensland, making the current lockout conditions in operation in Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Townsville and Mackay blanket conditions for the entire state. I have a personal opinion on lockouts in nightclub precincts in the south-east corner, but I feel it is only my duty to express my personal opinion in this House when I have sufficient evidence to back that up. Unfortunately, I do not have adequate evidence to suggest that 3 am lockouts should be placed over the entire state. We are all too familiar with why a safety plan with strict lockout provisions was brought in. Several incidents of street violence—alcohol induced violence—had occurred on the streets of Brisbane and the Gold Coast, so I am not denying the fact that something had to be done and a plan had to be formulated.

3 am lockouts were heralded as the way forward—the shining light of the new safety plan. Lockouts sought to address the growing problems associated with the management of public intoxication and minimise harm by restricting early morning club hopping. Interaction between intoxicated patrons in public places was considered a primary factor leading to violence and vandalism, and the effect of the lockout is to minimise numbers of patrons on streets and in public places surrounding licensed premises by spreading their departure times over a longer period. This all sounds good, but before we go about making this a blanket state policy I would have been happy to have seen some statistics proving that street violence, if at all, has been reduced.

When the minister does get around to producing statistics on street violence incidents since lockout provisions were brought in, we cannot be jumping to conclusions that it is because of the 3 am lockouts alone that street violence has reduced, if indeed this is what the statistics show. I understand, in fact, that the offences against police numbers have increased and this is explained by the fact that in Brisbane and the Gold Coast there are more police at 3 am to assault. 3 am lockouts are one strategy to reduce the incidence of alcohol induced violence on our streets but there must be a multifaceted plan to this problem. This is not an issue that can be improved through a one fix-all solution.

The minister will stand up and inform us all that 3 am lockouts are only the first stage of the safety plan. The second stage will include tougher statutory licence conditions on all licensees with permission to trade after 1 am, including crowd controller numbers, installation and maintenance of closed-circuit TV cameras, restrictions on the frequency and duration of happy hours, prohibition of drinking competitions and mandatory development of house policy. Irrespective of whether stage 2 is more than a one fix-all solution, stage 1 will only bring in lockout provisions. Stage 1 is, therefore, incomplete. 3 am lockouts alone are not enough and it is not enough for the minister to say that the next stage will fix it.

The Surfers Paradise electorate is the nation's most concentrated nightclub and entertainment precinct. We have 3 am lockouts in operation and I will explain to the House what happens every Friday and Saturday night at 3 am. Club hopping has certainly stopped, except there is often a mad dash to more popular venues at 2.45 am. When the lockout hits, people start going home. 3 am, however, is also the traditional changeover time for taxis. Therefore, at the time people are heading to the taxi line to grab a cab home after being locked out, the frequency of taxis slows down. So, instead of a steady

stream of people going home after a night out between midnight and dawn, there is a mass of people needing to get home at one time and at a time when the available transport home is minimal. If anything, there are now more people, many intoxicated, in public places with no way to get home. How is that addressing problems associated with the management of public intoxication and reducing the interaction of intoxicated patrons in public places? Keep in mind that this is the supposed primary factor for violence and vandalism. If anything, 3 am lockouts as a sole provision potentially increases the likelihood of interaction of intoxicated individuals in public places at 3 am.

What the government needs to stop doing is offering bandaid solutions. If a 3 am lockout is to occur, look at the practical effect that is happening in Surfers Paradise and complement a 3 am lockout with the provision of adequate public transport to supplement taxis and ensure enough police are visible on the beat at this time. That is the government's responsibility.

The first stage should be seen for what it actually is—a diversionary tactic that shifts the blame from the government to the licensees themselves. This safety plan has everything to do with placing restrictions, be they worthy or not, on licensed premises. What does that imply? It implies that it is the licensed premises which are to blame for incidents of violence on our streets. Why does the plan not include the provision of more police on the beat at lockout time? Why does the government not look at providing more public transport services around the lockout time? I will tell members why: that would mean the government would actually be accepting the fact that it is as responsible as the licensed premises for stopping the problem of alcohol induced violence. This safety plan should not only be placing restrictions on licensees but also be providing more resources to the police and the public transport system. Now that is a plan.

This plan does not properly achieve the aim of effectively managing public intoxication as it is too short-sighted and is more interested in shifting the blame and focus onto our licensees rather than onto how the government's lack of resources to its own services could also be improved to help the alcohol induced violence issue.

Interestingly, there is a specific clause in this bill which expands the licensed premises that are exempt from the lockout condition during the Indy carnival on the Gold Coast. I am referring here to clause 6(3) of the bill. They can do this because at Indy more police are stationed on the Gold Coast. The Beattie government knows that it can control crowds, even large crowds of intoxicated people, when enough police are on the beat. Better police resourcing must be part of this safety plan's first stage.

I would like to return to my original point and point out that I am unaware of any review process or consultation that could possibly occur in regard to the effectiveness of 3 am lockouts before the imposition of this short-sighted stage 1 on 1 July. If I could suggest what would have been the overwhelming response from licensees, this bill imposing across-the-board 3 am lockouts raises the same concerns as any blanket policy does. It is draconian and does not strike an appropriate balance between the rights and interests of licensees. What about the local pub of a regional centre? Is a 3 am lockout really necessary? Are there incidents of gang bashings that warrant a draconian lockout condition being placed on them?

Unlike the circumstances in the city and busy precincts like Surfers Paradise that may call for more regulation and police and transport resources, in the country this bill is the start of a plan of overregulation that will be an unjustified burden for smaller regional businesses and licensees.

Mr O'Brien: You wouldn't know!

Mr LANGBROEK: I take that interjection from the member for Cook, and I will point out that I was speaking to someone from a regional race club yesterday who told me that, when they want to have a fundraising event like a concert or with a DJ after the races to raise some money, under this plan and the second stage of it they will have to fork out more money to employ security guards at a draconian ratio to keep the crowd under control.

Ms KEECH: I rise to a point of order. The provisions before the House in this bill refer to stage 1. The member is referring to stage 2 and is therefore irrelevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! You can address those in your summing-up.

Mr LANGBROEK: So this clearly drains the finances of an already struggling group, the regional race clubs. We can see this blanket safety plan will kill their attempts to keep themselves viable.

The blanket 3 am lockout and more restrictive measures that will follow are required more so in highly concentrated night venue precincts. Regulation is needed, but in regional venues the regulations that may be appropriate in the city are just overregulation. Then again, the potential burdens of this plan on regional groups would have been recognised if an appropriate consultation process was undertaken. It would also have been interesting to find out what licensees, who have been subject to the responsible service of alcohol provisions for some time now, had to say about how the 3 am lockout would affect their bottom line.

Earlier this year, on 14 March, the front page of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* had the signs of six Gold Coast nightclubs on it. Three had a 'sold' stamped on them. Another two had 'show cause' on them and the remaining club said 'for sale'. It is anyone's guess as to whether the lockout is responsible for six venues either being sold or offering themselves for sale after the provisions came in without proper consultation or an adequate review process being undertaken.

Again, this government does not take everyone's interests into consideration when spitting out pieces of legislation it wants to rush through so it can say, 'Look what I did.' A blanket 3 am lockout provision is short-sighted. A lockout alone will not stop street violence and confrontation between intoxicated individuals. In fact, without more resources dedicated to police and public transport to complement a lockout time, the situation could actually become worse. A review process proving violence has dropped since lockouts were introduced is required to justify a blanket policy.

Furthermore, some sort of consultation process should occur to consider the interests of licensees and the impact on them, in particular regional licensees, before this policy is implemented. This safety plan is all about shifting the focus of responsibility from the government to licensees. This government must accept that it is responsible as well. We need more police on the beat and more public transport to get the people who have been locked out of premises home safely and consistently.

The minister was quoted in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on 11 April as saying, 'People have the right to feel safe when they go out at night. I make no apology for our tough approach.' So it is tough. I agree with the minister that lockouts will help the situation, but only if the lockouts are put in place at the same time as this government accepts its responsibility with regard to policing and transport and recognises how it is crucial to any plan to fix this problem. That will truly provide the safe environment we want and need in our night-life precincts.

Mr ENGLISH (Redlands—ALP) (6.12 pm): Mr Speaker, I seek your indulgence at the start of this speech because I have to answer a question posed by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. He asked the question: why does this government not have more police on the beat at 3 am? I need to answer that question because it just goes to show how little the National and Liberal parties have learnt post-Fitzgerald. This government is undertaking to increase police numbers by over 300 per year. So in real terms, police numbers are increasing by at least 300 officers per year. Obviously, the member for Surfers Paradise wishes to wind back the clock to the days when there was significant political interference in the Queensland Police Service, to the days when politicians used to interfere and direct operations. I say to the honourable member that, unfortunately, our job is to get police into the service. When and where they are tasked is an operational decision for the commissioner and his management. It would be illegal, inappropriate and downright corrupt for any politician to interfere in operational matters such as that. I suspect that he is actually asking for politicians to go around to each station and write the roster.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr ENGLISH: The member asked the question. Through the chair, I say that the member asked why this government does not achieve that. We do not write the rosters; we cannot. His desire to wind back the clock to those corrupt old days certainly will not be supported by this side of the House. We respect and observe the separation of powers.

In the speech I made when the management plan was brought in, I acknowledged that a significant factor in my support for the bill was the death of Paul Markham in the city. I went to his funeral. That funeral and the events surrounding Paul's death have stuck with me since that time. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise is correct that this bill is not a solution in itself; it is part of the solution. Club owners and operators have a role to play in relation to the responsible service of alcohol.

The intent of this bill is to have a phased dispersal of patrons from these clubs. So rather than having drunks roll out of clubs at 5 am, they will be staged from before 3 o'clock until 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning. This is not a guarantee of decreasing violence. It is certainly a factor that will contribute to less violence out there because there will be fewer people on the street and fewer drunks on the street interacting with each other with the potential for violence at any one point.

The opposition has made extravagant claims about extending the 3 am lockout across the state. However, at the same time we must highlight that it impacts only eight licensed premises. So this bill that we are debating tonight actually only increases the 3 am lockout from those currently affected to a further eight clubs across the state. This is not going to be the death knell for clubs across Queensland. Effectively, it will not impact on any of the pubs or clubs in my electorate. Again, as I said in regard to the original bill, I think this is a reasonable step to take. Given the violence we have seen in and around entertainment precincts—in the city, in the Valley and down the Gold Coast—I think this is a very reasonable step to protect the life and welfare of Queenslanders. I commend the bill to the House.

Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—NPA) (6.17 pm): The principle behind this bill is flawed. It will make policing harder and drive tourism away. I put to members that the 3 am lockout, despite its strong proponents in the government, is not based on sound evidence—

Ms Keech: So you're not supporting the bill? The Liberals are supporting it; the National Party is not?

Dr DOUGLAS: Hang on a second. It is a knee-jerk reaction to a problem that no longer exists. I would like to focus on the Gold Coast experience.

I represent a wide spectrum of people from Coomera to Nerang. In our area there is a large number of hotels and licensed venues that largely close at 1 am. Both young and old use Surfers Paradise for entertainment and the big attraction is that people can go late into the night and, for many, into the morning. There are many here in the House who have holidayed, honeymooned and partied in Surfers Paradise. Tourism is the driving force behind Surfers Paradise. It is the major income generator for families working on the Gold Coast and for my seat of Gaven. It will remain so for many years to come. It has continually grown. Its value to our national economy has grown by four per cent every year since 1964. It is common sense to support any proposals that allow this to continue. Tourism is the biggest business in the world after the military.

Nightclubs are a significant part of the entertainment industry on the Gold Coast. Equally, clubs and hotels have a critical role to play as well. The majority of these have, at times, displayed high levels of professionalism and transparency in their operations. The nightclubs on the coast are largely contained within a precinct between Orchid Avenue, Surfers Paradise Boulevard and Cavill Avenue. The pressure on them is coming from local residents, the residents of new buildings, the police and some members of the council. The lockout that is already prescribed targets them specifically. This bill, based on emotion and 'feel good' sentiments, will extend the lockout widely.

New players who wish to spread the precinct—in location, age, targeted increased patronage and night-time flows—face a significant challenge to their businesses because of the lockout. I live on the Gold Coast. My wife, Susie, is the councillor for Surfers Paradise. My children love Surfers Paradise and go to the nightclubs. Two of my four children are aged 19 and 21. They love the nightclubs and go there with their friends. There are many young people in my electorate who feel the same.

Surfers Paradise is safe. We have CCTV which is very extensive. We have good policing. We could do with more. We have a positive policy to manage the rampant growth of recreational drug use which is a worldwide phenomenon. All clubs and hotels have signed off on an accord. They follow the responsible service of alcohol. Their security staff are organised, trained and low-key. Staff are screened regularly. These clubs and hotels have a code of conduct, train security officers, have drink-spiking education, provide telephone assistance, organise taxis home and do much more.

There have been very few instances of blatant violence to customers. There has been no reduction in violence in general since the lockout was imposed. The reason for the few instances of violence outside of Surfers is that increasingly more people are drinking at their local hotels until 1 am and they have nowhere to go afterwards. There are young people walking on the streets.

It is very hard to have the necessary police to cover the wide spread of hotels on the Gold Coast. All the wrong things are occurring. People are driving cars home drunk. Young people are walking the streets. The neighbours are being terrorised. For example, the Varsity Lakes Tavern is now getting about 1,500 people on a Saturday night. Before the lockout there were fewer people at that tavern.

This Liquor Amendment Bill should be about telling people that we are interested in their safety. There are more against the current lockout than for it. Extending the lockout to include a further eight premises, three in prominent tourist locations, does not resolve the problem it seeks to address. I say that the bill is flawed because it does not reduce violence, it does not reduce alcohol abuse but, moreover, it will make policing harder because it will spread the radius of the problem.

I put it to members that the policy is putting the cart before the horse. The problems associated with alcohol, violence and misbehaviour are as follows. People are drinking too much. This is the case for younger people and especially women. They do not go out until about midnight. Those who have children would know this. The hours of work have changed. Young people are being routinely rostered on to midnight, especially on Fridays and Saturdays. Woolworths and Coles are doing this routinely. Certain elements of the security industry have been infiltrated by well-known bikie gangs which have stirred up trouble on the Gold Coast. I do not know what is occurring in Brisbane. The incidents recently have been well documented in the press.

Residential buildings are being proposed very close to the major tourist precinct. This needs urgent attention from our planning department. The lockout is easy. But there is no evidence to show how it works. In fact the contrary is true. Tourists are unable to access the nightclubs at night. They cannot access the hotels in outer areas because they cannot get to them. They are losing one another inside. Sometimes one is on the outside and one is on the inside. The one outside cannot get in because of the 3 am lockout.

Smaller clubs are losing out to larger ones. For example, in Surfers there is a massive move from Orchid Avenue to the lower end of Cavill Avenue between 2 am and 3 am. This has been highlighted by the member for Surfers Paradise. It gets worse. Girlfriends cannot get in because their boyfriends cannot get in. Passouts remain a problem. Backpackers in particular cannot understand the rules.

There is also an inequity in that the casinos in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast will be allowed to trade 24 hours a day without restrictions. I will discuss that later. It forces patrons to hop between places and binge drink and they get locked in by 3 o'clock. It also allows for those who are not locked in by 3 am to get out on the streets and cause trouble in an unrestricted way. Remember, they do not go home straightaway; they party on until dawn and, sadly, this does not occur near their clubs in the suburbs.

Taxis cannot handle the sudden rush. They will not come to the places because of the trouble. It would be better to stagger the times when people could exit clubs. A lot of violence has occurred near taxi ranks. There are now two new types of problem—

Mr Reeves interjected.

Dr DOUGLAS: Just listen. There are two types of problems with taxis. People are coming from the suburbs after the hotels have closed at 1 am and taxis are leaving Surfers with those who get locked out at 3 am. This lockout is difficult to implement and it causes trouble with intoxicated patrons who do not like silly rules.

There are also those who are locked in and party hard until 5 am. The law will encourage heavier drinking. It does in practice. When patrons get released at 5 am they have to make their way home. They are often intoxicated. As the member for Surfers Paradise has said, they wait for buses and trains that are hard to access and taxis that cannot cope with the rush.

The crime that is occurring is organised. It is perpetrated by known criminals. They are not there for entertainment. It is known that many are not locals. The lockout works to help, not hinder, their activities. The lesser-known negative effects of the lockout are that hotel or nightclub hopping and the patronage of suburban hotels and clubs has increased. There is increased drug saturation. The organised crime element are not really sure where the action is so they supersaturate both the nightclubs and the pubs.

Clubs and hotels, as opposed to nightclubs, find it very hard to address safety, especially outside. We saw what happened at the RE in Brisbane this week. It is the major reason nightclubs are suffering financially. One well-known nightclub has been declared insolvent and a number of others have closed and changed hands. This will continue to occur.

There are very few police available at night for callouts in the suburban areas of the Gold Coast where the large hotels, taverns and clubs are located and increasingly becoming more heavily populated. Locking people in does not stop the violence. They will offend in the clubs and hotels in the suburbs as well.

Why exclude casinos, airports and Indy? The reason is plain to see. The Brisbane and Gold Coast casinos are owned by Tabcorp. Tabcorp is building two massive new nightclubs that can trade 24 hours a day. They are exempt from the lockout rule. This probably constitutes unfair trading. It is even more extraordinary that the money is going back to Victoria rather than to local people. The clubs in particular will not be insulated from this. I ask the minister to specifically address the issues that will be faced by Tabcorp's recent decision.

Remember that people in casinos gamble when they drink more. On aircraft and at ports it goes without saying that drunken passengers cause trouble. We get more police during the time of Indy. We do not want to send a bad message to tourists. There is bipartisan support for Indy. It is a great event. But on the Gold Coast there are events week after week.

We do not want to hear motherhood statements like, 'We're doing something. We are hearing the problem. We can get good media out of it.' We do not want to see pictures of ministers walking with our police on near-empty streets at 3 am. We want something substantive. The Surfers Paradise police service is currently paying 100 hours in overtime per weekend. These hours will be substantially reduced. No-one wants to do the hours and no-one wants to have weekend work. This is all about keeping police numbers up. But unfortunately the effect of the lockout has been to shift crowds from Surfers to the suburbs. It scatters police over a larger radius. It causes more problems. It will never work in the long run.

Those who choose to read widely—and I would urge members on the opposite side to do so—would know that in the UK nightclubs and hotels that have a five-star rating get 24-hour trading and those that have a two-star rating trade until 1 am. When the lockout was implemented in Miami and Florida all the clubs went broke. All the ones that were a distance of five kilometres or more from the central clubs went broke within two years. No lockout in the world has ever been successful. Licensees in central locations are opposed to this. Other sites will follow.

The original intention of the lockout was to address the issue of violence. The accord has addressed this problem. Rather than extend it, we should be following the lead of other countries. Is the minister trying to kill the goose that laid the golden egg? It will be cheaper for the tourist operators in Surfers to close their doors. Our police will be spread wider and will have to work harder. This is a liquor bill and it should be approaching the issue of abuse and inappropriate consumption in a more appropriate way. I would ask that the minister look closely at what this bill has the chance of achieving. The lockout to date has been destructive. To further extend it would be a mistake.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

Dr LESLEY CLARK (Barron River—ALP) (7.30 pm): I welcome the implementation of a statutory statewide lockout as an initiative that will enhance public safety in and around licensed venues throughout the state, including those in Cairns. I welcome the opportunity to speak to this legislation.

The positive outcomes that have been achieved as a result of Brisbane's 3 am lockout have been significant and well reported. I welcome the decision of the Premier and the minister to expand this tried and tested strategy statewide to reduce alcohol related antisocial behaviour.

As members would recall, earlier this year the Commercial and Consumer Tribunal overturned licence conditions imposing the 3 am lockout on licensed premises in Cairns. This decision raised serious concerns about the effectiveness of the existing process under the Liquor Act to impose lockout conditions on late-night trading premises and caused a furore in Cairns, as reported in the *Cairns Post*. I wish to quote from that newspaper, to give the flavour of those reactions. One article states—

Mayor Kevin Byrne feared the CBD would return to "the bad old days" when drunken fights and disturbances were rife in the early hours of weekend mornings.

"Our issue is not to deny nightclub owners from trading, our concern is for public safety," Cr Byrne said.

As members know, it is not often that I agree with Kevin Byrne, but in this instance we were as one.

Member for Cairns Desley Boyle was equally outraged by the decision, having worked so hard to curb city violence and get the lockout imposed. The Police Union was also appalled. Again I quote from the same article in the *Cairns Post*, which states—

Queensland Police Union vice-president and Cairns police Sen-Sgt Denis Fitzpatrick said many officers feared the rate of offences would rise as revellers made a habit of bar-hopping between 3 am and 5 am.

...

Sen-Sgt Fitzpatrick said the union would continue to lobby for the lockout concept to be legislated statewide.

Of course people would know that on the John MacKenzie show in Cairns, Police Minister Judy Spence first indicated her intention to deal with the tribunal decision by legislating for a statewide lockout.

Why was there such community outrage at the tribunal decision? Firstly, the tribunal justified its decision by saying that the police had done such a good job that there was no longer a problem, but of course there were fewer drunks wandering about causing problems as a result of the lockout. In fact, it was just too good. Secondly, there was the small matter of the facts about what happened after the lockout was lifted. Cairns City Council security officers indeed reported a 34 per cent increase in alcohol related incidents and 25 per cent more violent incidents in the month after the lockout ended and the police confirmed this increase in violence. So who is happy? Obviously, the nightclub owners and the managers, because once again they are able to pack in more patrons until 5 am.

But who should be the spokesperson for the association of nightclub owners? Who should be assisting them in matters relating to liquor licensing laws? It was none other than the Liberal candidate for Barron River, Stephen Welsh. His support of nightclub owners did not go unnoticed. Trinity Beach resident Bob Dyson, a well-known supporter of law and order and regular caller to talk-back radio, wrote a letter to the editor that appeared in the *Cairns Post* in March under the heading 'Mayhem on streets an issue for voters'. That letter states—

Surprise, surprise. The council's security cameras have recorded an increase in crime ... since the 3 am nightclub lockout was overturned by the Commercial and Consumer Tribunal.

It is a pity the council's submission to the tribunal was not more convincing. But it is the position of the Liberal candidate for Barron River that has me most concerned.

Stephen Welsh, as spokesperson for the Cairns licensees' so-called "safety association", is out there championing their cause for more mayhem in our city streets.

Mr Welsh needs to decide where his loyalties lie. Are they with the profiteering nightclubs, the Liberal Party, which I thought wants to curb violence on our streets, or the residents of Barron River who want to visit the city in safety?

Let's hear from you, Stephen. I want to know where you stand before I cast my vote next year.

Did Steve Welsh ever let Mr Dyson know where he stood? Not in any letter to the *Cairns Post*, so we have to assume that his loyalty lies with the nightclub owners rather than with my constituency of Barron River. At the outset of my speech on this legislation, I said that the bill has my full support and it also has the full support of the Labor candidate for Barron River, Steve Wettenhall.

The nightclub owners are obviously unhappy and slammed the reimposition of the lockout that this legislation will allow. But what of their spokesperson, the Liberal candidate? What did he have to say? Of course, by now he must have worked out that it was not a good look supporting the nightclub owners ahead of those who want to be safe in our city at night, including residents in Barron River, so he found another hat to wear—the spokesperson for the Tropical North Queensland Backpackers Hostel Association. And surprise, surprise! He was quoted in the *Cairns Post*, in the same article, following on comments of the nightclub owners, slamming the legislation. The paper quotes him as saying that the decision to legislate the 3 am lockout statewide benefited Cairns as a tourism destination. So now he supports the lockout and supports the legislation!

What does this say about the Liberal candidate? Obviously he has no personal integrity or loyalty, otherwise he would still be opposed to the legislation. The people in Barron River can take no comfort from his support for the 3 am lockout because his change of heart does not stem from concern for their safety but from his commitment to yet another special interest organisation, this time the backpackers' association. So now the residents have to assume that Mr Welsh will put the interests of backpackers from around the world before the interests of residents of Barron River, or indeed the interests of any other group that he happens to work for.

By contrast, the Labor candidate, Steve Wettenhall, has the runs on the board with his commitment to the community, being a founding member of the Cairns Community Legal Centre and now vice-president of the Freshwater P&C, and strong supporter of various other organisations in Barron River. Indeed, he still works as a volunteer for the Community Legal Centre.

In conclusion, we are both proud to support this legislation for the right reasons. It will improve public safety and benefit the majority of people in the Barron River electorate and Cairns generally. I commend the legislation to the House.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (7.37 pm): I rise to participate in the Liquor Amendment Bill 2006. I commence my contribution by quoting extracts of the minister's second reading speech. In her conclusion she said—

> In summary, the amendments in this bill form part of a wider state government initiative, the Statewide Safety Action Plan, aimed at providing a safer environment for patrons and the public in and around licensed premises.

Quite frankly, I think that is common sense and that is what we should all be supporting tonight. This is about ensuring that our community is safe not just during daylight hours but also that it is as safe as humanly possible during the night-time hours. When private businesspeople such as nightclub owners simply want to concentrate on making profits and not contributing to our community, that is the time when the state government has to act by changing the law because some of the business operators in our community are not prepared to play their part.

I believe this is a great amendment. I believe it is a common-sense amendment. Many examples are reported in the media, reported in parliament and referred to us by our own friends and associates which show that alcohol, the early hours of the morning and nightclubs simply do not mix. I believe that the government has had to respond because some irresponsible nightclub owners are not prepared to act as responsible members of our community. All they have wanted to do is look at the profit margins and the bottom dollar. I do not have a problem with someone making a profit or businesspeople making money and ensuring that their businesses are viable and successful. However, I do believe that businesspeople—just like everyone else in our community—have a responsibility to give something back to our community. We are debating this bill and the minister has had to bring in this amendment to the legislation because some nightclub owners have not been prepared to demonstrate the level of responsibility that we require in our community.

Without further ado, I congratulate the minister on her amendments. I think it is high time. I say to the irresponsible nightclub owners that this legislation has had to come about simply because they have not been prepared to be leaders in their industry. I commend the bill to the House and look forward to the consideration in detail stage.

Hon. MM KEECH (Albert—ALP) (Minister for Tourism, Fair Trading and Wine Industry Development) (7.39 pm), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions. I particularly thank government members who gave such intelligent and well-researched contributions to the Liquor Amendment Bill 2006. In addition, I thank the member for Maryborough and the member for Nicklin for supporting the bill. They commented on the fact that the introduction of a statutory lockout is common sense, it is good for the community and it is about putting community interests—the interests of the majority of our constituents—far ahead of the interests of a few businesspeople who may be seeking to profit.

This bill is all about public safety. It is about ensuring that everyone in the community, whether young or a little more than young, can go out on a Saturday night and enjoy themselves and the government is absolutely committed to ensuring that they have a safe time. The amendments have come about through a range of serious incidents in Brisbane which led to the Premier calling a city safety action meeting, which resolved that we would have a two-stage Statewide Safety Action Plan. The provisions in the Liquor Amendment Bill before the House are the first stage of that plan.

The debate tonight is all about the safety of the Queensland public on and near licensed premises. The Beattie government takes seriously its responsibility to help protect Queenslanders. The lockout provisions deliver the first stage of the government's safety action plan and builds on the Brisbane City Safety Action Plan.

Contrary to the comments of some members opposite, we have never said that lockouts are the panacea for alcohol-fuelled violence and antisocial behaviour. They are, however, an effective management tool in changing patron behaviour and are part of this government's plan to make Queenslanders safe. These amendments are all about public safety. It is as simple as that, and the government makes no apology for that.

I particularly acknowledge the member for Mount Coot-tha for his intelligent contribution and his comments with respect to the importance of taxis and transport arrangements which the government is implementing. I also know that he is a proud supporter of the Caxton Street entertainment precinct.

The member for Algester spoke about the Good Sports program. I know that she is a great advocate of that program and believes that it encourages not only fun but also safe relaxation and enjoyment. The member for Whitsunday in her response gave, as usual, a very sensible contribution and indicated that she has evidence that no licensees who have participated in the lockout have gone out of business. In fact, she commented that it is very important to realise that late night trading is a privilege, not a right.

I thank the member for Barron River for her contribution regarding Cairns. She gave some very important statistics. Unlike some members opposite, she indicated that when the lockout was lifted the violence in the streets actually increased. That is why she is a strong supporter of the lockouts in the Cairns region.

The member for Redlands as well needs to be congratulated for doing his homework, as he indicated that the lockout provisions will apply to only eight additional licensees given that the other licensees in Queensland already have some lockout provisions.

I turn now to the contributions of the member for Currumbin, the member for Surfers Paradise and the member for Gaven. This was a great opportunity for the so-called coalition on the Gold Coast to be exactly that—a coalition and to show support for the shadow spokesperson for my ministerial portfolio. The shadow minister and I had a discussion last week in which she indicated that on behalf of the coalition she would be supporting the amendments before the House to do with the statutory introduction of lockouts.

Mr Reeves: And she did.

Ms KEECH: I take the member for Mansfield's interjection. I thank her on behalf of the government for that because it did show common sense and a recognition of the fact that focusing on public safety and lockouts is the best way to go. It must have been of tremendous surprise to her to hear the newest member of the coalition on the Gold Coast, the member for Gaven, getting up and not supporting his parliamentary colleague and shadow spokesperson. So on the Gold Coast we have the Liberal member on behalf of the coalition supporting the lockout provisions and then the newly elected coalition member for Gaven getting up in this House and speaking against them.

Mr Reeves: Do you think that might have had anything to do with his wife's support for her campaign by the nightclubs?

Ms KEECH: That is an interesting comment. The fact is that his wife, who is Councillor Susie Douglas, is the councillor for Surfers Paradise in the Gold Coast City Council. She does have the nightclubs precinct in her division. From reading the *Gold Coast Bulletin* leading up to the election, I know that she has been a very strong supporter of the nightclubs on the Gold Coast and has supported them in their very strong opposition of the lockouts.

Mr Reeves: Didn't the *Gold Coast Bulletin* also say that they funded part of her campaign?

Ms KEECH: That is an interesting comment as well. In the interests of transparency, I recall, as do other government members on the Gold Coast, that in the lead-up to the election councillor candidates were encouraged to be transparent and acknowledge where their funding was coming from. I recall that the councillor did indicate that the majority of her funding came from the nightclubs on the Gold Coast that were opposing the lockout.

Mr Reeves: The poor member for Currumbin has been sold a pup.

Ms KEECH: She was looking very embarrassed, and I can understand why. She did her homework. She spoke to me. We offered her a briefing and she was fully in support of these provisions. She said she was okay about them. So this is what constituents on the Gold Coast can look forward to if they ever came to elect, God help us, a coalition government: the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing. They do no caucusing. They have no idea. They say one thing and do another.

That leads me to the member for Surfers Paradise. The member for Currumbin has her fingers crossed and is praying that no division is called, because I do not recall the member for Surfers Paradise saying whether he is going to support this bill or not. It is similar to his views on the cruise shipping terminal on the Gold Coast. He supports a shipping terminal: 'Yes, we want one.' But where does he want it? 'We don't want it on the Spit.' Do they want it? He has no idea. Once again, they are all over the place. The coalition is saying one thing and doing something else. There is total confusion. We are totally confused. The poor member for Currumbin is totally confused. She has no idea what is happening with those behind her, and I can understand her frustration.

I would like to sum up by acknowledging some of the issues that the member for Currumbin raised. Unfortunately, she did get quite a few things wrong in her presentation. I was initially excited because she did say she supported the bill but then she went on to argue against the bill. Then her very last words were, 'I commend the bill to the House.' It has been a long time since I have written an

argumentative essay. We all did that in year 7 and we all know that you state your premise and then your arguments support your premise. But, again, the Liberal Party and National Party members on the Gold Coast are totally confused. The member for Currumbin supported the provisions for the statutory lockout but then argued against them and then at the very end said that she still supports them.

The member said that licensees have expressed the concern to her that the chief executive could impose a lockout earlier than 3 am and they would have no rights of appeal. This is wrong. The appeal rights will remain. Some lockouts are made earlier than 3 am. In some areas of Queensland lockouts have been voluntarily entered into. The time of the lockout may be 1 am, for example. That would be a decision of the chief executive. Decisions of the chief executive can still be appealed. Decisions that are statutory cannot be appealed.

The member spoke of extra compliance costs being forced on premises. These amendments affect only eight premises throughout Queensland and they have not been subject to a lockout previously.

The member also said that the government was not providing appropriate resources in terms of police and public transport. In fact, the member for Redlands has indicated that she is wrong. Police presence in Queensland has been beefed up by 300 and certainly augmented by compliance of Liquor Licensing. In fact, in the last budget the government allocated extra funds for the introduction of a liquor licence flying squad, a group of licensed inspectors who could travel around the state to investigate issues of concern.

The claim by the members for Currumbin, Surfers Paradise and Gaven that there is little evidence that lockouts are effective is wrong. I say to them: ask the councils and ask the police in those areas. In view of the time, I commend the bill to the House. I thank all members for their support, and the member for Currumbin.

Motion agreed to.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Long title of the bill agreed to.

PERSONAL INJURIES PROCEEDINGS (LEGAL ADVERTISING) AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 28 March (see p. 850).

Mr McARDLE (Caloundra—Lib) (7.52 pm): The bill before the House today encompasses four points: firstly, restriction on advertising by what are termed 'claim harvesters' by amending the Personal Injuries Proceedings Act 2003; secondly, an extension of the powers of the Legal Services Commissioner to deal with complaints under the preceding point and resourcing of such investigations; thirdly, the postponement of certain provisions of the Legal Profession Act 2004; and, finally, amendments to the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003 to allow interim detention orders to be made.

The amendments to the Personal Injuries Proceedings Act 2003 derive from the High Court decision of APLA Ltd v Legal Services Commissioner (New South Wales). That case determined the validity of regulations in New South Wales under the Legal Profession Regulation 2005, which restricted advertising for personal injury services in New South Wales.

Subdivision 3 of the regulation includes a provision that a person must not publish a personal injury advertisement if the person is engaged in a practice involving or is party to an agreement that provides for the referral of persons to lawyers for the provision of legal services in respect of personal injury. The provision in New South Wales would appear to cover advertising by what are called 'claim harvesters'. As the High Court ruled that the regulation was valid, it would therefore appear a similar provision in Queensland legislation would also be valid.

The term 'claim harvester' is a new term in this state and derives from people—not legal practitioners—who place advertisements promising or offering to assist the public to obtain money in personal injuries matters. The current legislation does not cover these 'claim harvesters'. It deals only with lawyers or persons acting for lawyers. Clearly, there is a gap in which a legal firm or a firm in conjunction with a legal firm could flout existing legislation.

The 2004 act came into existence to cease the practice of 'no win, no fee' advertising and placed a prohibition on legal practitioners using that term or one similar in nature. The amendments contained in this bill are to extend that to capture 'claim harvesters'. The Queensland Law Society has written to me confirming that it is in agreement with the proposal.

In essence, firstly, the bill amends section 64 of the principal act to define a person as advertising personal injury services if a published document is likely to encourage or induce a person to make a claim for compensation or damages or to use the services of a practitioner or a named legal practice in making a claim.

However, it is the second point that is of concern and where claim harvesters come directly into play. The second principle contained within the bill is the insertion of a new section 66, which places restrictions on advertising personal injury services by limiting what a publication can contain. It provides, in fact, only for the allowing of the name and contact details of a practitioner or law practice, plus information as to the area of law or specialty, coupled with it being published by or in an allowable publication method. I note that the penalty involved in this matter is 300 penalty units.

The third provision in the bill in relation to claim harvesters is that it acknowledges that exceptions should apply, and rightly so, where a practitioner can advertise directly to a class of persons, including an existing client, a person who works at the practice, a person who works at the practice's place of business or under any court order. Further, it states that a practitioner can advertise personal injury services on the internet web site of that practitioner or law practice if the advertising is limited to the operation of the law of negligence, a person's legal rights under that law and conditions under which the practitioner or practice is prepared to provide personal injury services.

Fourthly, it is clear under the terms that a breach of these provisions will result in a charge of misconduct. Under this bill, 'misconduct' means professional misconduct or unsatisfactory professional conduct as defined under the Legal Profession Act 2004. This places actions contravening the act on a very high level of misconduct and could well result in significant penalties being imposed by the Legal Services Commissioner as a consequence of any investigation. The question that I pose, of course, is whether amendments of such a draconian nature are required.

During my briefing with the Attorney-General's staff, I asked whether complaints had been lodged with the Attorney-General's office or whether they were aware of any adverse public comment in relation to what are termed claim harvesters. The answer—and the Attorney may well correct me on this point—was no. On my interpretation, the bill seems to be a pre-emptive strike as to what could happen in the future. Naturally, a pre-emptive strike carries with it certain dangers in that you do not really comprehend or understand the danger or risk that you are dealing with. A comment I would pass is that if there has been no adverse reaction nor a claim that legal bills or fees have increased as a consequence of claim harvesters it is somewhat difficult to gauge the evil you are attempting to combat.

Irrespective, I can see a clear benefit attaching to this bill as it really moves forward the initial act of 2004 to encapsulate people who would attempt to use a loophole, and in that sense we will be supporting the terms in relation to what are termed claim harvesters.

The second point covered in the bill is the extension of the powers of the Legal Services Commissioner. To date, that officer has only dealt with practitioners. However, the bill will extend that and allow the commissioner to commence an investigation involving a legal practitioner or a person suspected of contravening the terms of the bill—that is, the claim harvester. This is a logical extension of the powers and duties of the commissioner, as it would be impractical to have two separate bodies investigating what would, in essence, be one complaint. In addition, more likely than not that complaint would involve if not the same persons then certainly a relationship that blurs the distinction between the two.

The third issue dealt with in the bill concerns the postponement of certain provisions of the Legal Profession Act 2004. I note that in her second reading speech the Attorney said—

> It is desirable that those provisions not commence until certain amendments included in another bill, expected to be introduced in May, also commence. In the event that the other bill is not assented to by 31 May 2006, the bill provides for the commencement of the provisions that would otherwise automatically commence to be further postponed.

I note the contents of *Alert Digest No. 4 of 2006* when dealing with this issue and the particular comments raised therein. However, it would appear the Attorney's statement is quite unequivocal. The bill was only to delay the implementation of the provisions included in what is clause 20 of this bill for a very short period of time.

I ask the Attorney to clarify in her response the circumstances surrounding clause 20 as they currently stand—that is, is it the intention to introduce in the immediate future into parliament a bill that encapsulates clause 20 so that the terms of section 15A of the Acts Interpretation Act are not excluded as they would be under the current wording as it appears in clause 20? Clause 20 simply says that the Acts Interpretation Act does not apply to certain provisions of the 2004 act.

Mrs Lavarch: It would be automatic.

Mr McARDLE: Can the minister clarify when the bill is to come into parliament potentially to activate those particular sections of that act?

Mrs Lavarch: It will be activated upon the proclamation.

Mr McARDLE: The fourth and final provision of the bill deals specifically with the amendment to the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003. The act passed this House unanimously when it came before it on 4 June 2003. This bill now proposes an amendment to it allowing an interim order to be made in detaining the person under an interim detention order pending the hearing of an application to rescind a supervision order. I note in particular that the determination of whether a person is so incarcerated is on the basis of the test of reasonable belief. *Alert Digest No. 8 of 2003* went into great detail in discussing the principal act, in particular detailing a number of concerns that it had. I note that those concerns incorporated the length of time the prisoner had to respond to the initial application, how they could obtain proper and ongoing legal advice to deal with the material, the fact that there appeared to be no right of the prisoner to obtain a lawyer to appear for him at the preliminary hearing and the standard of proof required to obtain the requisite order.

As I said, the digest did go into some detail as to the concerns it held and then quoted at length from the Wood royal commission in New South Wales and I believe that it is important that we refer to that document as there are some pertinent points to be raised. In report No.8 this comment appears and it does give some solace to what is a very restrictive provision concerning the individual liberties and rights of citizens of this state—

> For none, on the evidence received by the Royal Commission, can there be any certainty that the experience or threat of imprisonment will act as an effective deterrent, or that treatment will prevent an offender from reoffending... Clearly however there may need to be some difference in the response of the system, according to the characteristics of the individual offender.

The report further states—

> There is ample evidence that conventional forms of punishment, whether they involve imprisonment or supervision in the community, have little value in reducing recidivism.
>
> Whether treatment provides any long term benefits in the reduction of recidivism has been questioned, and still remains far from resolved.

From those two quotes I take clearly that the commission was making it very clear that there are certain people in our community who, irrespective of what treatment is provided to them, will reoffend. In that context, provisions in legislation that protect the individual and protect society from that person are an integral part of ensuring the safety of society and the public at large.

Under the current act there is no power for the court to make an interim detention order. This bill remedies this position by giving the court sufficient power to make such an order if the criteria contained within the act are met. This will mean that a convicted person is not at large in the community with the potential to commit serious and ongoing sexual offences. It must be clearly understood that the act applies to a very small class of person and deals with the class of person that has to be kept from the public, and if there are circumstances that warrant them being taken into custody and dealt with then we on this side of the House will support the proposition. It must be also clearly understood that this bill does remove significant legal rights, as in fact does the initial act, from the citizens of this state.

As a consequence, only in the most extreme and urgent circumstances should this House pass such legislation. There is, without doubt, uniform agreement across the chamber that this legislation—that is, the principal act—falls clearly within the terms of those two principles; that is, it applies only in the most extreme and urgent circumstances. The bill before the House merely extends the terms of the current act and in my opinion it also deals with the most extreme and urgent circumstances.

This House has an obligation to protect the citizens of the state and this bill, though it is beyond what would be classed as normal in terms of legislation in that it impacts upon the rights of citizens, does nothing more than as stated in the *Alert Digest* and that is to extend the current legislation to a practical conclusion.

As a consequence, the opposition will be supporting the bill, but I do ask the Attorney to clarify the clause 20 scenario and how it impacts in the near future. We support the bill.

Mr SHINE (Toowoomba North—ALP) (8.05 pm): I support the Personal Injuries Proceedings (Legal Advertising) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006 before the House. It is an area in which I had intense interest prior to entering parliament. I state for the record that I have no current interest in any legal firm at all, let alone one that engages in personal injuries work or matters which are the subject of this legislation.

I was interested to do some research to find out what the law was with respect to other jurisdictions. It does appear that only New South Wales, and to a lesser extent the Northern Territory and Western Australia, has laws that restrict nonlawyers from inducing potential claimants to seek out a legal practitioner to make a personal injuries claim. Therefore, it is the case, from my understanding, that Queensland, along with New South Wales, is leading the charge with respect to this type of legislation.

In some respects the law in New South Wales is more stringent in that there is a restriction on advertising of any interest, let alone interest in personal injuries type matters. Advertising by nonlawyers is covered by subdivision 3. The previous member spoke of the regulation which makes nonlawyers subject to the same advertising restriction as lawyers. Moreover, a person must not publish a personal injury advertisement if the person in a practice is involved in, or is party to, an agreement that provides for the referral of persons to lawyers for provision of legal services in respect of personal injury. The latter restriction would appear to cover advertising by claims harvesters.

The previous speaker referred to the High Court challenge; I will not repeat that. In New South Wales the state government has the power to fine journalists $22,000 for the offence of writing about lawyers who do personal injury work. As might be expected, various lawyers, particularly those who might have been affected adversely by this type of legislation in the High Court ruling, see the changes to the law as being a blow to injured people as well as to their own interests.

There is a similar law in the Northern Territory and Western Australia but in all other territories and states there are no similar laws. The Queensland law, as the minister mentioned in her second reading speech, will extend the existing restrictions on advertising to claims harvesters. That will be the effect of the legislation. There is no point in repeating what she said in her second reading speech.

In some respects, as a former practising lawyer, the legislation does tend to go against the grain in that it is a restraint on trade. No other profession throughout Australia that I am aware of has any restriction on advertising placed on it so it is an oddity in that regard.

Many injured people as a result of this legislation and similar sort of legislation which has led up to it will not receive their day in court, will not receive justice for injuries that they sustained, which is not a good thing. I believe personally that the scaremongering we have seen was brought about by a rort by the insurance industry throughout the world. I do not think that we should lose sight of that. We should keep a very close eye on the premiums being charged.

In conclusion, let me say that this state still has the most liberal laws when it comes to CTP legislation, access to recovery of damages for personal injuries, as it does with workers compensation legislation. I think that is the trade-off. It is better to have access to the courts for justice in relation to damages for personal injuries than not at all. If the trade-off is restriction on the rights of people to know about their rights, then I suppose that is an allowable thing.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, prior to coming to this place I was involved for many years with personal injuries firms. I was fortunate enough recently to be invited to the 30-year celebration of a firm then known as Shine Roche McGowan and now known as Shine Lawyers. It was a great occasion. That firm has achieved a lot over that period of time, particularly since I left it, I might say. It has become a national firm.

I would also like to pay tribute to the firm I was with prior to coming here, Shine Gouldson, which is now called Gouldson Lawyers, conducted by Faran Gouldson. Both firms demonstrate a great deal of skill and courage in the way that they carry out their work on behalf of injured people. They tackle big business—the big end of town. It is a very high risk area of the law in terms of what is at stake, particularly in the no-win, no-fee area. Whilst it comes under considerable criticism—and no doubt we will hear some tonight from various quarters—having been in the game for a long time I understand it perhaps better than any other member of this House. I commend them for their efforts on behalf of injured people in Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (8.11 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on the Personal Injuries Proceedings (Legal Advertising) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006. I wish to limit my comments to the amendments in this bill which amend the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003. I note that the minister in her second reading speech talked about how these amendments will enable the Supreme Court to impose interim detention pending the determination of an application relating to the contravention of a supervision order. It is good news that the government is again responding to community concerns on this issue.

I note that in the bill and in the minister's second reading speech she again uses the words that the police officer or the corrective services officer has to 'reasonably suspect' that a released prisoner is likely to contravene. It is not any suspicion; it is those important words that we discussed when debating a number of bills during the last sitting of parliament. Again, we saw those words 'reasonably suspects'. I am very pleased that the minister has used those words. It should allay any concerns that other members may have, because I believe those words are appropriate. I certainly support the intent of what the minister is trying to achieve with this bill.

The explanatory notes refer to the likely cost of these amendments. Even if it were the case that there would be a significant cost to the Department of Corrective Services, I would still be supporting this bill. I note that in her second reading speech the minister indicated it is not likely there will be a significant impact on the existing resources of the Department of Corrective Services. I think that is secondary. I think the intent of the legislation is right. I think she is addressing a concern in our community. If it were the case that there would be a significant resource cost to the Department of Corrective Services, I believe all Queenslanders would support her to still proceed with this bill and for those costs to be recovered elsewhere. Bear in mind that in three weeks time the next budget will be brought down by the Treasurer. I commend the bill to the House and I look forward to it proceeding to the consideration in detail stage.

Hon. LD LAVARCH (Kurwongbah—ALP) (Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (8.13 pm), in reply: I thank all members for their contributions to this debate. This bill amends three pieces of legislation. The first is the Personal Injuries Proceedings Act, which recognises the role that personal injuries law reform has played in stemming the development of an aggressively litigious culture in Queensland. The legal advertising restrictions recognise the need for potential claimants to receive accurate information but also acknowledge the risk that such information may unduly encourage them to bring unrealistic claims.

Amendments to the Legal Profession Act 2004 will ensure that the implementation of the final stages of the government's legal profession reforms run smoothly. The remaining provisions will now not commence until proposed amendments to give effect to recent changes in the national model bill also commence. Finally, the amendments to the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003 will ensure that the community is appropriately protected from violent offenders.

In response to the question raised by the member for Caloundra, it certainly was not my preference to have to bring in provisions that postpone the automatic commencement of provisions. With the legal profession—and I know the member would well understand this—the project to have a national model of a legal profession has been on the agenda now for about three or four years and it has been actively progressed over the last three years. Queensland was one of the first jurisdictions to introduce the model reforms as they stood in that time when the Legal Profession Act was passed by this House.

What has happened since then is that the project for the national model has continued, in partnership with officers from the Commonwealth and the states through the SCAG process and with the Law Council. The Law Council represents both the solicitors' and the barristers' arm of the legal profession in every state and territory in Australia. We are almost there. It was very much hoped that the national model bill would be finalised prior to the end of May. For Queensland, that would have meant that for the remaining provisions in relation to trust accounts for solicitors, costs and cost reviews and some general housekeeping, to make sure that our laws are consistent with the laws across Australia, we would have needed to bring in amendments that reflected the parts of the model bill that are not in our legislation at this point in time.

As members would be aware, working with six states, two territories and the Commonwealth is not always a very efficient and fast way of doing things. We are almost there. I will not make it categoric tonight, but it is my hope that we will have the bill before the House by August or September. If it allays the member's fears, I am quite happy to make a statement in the House in September if there is going to be any further delay.

The bill that will incorporate the remaining provisions needed for the model bill and also the operation of the incorporated legal practices, which is one of the provisions being delayed from commencement through this bill, is being done in full consultation with the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland. They are quite comfortable with how it is progressing at this time, because quite a lot of questions have been asked. As the member can imagine, this is a very big project. If that allays the member's fears, I am happy to make a statement to the House if there is going to be any further delay—if the bill has not been introduced by the end of September.

I thank the member for Nicklin for his support, and certainly for his support of the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act. This was groundbreaking legislation when it was introduced and it has withstood a High Court challenge. We found that the current act does not make provision for an interim detention order to be made when there has been an alleged breach of a supervision order. This provision before the House will give the courts the ability to have an interim detention order.

I thank the member for Toowoomba North for his support of the bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7 (Amendment of s 37 (Exchange of material for compulsory conference))—

Mrs LAVARCH (8.19 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 7—
At page 6, line 2, 'may'—
omit, insert—
'must'.

The explanatory notes to the bill explain that clause 7 updates the terminology of section 37 to provide consistency with the terminology used in the Legal Profession Act 2004. It is clear from this explanation that no change in policy was intended by the redrafting of section 37. The amendment ensures that the existing meaning is maintained.

Section 37 provides for the exchange of material for compulsory conferences. Currently, if a person has legal representation, the lawyer must sign a statement that all relevant documents are provided as well as a certificate of readiness for trial. The amendment will ensure that the lawyer must sign the statement and certificate. This accords with the policy intention. I think that was the matter that the member raised in consultation.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 30, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Bill, as amended, read a third time.

Long Title

Long title of the bill agreed to.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 29 March (see p. 944).

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory—NPA) (8.22 pm): In rising to speak to this legislation this evening, I have to say from the outset that the opposition will be supporting the legislation. The legislation makes some fairly important changes to the parole board, which is probably a positive in the long term. It is good to see that the minister and the government are also adopting some of the principles that the opposition supports in policy.

The bill is a consequence of the review of the Corrective Services Act 2000. It is a review of the initial legislation that was passed some five years ago. Contrary to the assertions made by the minister in her second reading speech, section 252 of that act required a review to be undertaken within five years of the commencement of the act. Let us get it straight from the outset: the minister had no option but to review the 2000 legislation.

This bill, in effect, abolishes remission and conditional release. They are to be phased out so that prisoners will either be in prison or on parole. In fact, remission was effectively abolished in 2000 for future prisoners, but prisoners who had committed crimes before 2001 were still eligible for remission.

The opposition welcomes the abolition of the outmoded concept of remission but rejects entirely the minister's assertion that this legislation amounts to truth in sentencing. Truth in sentencing means that, if someone is sentenced to five years in jail, they serve five years in jail. That is what the victims of crime call truth in sentencing. To pretend otherwise is an insult to the victims.

This legislation finally puts paid to some of the important reforms to the prison system introduced as a consequence of the Kennedy report in 1988, which enjoyed bipartisan support. I remind the House of what Kennedy found in 1988, for example, that remission is a flawed concept and should be re-examined—an issue we are finally addressing some 18 years later. In particular, Mr Kennedy had quite a bit to say about parole and the administration of it. It was Mr Kennedy who suggested the establishment of community corrections boards. I remind the House of his reasoning for them. He stated that parole decisions would be closer to the communities to which the offender returns, the community can be involved in the decision, the people who know the offender best would be involved in the decisions and the authority to release prisoners would return to the body intended by parliament to have that power.

Honourable members will therefore understand the concern of the opposition to learn that this legislation reduces the number of community corrections boards from seven to three. I understand this reduction follows the abolition of post-prison community based release and the introduction of parole as the only form of early release. However, we believe that there must be adequate community representation on the boards that are to be established by this legislation. I will have more to say on that matter later.

This bill proposes that anyone sentenced to three years jail or less—except for sex and serious violent offenders—will have their parole details, if any, specified at the time of sentencing by the sentencing magistrate. Prisoners sentenced to between three and eight years jail or sexual or serious violent offenders sentenced to less than three years jail will be administered by the proposed regional parole boards. These will be the Central and North Queensland Parole Board and the South Queensland Parole Board. The Queensland Parole Board will deal with prisoners jailed for more than eight years and serious violent or sexual offenders jailed for more than three years.

This board will also deal with resettlement leave of absence. Resettlement leave allows low-security prisoners to spend their short periods of time in the community with a sponsor or family member as a precursor to parole. This bill abolishes resettlement leave entitlements for prisoners sentenced to less than eight years. It does, however, provide for reintegration leave for low-security prisoners serving less than eight years who are transferred to work camps. A prisoner's performance during this leave will assist in determining suitability for parole.

Other leave entitlements specified in this bill are community service leave, compassionate leave, educational leave, health leave and the provision that the chief executive can grant other leave for any purpose that he considers justified. While some of these leave provisions are quite obvious, I am concerned that some entitlements are quite nebulous. I can appreciate that the chief executive should be provided with flexibility in granting leave, but this takes us back to the problems identified by Kennedy almost two decades ago. If entitlements are not specifically codified, this will lead to unrest, particularly when some prisoners believe they have been discriminated against. I seek the minister's assurance that there will be regulations or published standards that will apply to the granting of leave and that all applicants refused leave are provided with a reason in writing.

In a similar vein, this legislation also codifies prisoners' entitlements and also details specifically what prisoners are not entitled to. Entitlements specified include the right to receive a personal visit each week and an entitlement to receive visits from lawyers.

As I have mentioned, this bill abolishes the previous seven regional corrections boards and replaces them with two regional parole boards and the Queensland Parole Board. I noted that in her second reading speech the minister stated that the new boards will accurately reflect the community they are representing and that she proposes to draw on the dedication and expertise of the members of the current boards. This bill provides that the board is to be made up of the president and a deputy president who are to be a retired judge or a lawyer of at least five years practice and five other people, at least one of whom is to be an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, at least one doctor or psychologist and at least two women. Similarly, with the regional boards, the president of the Queensland board is to be the president of each regional board—under clause 232—a deputy president is to be a retired judge or a lawyer of five years standing and then an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, at least one doctor or psychologist and at least two board members are to be women.

The minister was a former minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander policy and I was a former shadow minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander policy so it is very gratifying that Indigenous people will be represented on these boards. In Queensland nearly 25 per cent of prisoners are Indigenous. Quite frankly, these membership requirements do not really permit these boards to represent the community at all. I will take the minister's assurance that she will utilise existing expertise. I sincerely hope that she does not allow herself to be pressured by the party hierarchy so that we end up with boards full of Labor mates. As I said, I will give the minister the benefit of the doubt, but we will be watching these appointments closely.

A specific provision of the legislation is to prohibit a prisoner from running a business whilst in jail. This is an issue that has in the past been raised with the opposition by victims of crime. We made representations to the minister about this. I thank the minister for addressing this matter. This bill specifically prohibits a prisoner from carrying on a business or participating in carrying on a business. I note that a transitional period will allow existing prisoners to make arrangements in this regard. Similarly, sentenced prisoners will also be allowed a period to make suitable arrangements in this regard.

One of the matters of concern to me is that there is really no way to prevent a prisoner from benefiting from a business they own whilst in the prison provided they do not participate in its running whilst in prison. One of the issues that upsets victims is when businesses are carried on a prisoner's name, albeit by someone else like a spouse or partner. It can be quite confronting for victims or even a victim's family if they are confronted with advertising in the name of the prisoner, even if the prisoner is not running the enterprise. I ask the minister to specifically address this matter and advise whether this legislation will permit businesses to be carried out in the name of a prisoner.

This bill requires a prisoner to seek the prior approval of the director-general before being able to undertake a change of name. This is particularly designed to prevent the situation that arose interstate where a prisoner assumed the name of a victim. I understand that this provision may serve to prohibit a change of name by deed poll, but there will remain an issue with prisoners changing their name by common usage. My understanding is that they are entitled to do that unless they are doing so for illegal purposes. I would appreciate the minister's comments in this regard.

This bill denies prisoners access to assisted reproductive technology. This is a prohibition that the opposition welcomes. But again there are questions that this prohibition raises. I recently raised in parliament the case of a late-term abortion obtained for a prisoner with the assistance of the department. I know that the minister claimed that this abortion was obtained on medical advice. I fear that there are some medical practitioners who would approve abortion as a birth control method. I ask the minister whether this provision will prohibit the obtaining of abortions for birth control reasons. If so, how will the director-general be able to distinguish between the two?

Whenever the matter of reproductive entitlements of prisoners is raised the conjugal rights are also raised. I note that proposed section 154 continues the prohibition of conjugal rights with visitors. I presume that other such issues regarding sexual contact between prisoners and staff and, for that matter, between prisoners would actually amount to a breach of discipline by prisoners as covered by chapter 3 of the bill. What is not clear to me in this legislation is the matter of a breach of discipline or other offences that may involve prison staff and departmental staff. I would ask the minister to comment on how such matters are dealt with and the relationship of such offences to this bill.

Another of the rights that prisoners will have withdrawn relates to communications. At present a prisoner's mail, except for privileged mail, may be opened, searched and censored. This bill will provide that privileged mail may be opened or searched in the presence of the prisoner when there is a suspicion that it is not in fact privileged mail or where privileged mail is suspected of containing harmful or privileged items.

The current regulations specify certain persons with regard to privileged mail. Some 15 positions are prescribed, ranging from the minister to a member of an enforcement agency, and can include the person's lawyer and an official visitor. What I have found recently is that making representations on behalf of prisoners is more and more restricted due to the privacy provisions. I know that this is also a problem in relation to other legislation, including particularly the child safety legislation.

I am asking the minister to consider including as privileged mail correspondence with a member of parliament. Surely given all the accountability processes, including the enhanced power of search now proposed in this bill, the time is right for a prisoner to be able to confide their concerns to their member of parliament. I would be interested in the minister's comments in relation to this proposal. If she is opposed to my suggestion I would like her to explain just what the grounds for her objection are.

Proposed section 50 deals with telephone calls and provides that, in addition to the one call permitted on admission, a prisoner may at their expense phone approved persons at approved numbers. However, the chief executive may decide the length and frequency of such calls. A prisoner cannot receive calls unless they are for a family or personal emergency. Provision is made in this bill for the use of personal video conferences for approved prisoners as a means of enhancing family contact for prisoners with families in remote areas.

I now will turn to the provisions relating to rehabilitation services that are to be provided to minimise the risk of further offending. Rehabilitation objectives are to be achieved by requiring the chief executive to establish services to rehabilitate offenders, to help them integrate into the community, to acquire skills, for religious welfare and to initiate, maintain and improve relationships between offenders and their families. The minister knows that access to rehabilitation services is a matter that the opposition frequently receives complaints about. I hope that this legislation assists in clarifying some of those concerns. However, I have some doubts about that.

Let me commence with the concept of rehabilitation. It is mentioned in chapter 1 of the bill at section 3 but that is it. The only other mention relates to the title of other legislation. What does it mean? It is not in the dictionary at schedule 4, yet we are told that it is a primary purpose of this bill.

An understanding of just what is intended by rehabilitation is critical to understanding what services are to be provided. The explanatory notes at page 17 state that rehabilitation services will be provided to offenders to minimise the risk of further offending. The bill does not say this; only the explanatory notes do. In her second reading speech the minister mentioned the importance of programs for sex offenders and violent offenders to reduce the recidivism risk and then talked about a range of other non-criminogenic programs to equip prisoners with skills to assist them in gaining employment after release. In my view, these programs are just as important in preventing future crime.

My point is that prisoners must know what they are entitled to and when. One of the major frustrations that prisoners have is that they know, for example, that the successful completion of a course on preventing violence or sexual offences is a necessary precursor to parole for prisoners

convicted of such crimes. So they are keen to do these courses as soon as they can. The department's policy, based on research, is that these courses should only be undertaken as close as possible to release, hence the conflict—the prisoner wants to do the course now and the department says, 'Not yet.'

The other area of potential conflict relates to the vocational education courses. Whilst a prisoner may express a desire to undertake a particular course, their options are, firstly, limited to what courses are available and, secondly, determined by a departmental assessment of their needs.

There is another matter identified in section 266 regarding rehabilitation. That is the religious welfare of prisoners. In view of recent policy changes and legislation proposed by the government, I need the minister to confirm that Bibles will not be removed from prison cells. Similarly, I note there is no definition regarding 'religion' or 'religious', so I have to ask whether these services could include programs for humanists, pagans or witchcraft as has been proposed for schools. If not, and I presume they do not, why does the government have two policy positions regarding education—one for schoolchildren and one for prisoners?

As Kennedy, the PSMC and subsequent reviews have found, this is an area that has not been managed well in our prisons. Although improvements have been made, there are still significant issues concerning the provision of those services to match the options agreed to in sentence management plans.

As the minister is well aware, the Leader of the Opposition has before the House a private member's bill that would serve to prevent the release of serious violent or sexual offenders until they undertake the prescribed rehabilitation program. As this is a bill before the House, I am unable to debate it. Suffice to say that the opposition is disappointed that the government has failed to make such a provision in this legislation with the consequence that under this government such offenders will be able to leave prison without having undertaken appropriate rehabilitation courses.

Provisions for victims of crime relating to a victims' register are recognised by this legislation, ensuring victims an entitlement to make a submission to a parole board or to be provided with information regarding the offender's status. The bill also proposes that there may be others in addition to victims who should be advised of a prisoner's status.

The legislation proposes the appointment of a chief inspector to provide independent external scrutiny of the treatment of prisoners. This will complement the role of official visitors and the Ombudsman. My concern is that while the minister suggests that this role will provide independent scrutiny, this person will just be another officer of the department in the eyes of prisoners. I hope that will not be the case.

However, not all decisions under the bill will be subject to judicial review. In particular, the ability to review classifications and transfer decisions will be exempted from the Judicial Review Act 1991. I have been troubled by this aspect of the legislation. However, I do recognise the overriding importance of safety to the prison community and to the public at large. I am aware that some prisoners have used this entitlement.

In the absence of a judicial review, the bill provides for an internal mechanism for the merits review of security classification and transfer decisions. In addition, a prisoner may raise for investigation a grievance relating to his or her security classification or transfer with an official visitor. Under the bill the appointment of a chief inspector to oversee the inspection of all corrective services facilities and probation and parole officers will also enhance the accountability of the corrective services system, even though in my opinion they will be reviewed as a part of the system.

However, I note that the Ombudsman will continue to provide independent scrutiny of decisions affecting prisoners. I raise for the minister's comment my concern at what may be an increase in the references to the Ombudsman's office. That office is already struggling to cope with demand. I note the assurance given in the explanatory notes at page 19 that all costs associated with the introduction of the bill will have been anticipated by the department. Therefore, I ask the minister: was any estimate made of the increased references to the Ombudsman and, if so, were any additional resources identified?

This bill also proposes a new regime for the classification of prisoners. Prisoners are to be classified as either maximum, high or low security. This includes prisoners on remand. According to the explanatory notes, their classification will 'guide' the decision regarding the facility in which the prisoner is to be located. I presume that that means that maximum security prisoners will always be held in maximum security facilities but, depending upon resources, it does not mean that low-security prisoners will always be held in low-security facilities. For that matter, there may also be occasions where high-security prisoners will be held in maximum-security facilities.

I note that low-security prisoners will still be able to be allocated to work camps and that work camps are to continue. Again, the opposition stresses the importance of work camps. Not only do we believe that they are a benefit to prisoners, but as the minister knows they are also a benefit to regional and remote communities around the state. I congratulate the minister and former ministers for continuing that scheme. Certainly some good work has been done by it.

Importantly, this bill enables provision to be made for Indigenous prisoners to be placed closer to their communities to maintain family and community support. I continue to be saddened by the overrepresentation of Indigenous people in our prisons. What makes it worse is the number of Aboriginal women who are incarcerated. This is a tragedy and the members of this parliament need to work together to address it.

I notice recent media reports concerning the mental health of prisoners in jail and, in particular, the claim that prisons are now the government's way of handling the mentally ill. The bill before the House makes certain provisions in relation to a prisoner's health. The bill states that a prisoner must submit to a medical examination if the doctor considers that the prisoner requires medical attention or where the chief executive requires such examination in relation to the prisoner's security classification; where to place the prisoner; whether to transfer a prisoner; an examination of the prisoner's suitability to participate in an approved activity; or suitability for leave, early discharge or release. Similarly, a prisoner must submit to a psychiatric examination if the chief executive officer so orders.

In view of the shambles that now exists in our mental health system and in the medical system per se, I believe that the time has come where on admission to the prison system every prisoner must be provided with a full medical examination in an assessment of their mental health. This is not only to protect the health of the individual and to ensure that they receive appropriate treatment whilst in custody, but I believe that those examinations are also necessary for the protection of staff and other prisoners.

The continuing incidence of suicide and other deaths in custody mean that we can no longer rely on a crisis management model where the system is designed to respond to incidents rather than taking a preventive approach. I note the system of crisis support orders and special treatment orders. This will have a duration of up to nine months where professionals believe that an individual is at risk of self-harm or harming someone else, where the chief executive believes that they are at risk from others, or for the good order of the facility.

There are other provisions in this bill that will assist in addressing safety matters. In particular I welcome clause 18, which provides that whenever practical each prisoner must be provided with his or her own room. I note also that a prisoner who is under 18 years of age must be kept apart from other prisoners who are 18 or older, unless it is in the prisoner's best interests to do otherwise.

Under this bill search powers will now apply to everyone in a prison, that is, prisoners, staff and visitors. Intensive searches, including the removal of clothing, will apply to prisoners. Scanning and less intrusive searches will apply to staff, visitors and those providing services. For the first time, this legislation will permit searches of children who are residing with a mother.

Obviously, the most serious power conferred by this bill is the use of lethal force. Clause146 provides for the use of lethal force, but only authorises this force in relation to escapes or to protect someone whom the officer has reason to believe a prisoner is likely to kill or cause grievous bodily harm to. I would like the minister to confirm that clause146(c), in relation to protecting another person, also applies to the corrective services officer protecting themselves. That is, does clause146 permit the of use of lethal force in self-defence, because it specifically refers to the officer having a belief in relation to the danger being faced by the other person?

The best interests of the child will be the criteria in determining if a child is to visit a prisoner. To facilitate family links, provision is made for video links and for primary school-age children to reside with mothers in low-security facilities on weekends or during school holidays.

The practices to be followed in relation to the death of a prisoner are detailed in clause 24. It all makes sense, but there are two aspects I would like the minister to comment on. The first relates to an eligible person on the register as provided under clause 320. Given that any public information subsequently released about the death of a prisoner has the potential to emotionally impact upon eligible persons, I would have thought that it was appropriate for clause 34 to include them as a person to be notified.

Secondly, I note that the provisions of clause 24 do not apply to a prisoner on parole. Whilst I can appreciate that the death of such a person would be treated in accordance with the general community provisions for such deaths, I would have thought that there were matters consequential to such a death that would invoke similar actions to those specified in clause 24, particularly if we are to consider that parole is an integral part of the prison term. Surely clause 24(2), which is about keeping a record of a prisoner's death, would apply to the chief executive, for example.

In conclusion, this bill is a step forward in the administration of our prison system. In many ways it is inspirational legislation in that it provides guidelines and espouses intentions. But these are not necessarily backed up with actions. Take, for example, the provision of rehabilitation. It is one thing to say that rehabilitation is to be provided and that the chief executive must establish programs, but it is quite another to make sure that all prisoners are able to take advantage of the relevant courses.

There is nothing in this legislation that ensures that sufficient resources are provided for prisons to operate effectively. There is nothing that guarantees that adequate staff will be provided or that they will be able to carry out their duties effectively. Let me take, for instance, the much criticised concept of

perimeter patrol vehicles. Since the Beattie government saw fit to withdraw the Hummers in 2003, there has been a talkfest between the minister and the Queensland Public Sector Union about their use and that issue remains unresolved today. The sticking points are deployment, staffing and appropriate responses for these vehicles. I understand that there are also issues regarding the armaments that can be deployed with these vehicles. What the minister is insisting upon is that perimeter patrols be abandoned and that these vehicles be used only when an incident occurs. I table a circular from the general secretary of the QPSU concerning this matter.

As Mr Scott points out, for all their faults at least the Hummers did perimeter patrols to deter incidents and to protect the general public. He goes on to say that the original position of the government was not to replace them at all, and when finally convinced of the stupidity of that position they wanted to deploy vehicles without weapons. So we have millions of dollars of perimeter vehicles doing what? Isn't it true that negotiations with the union have broken down and that three years after the Hummers were abandoned we still do not have perimeter patrol vehicles doing adequate patrolling of our prison facilities?

When it comes to Corrective Services officers, this bill is silent on their entitlements in terms of training and equipment. It may be no coincidence that the same section dealing with the appointment of these officers makes similar provision for the appointment of a Corrective Services dog.

This bill is an important piece of legislation as there is nothing more indicative of the power of the state than the power to remove someone from society and the privileges of being a citizen. In today's society it is the ultimate penalty and, as we have seen, it is backed by the authority to use lethal force.

I again express my appreciation to the minister and her staff for providing me with a briefing on the legislation which, as usual, was professional. I thank them for their assistance. I have raised a number of matters that I look forward to the minister responding to and matters that I intend to pursue further at the consideration in detail stage. At this stage I propose that the coalition government, as I said at the start, will be supporting this legislation.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 24 April 2006, from Alex Scott, General Secretary QPSU to Queensland Public Sector Union members, Department of Corrective Services relating to the use of perimeter patrol vehicles

Mr NUTTALL (Sandgate—ALP) (8.53 pm): I rise tonight to support the Corrective Services Bill 2006. I think it is important to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister for Police and Corrective Services and, of course, her director-general on the review of the 2000 act, which examined the legislation governing corrections in Queensland and in other jurisdictions. The comprehensive and inclusive way in which the review of the act was conducted, particularly in terms of stakeholder engagement and responsiveness to community expectations, can be held up as best practice. The result of the review is before us today—a bill that will ensure the management of prisoners with due regard to community safety.

The review has demonstrated that the Beattie Labor government continues to commit itself to ensuring the legislation governing corrective services in Queensland meets the needs and expectations of the broader community. For example, the passage of this bill through the House will bring about laws that have been developed in response to calls from the community that prisoners (1) should serve the entire sentence handed down by a court, (2) should not be able to access assisted reproductive technology in custody, (3) should not be able to change their name without seeking permission, and (4) should not be able to run a business from prison.

The bill has also responded to calls that parole boards should have input from the victims of crime prior to making a decision about the prisoner's application for parole. The community expects governments to provide protection against serious crime and to provide deterrents and punishment for those who commit crime. The Beattie Labor government takes this responsibility seriously. I would like to take this opportunity to remind the House that there have been no escapes from secure custody in Queensland since the Beattie Labor government came to power.

We must not forget, however, that it is also the responsibility of government to provide rehabilitation and prevention strategies for prisoners as well as secure containment. Bearing that in mind, I would also like to congratulate the government on its commitment of spending $5.9 million this financial year on rehabilitation, including prison industry activities and sex offender treatment programs.

The government has proven that it is willing to step up to the plate when it comes to addressing issues of crime. Importantly, this government is focused on crime prevention strategies and strengthening diversionary options for low-risk offenders. When offenders are sentenced to jail time, they are provided with rehabilitation programs and services. This demonstrates that this government is serious about finding a long-term solution to reducing crime and enhancing community safety.

The new corrections legislation will make sure that when offenders are sentenced the offender is subject to supervision and control for the entire time that is determined by the court. If a prisoner is serving a short sentence and has not been convicted of a sex offence or serious violent offence, the sentencing court will determine how much of that sentence will be served in jail and how much will be

supervised on parole in the community. This change, which is quite significant, will mean that the majority of prisoners in Queensland will be monitored in the community after their release. Probation and parole officers will be watching them closely but also helping them to find suitable accommodation, look for work, participate in training or education programs, or take part in counselling to make sure that they do not reoffend. If a parolee's behaviour is not up to scratch, the parole officer will be able to have them returned to custody.

Other prisoners serving a longer period of imprisonment of over three years will need to apply to a parole board if they wish to get out of prison before the end of their sentence. The antiquated concepts of remission, conditional release, release to work and home detention will be abolished, and parole will be the only form of early release that is available to prisoners. Prisoners who are granted parole will have conditions tailored to their individual needs. These conditions may relate to a place of residence, for example, or requirements regarding attendance at programs or counselling. There are obviously a number of other changes in this legislation, but these are the ones that I particularly wish to point out.

When I first came into this parliament I was a member of the legislative committee for the then justice minister, Mr Milliner. I took the opportunity as a new member in this parliament to tour a number of prisons in this state.

Mr Reeves: Did you catch up with old friends?

Mr NUTTALL: No, I did not actually. I did not see anyone I knew, thank heaven. At that time there were some 2,000 prisoners. Now we have approximately 5,000 prisoners—

Ms Spence: Five thousand four hundred on any given day.

Mr NUTTALL: That is a significant increase. I think people should bear in mind what that costs us as a community.

It is one thing to say that we should lock them all up and throw away the key. However, we really should consider the cost of that to our community. Would it not be greater for our society to spend money on educating young people who do not have opportunities in life so that they do not start down the path of crime and violence? That would be a wonderful goal, if we could achieve it. What if we could actually reduce the prison population through educating young people and giving them greater opportunities to actually advance in life and make their lives worth while?

What worries me, I suppose, are the examples of the United States, which has one of the highest incarceration rates in the Western world, and New Zealand which, on a proportional basis, has the second-highest incarceration rate in the Western world. Both of those countries have deregulated their industrial relations and in those countries are the haves and the have-nots. I hope that our society is not heading in that direction. We need a proper balance. We do not want a society of haves and have-nots. We need a society that cares for all. For too long, at a national level it has been about individualism and not about the greater good of our society. It is a great tragedy for us as a nation to be heading in that direction.

The bill before the House, obviously, has basically rewritten the whole of Corrective Services. As I said, an enormous amount of work has gone into this legislation. Again, I congratulate the minister, her director-general and the department for putting together such a comprehensive piece of legislation.

Mrs LIZ CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (9.01 pm): I rise to speak to the Corrective Services Bill 2006. I believe that the minister's opening statement in her second reading speech articulates what most people in the community would say in terms of truth in sentencing. She stated that every prisoner sentenced after the bill becomes law will have to serve 100 per cent of their sentence, either in custody or under supervision in the community. The bill abolishes remission retrospectively and ensures that sex offenders and serious violent offenders can only be given supervised release approved by a parole board.

A great majority of people in the community believe that if someone is sentenced to seven years they should serve seven years. If someone is sentenced to five years they should serve five years. When I was first elected to this chamber in 1995 and subsequent to that, we debated a couple of law and order bills. I commented on the fact that if people receive a sentence of seven years they should serve it. That is what the community expected.

I was contacted by then members of the parole board and gently reminded that remission and early release are used by prison authorities to encourage better behaviour by prisoners. At the time I thought, and commented to those people, that perhaps the other rule could apply—that bad behaviour be rewarded with additional jail time. I think that is the way the community feels. It is not because they are heartless or lack compassion but because they very often see—to their mind—a person alleged to have perpetrated an offence who goes to court, is found guilty and—in the community's mind—is sentenced too lightly. That occurs for a broad range of offences but particularly violent offences and, more particularly, sexually violent offences. I believe that the community will welcome a step towards the government accepting their aspirations in terms of safety within the community.

I recognise, as the member for Sandgate said, that it costs a lot of money to keep people incarcerated. As I mentioned this morning, I have visited the prison at Wacol. No personal information was divulged inappropriately but, in general terms, I heard about the family backgrounds and circumstances of many who are serving custodial sentences. In terms of the backgrounds that they have come out of, in a generic sense, there are very many stories or circumstances of tragedy that have contributed to the place that these people are at at this point in time. It does not excuse bad behaviour. It does not excuse a person from robbing a bank. It does not make it right. However, sometimes it gives an insight into the decrease or loss of their self-esteem and their sense of self-worth.

This bill gets tough on prisoners and makes it clear that they do not have the same rights to access facilities as do people who have not broken the law. Again, the community would support that notion 100 per cent. I believe that it is the firm view of members of the community that when a person perpetrates an illegal act and is sentenced to a custodial sentence they give up many of the rights that we, as free citizens, naturally enjoy. Part of, for want of a better word, the trade-off when people act outside the law is that they lose many of those rights that we take for granted, appropriately, on a day-to-day basis.

I note that the current seven parole boards will be replaced by what appear to be three regional parole boards. In her second reading speech the minister stated—

> I am committed to ensuring that the membership of each board reflects accurately the community it is representing. That is why the bill retains membership requirements in relation to the inclusion of female and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander members. I will be nominating the membership of the three boards to the Governor in Council for approval and it is my intention to draw on the dedication and expertise of current members of Queensland's seven community corrections boards when instituting the membership of the new parole boards.

I want to make an observation. I do not know the members of the current parole board, and I am not casting aspersions on any of them. I want to make that clear. However, over time there has been some frustration with the process of releasing convicted offenders, particularly violent offenders, into the community. Some would say that the release has been premature, ill-advised or inadequately supervised and constrained.

I am not necessarily asking the minister for a response—it may be inopportune for her to do so—but if there is membership of parole boards with a history of, perhaps, ill-advised releases, that might also exercise the minister's mind when appointing new parole board members. There has been some frustration and regret in the past, and it would be a shame for that same propensity to be replicated in the new boards. I am sure that it is not an easy job. However, it is incredibly important that the community has confidence not only in the way offenders are treated but also in the way the community is treated.

The Queensland Parole Board will deal with serious violent offenders—those serving eight years or more—and two regional boards will deal with people sentenced to between three years and eight years.

In relation to short-sentence prisoners who are not sex offenders or serious violent offenders, there is provision for parole dates to be set by the sentencing court. I have one question. The information may be in the bill but I must confess that I have not been through it in detail, due to lack of resources. Where a prisoner is sentenced to a shorter custodial sentence, where they are not sex offenders or serious violent offenders, and where the court has set a projected parole date, if during that period of custodial sentence that prisoner proves himself or herself to be less than an acceptable prisoner—if they have acted inappropriately within the prison, if they have been provocative, if they have been unprepared to make adjustments to their behaviour—will there be an opportunity for that court appointed parole date to be reviewed or revised?

If a person is sentenced to 18 months and the court says they are eligible for parole after nine months and if during that nine months of incarceration—stupid as it might sound—that prisoner misbehaved quite seriously, is there an opportunity to revisit that parole date? I would be interested in the minister's response. I welcome, as do all in the community, the minister's proposal to increase probation and parole officers to ensure that they will be able to meet this additional workload. It will be an additional workload and a very demanding one at that.

The victims of crime changes are also welcome. It is very difficult, unless one has unfortunately been a victim of crime or knows somebody who is a victim of crime, to understand the nuances of effect. Sometimes the most subtle things can do the most damage to a person who has either been subject to a violent offence or an intrusive offence or is part of a family who has had those crimes committed against them. Something that even a reasonable person might think should not be provocative to victims of crime, should not be a trigger to further remorse and trauma, can be quite a significant provocation.

The closer the relationship between victims of crime to those making decisions, like parole boards, the more opportunity the victims of crime have to articulate their concerns and the impact of the projected release, the better the decision making will be. Every time a victim of crime is asked to respond to a proposal to review parole of a prisoner it reopens those wounds and sometimes those victims find it difficult to respond. The legislation says that they have 21 days to respond. It must be

borne in mind that that is extra pain for those people who were the initial victims of the offence. However, recognition of their position, their vulnerabilities and their rights is incredibly important and I commend the minister for the improvements in that area.

There is only one other issue that I wish to raise and that is the provisions that relate to the criminal history check of any person entering a prison whether it is a staff member, a personal visitor, a service provider or tradesperson prior to them entering a prison. It may be clearly set out in the legislation, but I was interested in the time line for that. I was advised by the minister's department that the prison had to be advised some days before we turned up for the inspection on Monday, but for people like some service providers or some personal visitors, if they turn up on the doorstep is it at that point in time that they will be told that the prison wishes to do a criminal history check? Will there be a process in place to allow for that person to be prepared not to be able to visit the person they want to see? I would be interested in those time lines. Not everybody lives close to the prison so if they are refused entry there may be a significant cost to them in terms of travel.

In closing, I commend the minister for the legislation. It reflects more closely the views and the values of people in the community. I do not believe we want to see masses of people in prisons, however, there is little option when individuals take law and order into their own hands and commit violent and grievous crimes against others, in particular those who are defenceless in our community. I commend the minister for the legislation.

Ms STONE (Springwood—ALP) (9.13 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services Bill 2006. The bill contains some major policy initiatives that will see Queensland continue to set the benchmark for corrections. I want to concentrate my remarks on the more technical changes that appear in the bill. The Beattie government has been dedicated to reviewing the legislation that governs operational procedures of Queensland's custodial correctional centres to ensure that management practices across all prisons are consistent, effective and of the highest quality and that prisons are a safe and secure environment for prisoners and a safe environment for staff.

There is no doubt that monitoring and controlling the importation of illicit substances into corrective services facilities is one of the biggest, if not the biggest, challenges facing correctional managers. The Minister for Police and Corrective Services should be applauded for her commitment to combating this problem. Last year alone Queensland prison intelligence officers uncovered 251 drug items and drug related implements in Queensland prisons, including heroin, amphetamines, cannabis and syringes. As a result of those investigations and other reported matters, 392 people were charged in relation to a total of 437 offences.

Minister Spence and this government have sent a clear message: if you want to try to smuggle drugs into prison you will get caught and face jail time yourself. I believe that if prisoners are to be rehabilitated in prison it is essential that their environment be drug free. If it is not, existing addicts will remain addicted, prisoners who enter prison without an addiction may develop one and prisoners will acquire drug debts which often are only paid upon their release by committing further crimes.

I support any processes that lead to the detection and prosecution of people trying to carry or send drugs into prison. Undoubtedly, one of the key tools utilised to combat the carriage of drugs and other contraband into prison is the search of people and things entering a prison. Strengthening the search provisions in the corrections legislation is another blow to those who want to smuggle drugs into prison. The bill makes clear that every person who enters a corrective services facility is required to submit to a scanning search. Personal visitors, staff and other visitors to corrective services facilities may also be subjected to a general search.

A scanning search includes a scan of a person and his or her possessions by electronic or other means. A general search is a search to reveal the contents of outer garments, hand luggage and pockets of a person without touching the person. The bill makes it clear that any person, whether a staff member or a visitor, who refuses to submit to searches may be directed to leave a corrective services facility. It is also made clear that a search may be carried out in absolutely any part of the prison. Any vehicle entering or leaving a prison may also be searched.

The most intrusive form of search utilised by correctional administrators is no doubt searches that require prisoners to remove their clothing. It has never been the intention of corrective services legislation that these types of searches apply to staff or visitors to prisons. To make it absolutely clear, the bill directs that a child residing in a prison with their mother should never be required to submit to a personal search or a search requiring the removal of clothing and may only be subjected to the same searches as visitors to prisons. What a sad day it is when we have to put this in our legislation. It is a sad day when we hear of such low people wanting to use children to carry drugs for them.

The Corrective Services Act 2000 included provisions specifically designed to ensure the preservation of a prisoner's dignity during a strip search or personal search by requiring that such searches only be carried out by corrective services officers of the same gender. The bill retains these provisions but goes a step further by directing that a corrective services officer must give a prisoner the opportunity to remain partially dressed during the search.

We all heard from the minister in March this year about the deterrent effect of searches that require prisoners to remove their clothing and the drop in drug use in the state's prisons during the last five years. The minister also informed the House at this time that searches that require prisoners to remove their clothing had been reduced by 50 per cent during that last 12 months in the Brisbane Women's Correctional Centre Crisis Support Unit. The minister's attitude and action has taken these types of searches from something that is part of a prison routine to an effective tool in combating the movement of illicit drugs and contraband through prisons. I commend the Minister for Police and Corrective Services for the bill and her no-nonsense approach to the issue of drugs in prison.

Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—NPA) (9.17 pm): I acknowledge the work involved in drafting the bill. The coalition intends to support the bill. I am a supporter of truth in sentencing. It is written in plain English and this represents a major step forward for non-custodial and custodial offenders. I have worked as a visiting medical officer to Queensland corrective services facilities for 15 years. In that time I have seen a variety of styles of management, custodial requirements, legal changes and changes to the types of offenders and offences.

The changes in that time have included increasing numbers of drug offenders, especially amphetamine users and traffickers; decreasing numbers of murderers; increasing numbers of women; decreasing numbers of major offenders, particularly hold-up people; stable numbers of rapists; increasing numbers of child sex offenders; increasing use of recreational drugs in prison; higher numbers of Aboriginal and Indigenous people imprisoned for lesser offences; increasing age of longer-term offenders, so much so that we may have to have a dementia unit attached to some of our prisons in the future; and the adoption of methadone and subutex replacement drugs in some of our prisons as strategies. I have also seen the removing of the ranking system of serving officers.

There have been increasing numbers of mental health patients in the system and they remain, I believe, just under the eight per cent mark. From my point of view, there has been an increasing medical model implemented within prisons. The transition now to a Queensland Health management scenario is a step forward, but Queensland Health may be underresourced to do it at present and that needs to be looked at. Also, there have been some work camps. I believe that they have been of excellent use. I wish they would be used more.

The history of prisons is very interesting and can give a great insight into what can occur over time. For those who do not know, William Redfern was a surgeon who was sentenced and was sent to Australia. Under Lachlan Macquarie, the then governor, he implemented all sorts of changes and all sorts of things which we use in our system today. A lot of the great changes that have occurred in prison systems were implemented in that time. We were very fortunate to have a wonderful person who decided to become a free settler in Australia and never return to England, despite him being said by Newton and others to be one of the leading people of his time.

I would like to commend the minister for addressing the major issues that required modern approaches. Specifically, they are truth in sentencing, rehabilitation, victims of crime, prisoner entitlements, accountability and management of prisoners within prisons. I believe this is comprehensive. The major changes seem to be very clear and will make it easier to manage people in custodial environments. Specifically, on the issue of truth in sentencing, it is a good step but it must not be misused. Prisoners clearly need to have it clarified at the beginning when their release date will be, should there be no further offences. Truth in sentencing can be misused and can be inappropriate when it applies to cases where the offender clearly is seeking to use the prison as an alternative to the everyday world. This occurs more frequently than people realise.

Parole boards appear to have been strengthened, and the ATSI and women inclusion is particularly welcome. They remain the cornerstone of our system and their continued role is critical to the success of our symptoms. On the issue of remissions, the minister has highlighted most of the points. I believe that, once the issue of the pre-July 2001 major offenders has been addressed with regard to their access to it, that will close off a very unfortunate historical remnant. Perhaps over time we will say that it was not and maybe history will repeat itself. I do not think we should rule it out forever.

On the issue of rehabilitation, the minister has highlighted that this is the major objective of this bill. This is commendable. For those who would not know or who may not have read about it, the majority of people actually refuse the sex offenders program. Recidivism remains high. The intention of the bill is to try to get them to change. That is a welcome strategy. It has been one that we have always addressed over time and I think that the minister's attempts are excellent. I do not think they will always be able to be implemented as well as they could, but at least it is a good trial. The variety of programs—I have seen all of them over time—both for violent offenders right through to alcoholics continue in our prisons and they remain excellent programs. Drug replacement or avoidance has not been mentioned as much, but I remain a cautious supporter of the use of methadone and subutex. I think most medical people do. In the small areas that it is being used—and I do not think it is being used as widely in New South Wales and Victoria—I think that it has been very effective.

I turn to vocational skills training. I personally have done medicals for offenders who were doing everything from plant operator tickets to operating all sorts of equipment. I think this is excellent. It has been going on for several years. Just literally getting people an active driver's licence is one of those very useful things that people need to have.

While it is not mentioned, literacy courses remain a vital area. It is not widely known that literacy remains a major problem within prisons. It is particularly bad amongst young white males and, sadly enough, amongst younger females who are currently coming into prison. I would ask the minister to continue to look at this area. Literacy remains a major problem. Whilst they can write their names, they cannot understand most of the common, everyday documents. It is a critical thing for everyday life. The postrelease program is important. It has not been mentioned extensively here, but it is usually tailored for people in prison who are going to be released. It is commendable and it should be supported by all.

I turn to prisoner entitlements. Most of these issues have been discussed tonight, but I would just like to highlight a few things. There is a need for prisoners to earn money in the system. Whilst the amounts of money are limited, the prisoners need to be able to earn an income. Currently, drugs, money and tobacco are the currencies within prison. Within a prison farm environment they can get jobs, but we need to recognise they need to earn money so they can survive and buy the little things of everyday life.

There is a need for prisoners to remain in contact with their families, usually by the use of telephones. In most prisons access to phones is relatively low, despite what most people think, and prisoners have limited money to be able to pay for them. It is very important that prisoners remain in contact with their families. They are a lot happier. They are a lot more contented. Their families are a lot happier. They do their time a lot easier. They are easier to manage and they will usually tell you what is going on if you treat them well. I think it is important that that remains a cornerstone for them.

There is also a need for prisoners to access counselling services. This is highlighted in the bill. They have higher rates of depression. They have higher rates of psychoses secondary to the use of both amphetamines and increasingly, sadly, marijuana in its different forms. What I feel needs to be addressed, and which has possibly been left off, is the access of prisoners to a variety of useless strategies for all sorts of things from computers to new shoes for all sorts of frivolous reasons. It is very difficult to draft laws that would prevent this, but it seems to be one of these things that takes up an enormous amount of time and certainly needs to be addressed. Prisoners often do that because they have all the time in the world to think about things, and they suddenly realise when something is denied to them that they can move to another thing and everything can take a whole new meaning in life. It needs to be addressed within the bill; in fact some of the things have been addressed.

I turn to the issue of victims of crime. This is an issue which has been progressing over time. Having a register is an excellent step. Access seems to be considered, reasonable and appropriate. I was also pleased to see that they want to clarify who was a victim. Recent cases would seem to indicate that this is a very reasonable step.

Domestic violence is identified and it is separated. That is very important because it is a major component of the people entering prison, both males and females—not necessarily just crimes of passion such as murder but a variety of other offences as well.

I turn to the issue of management. I support all the steps and changes. I would ask the minister to strongly consider the reintroduction of a ranking system within prison. I have seen how effective it is in practice with staff in prison. I believe the Queensland roles of prison superintendent and commissioner were very effective. In my time I have seen all sorts of strategies used, and without doubt having both a prison superintendent and a commissioner was the best system that I saw. It was good for staff and prisoners liked it. They like to know who is in charge of what because they are used to base type strategies.

I would also like to see a change in the way we deal with ATSI people entering prison. For many, it is a rite of passage. It is a safe environment, but it is not always the best place to be. I would favour a wider use of work camps for them and not concentrating them in some of our more popular prisons. I would also favour no institution having more than 600 inmates, as to manage them becomes impossible. Accountability changes are good, and nothing further needs to be said on that.

In summary, this is good policy. It is comprehensive. From my personal view, it retains the dignity of prisoners. It respects prisoners as a meaningful group in society and addresses most of the modern changes that need to be done for prisoners in Australia.

Ms CROFT (Broadwater—ALP) (9.28 pm): I am very pleased today to have this opportunity to rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services Bill 2006. I am proud to be part of a government that is already delivering an efficient and secure correctional system. Changes to the corrective services legislation contained in the bill before the House today not only support the innovations made by Minister Spence since she became Minister for Police and Corrective Services but also pave the way for making sure that Queensland continues to lead the way in all aspects of correctional management.

Nobody can argue that Queensland's prisons are amongst the most secure in the world. The minister should be congratulated on her approach to the containment of the state's most dangerous prisoners. Despite the success of the Beattie government on prison security, the minister has not been content to rest on her laurels but continues to improve and upgrade all forms of prison security. In July of 2005 the minister announced that security was about to get tougher, with an additional $30 million to be spent over the next five years on maintaining and upgrading the perimeter security systems of all Queensland secure correctional centres. In August 2005 the minister announced that a fleet of nine armour-plated four-wheel drive Holden Rodeos had commenced providing perimeter security at Queensland's secure jails.

Now the minister has brought into the House a bill that clearly says if people are going to break the law and end up in jail they should be subjected to tough rules and tough security measures. The bill makes it clear that when a prisoner enters jail they will be assessed as to their risk of escaping; the risk they pose to the security of the prison, to staff, to other prisoners and to themselves; and the risk of reoffending. The assessment of these factors will determine the prisoner's security classification.

At the moment prisoners classified as high, medium and low are all accommodated in high-security facilities. Prisoners classified as open security are accommodated in centres that allow them to prepare for their transition into the community. The current structure is unnecessarily complex, with prisoners of different classifications accommodated in the same centre. The new system is simple. Prisoners who are assessed as high risk due to their likelihood of attempting to escape, the risk they pose within the correctional services facility or their likelihood of reoffending will be classified as high security and accommodated in a high security facility with appropriate levels of supervision. Prisoners who are assessed as being unlikely to escape, who present a low risk within a correctional services facility and pose little or no risk to the community will be classified as low security and may be accommodated in a facility with less security and supervision. Maximum security will, of course, remain, and the most dangerous prisoners in the system will continue to be classified as maximum security and housed in maximum security units.

The minister spoke about the classification of remandees in her second reading speech and the fact that remandees currently make up a sizeable proportion of the prison population. Not all prisoners are remanded in custody because they pose a threat to the community. Many are remanded because they fail to raise a surety or because they have no suitable accommodation. The current act stipulates that prisoners on remand must be classified as high security. As a consequence of the current system, some prisoners who may not require such a high level of security and supervision are placed in a high-security environment. This bill will enable Corrective Services officers to assess prisoners on remand according to the same criteria as sentenced prisoners. This will mean that those prisoners of low risk can be accommodated accordingly.

Another aspect of the bill about which I would like to speak today is the separation of prisoners from the mainstream prisoner population. The necessity to separate prisoners from the rest of the prisoner population has always been a feature of correctional management. It is of utmost importance that a system of separating prisoners is focused on ensuring the safety of staff and prisoners and is open to scrutiny with transparent accountability measures in place. In the case of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prisoners, it is particularly important that methods for separating prisoners are used appropriately and with the appropriate opportunities for independent scrutiny.

As a key participant in the implementation of the Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Justice Agreement, the Department of Corrective Services is committed to ensuring the safety and security of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prisoners in custody. The separation of prisoners was also raised in the 1991 Royal Commission Into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, which emphasised the need for effective measures to prevent incidents of self-harm in custody along with more open and accountable decision-making processes.

This bill introduces a clear and accountable scheme for separating prisoners from the mainstream prisoner population by replacing crisis support orders and specialist treatment orders with a single safety order. This bill provides that a prisoner may be placed on a safety order for up to one month if the prisoner is a threat to the good order and security of a prison, to keep staff safe and to keep other prisoners safe or if the prisoner is at risk to themselves. The duration of this new order will reduce the time that prisoners at risk of self-harm or those who pose a risk due to a psychiatric condition are separated from the prisoner population.

The bill also provides increased accountability mechanisms by requiring orders to be subject to review by medical practitioners and official visitors. It is important to allow for circumstances in which a doctor or psychologist is not available, such as on weekends and during public holiday periods. Therefore, there is a provision for a temporary safety order to be made for up to five days if a corrective services officer or a nurse assesses a prisoner as being at risk of self-harm or poses a threat or risk to someone else. There is a requirement that the order be reviewed by a doctor or psychologist within the period of a temporary order.

The ability to make maximum security orders remains in the bill as a response to highly dangerous prisoners. This type of measure is as tough as it gets. Maximum security units are purpose-built to hold escapees, murderers and sexual predators and other prisoners who pose an extreme threat to the prison security staff and prisoners. The bill also recognises that it is a serious matter to have to contain a prisoner in a maximum security unit so there are enhanced requirements for the independent scrutiny of maximum security orders. Maximum security prisoners will be able to request a review of that order by an official visitor, and an official visitor must review these orders at intervals of no more than three months. Provision has also been made for prisoners on maximum security orders to be reintegrated into the mainstream prison population within the period of the order, where appropriate.

I am very pleased to speak in support of the Corrective Services Bill 2006. It is a bill that supports and enhances the security, safety and integrity of the management of prisoners. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—Lib) (9.36 pm): I also acknowledge the major work done in this review of the Corrective Services Act and the work of the minister and her department. I commend them for introducing truth in sentencing.

The Queensland community expects from its government legislation that ensures standards that help us improve how we interact with each other, including our correctional centres, and that appropriate laws are made to protect the innocent and punish the guilty. In return, our citizens should show respect and tolerance for the laws created which are designed to regulate our interests as individuals and states.

There is a general view within our community that the government will ensure that when a crime has been committed the offender should be punished according to the nature of the offence; that murder, sexual offences, robbery, theft and a breach of the public peace should be punished according to their criminality as defined by the law. Within this context of government control, this bill should adhere to the principles and standards of good rehabilitation programs and the reduction of recidivist rates by criminals. The punishment, management and reintegration of offenders into our communities should be our highest concern. Former US Attorney-General Ramsey Clark said in 1971—

> Ninety-five percent of all the expenditures in the entire field of correction in this country goes for custody—iron bars, stone walls, guards. Five percent goes for health services, education, developing employment skills—for hope.

I reminisce about attending a Corrective Services forum that was held a few months ago here in the old function rooms A and B. I remember Keith Hamburger, the former director-general of Corrective Services; Glen Milliner, a former minister; the shadow minister, the member for Gregory; and I were there, along with many other members of parliament showing a bipartisan approach to the difficulty of balancing punishment and rehabilitation. As the member for Sandgate says, we do not want to end up with the situation where those with no hope take it out on those of us who may have somewhat more. We need to establish a balance.

The following defined outcomes should be the benchmark for this corrective services legislation: an assurance that the public and private sector control of correctional services is efficient and effective in accordance with modern management practices; that the correctional services have a significant responsibility to manage the reintegration of offenders back into society within a stable family structure and/or strong community networks so that our community can feel safe and know that they will contribute in a meaningful way to our society; that the treatment and management of incarcerated persons is consistent with best practices and methods of rehabilitation and human care; that the management of the drug problems in correctional facilities is properly dealt with; and that the community wants to be assured that the standards for security and rehabilitation in correctional centres are clearly defined in legislation.

Of particular concern to us in any corrective services legislation is the need for strict accountability by the government and particularly the managers of correctional services to ensure that these outcomes are achieved and that the government should be held accountable for any failure to deliver the defined outcomes. Often the community feels that the criminal justice system is constantly failing them because administrative reviews of crimes, sentences and punishments do not attract suitable recompense. Perhaps this bill should consider how appropriate and suitable recompense to victims or the community can be achieved if the correctional services fail to demonstrate fully the rehabilitation and integration of offenders back into our communities.

The bill states that the primary purpose of the act is address community safety and crime prevention through the humane containment, supervision and rehabilitation of offenders. This purpose should be more substantially defined and even demonstrated in the bill. We need to know how the government intends to measure and achieve this overarching objective. Certainly current international and national criminogenic research trends do not suggest that public safety and recidivism has been reduced based on the existing rehabilitation programs within our correctional services. Certainly police commissioners and criminologists throughout Australia have been concerned about the lack of impact rehabilitation programs have had on reducing recidivist behaviour. Recent Home Office research suggests that repeat victims of crimes are the legacy of failing to address recidivist behaviour.

It is pleasing to note that the bill does encourage the application of modern correctional management practices which focus on prisoners participating in vocational education, training courses and general education programs and industries. However, these rehabilitation programs should be linked and integrated more substantially with programs externally when an offender is released into the community. That was something that also came out of the forum. The feeling was that once they were released they had nowhere to go and no support. Furthermore, performance measurements should be provided by the government on the success of these programs.

The introduction of supervised release on parole and the abolition of conditional release is certainly an improvement on past strategies. However, supervision requires resources and with an increasing population of offenders in our correctional facilities there is a need for additional resourcing, training and appropriate systems to address the needed supervision. Furthermore, accountability measures need to be put in place to address behavioural problems identified during the supervisory period rather than leaving the unguarded public with the results of increased crime and public disorder. The police should not be the vanguard to resolve inadequate and underresourced supervision programs.

The Queensland community wants an assurance that the correctional services and judicial sentencing process is vigorously reviewed prior to an offender being released on supervision. This process should be open to public scrutiny and constantly reviewed where the police, the judiciary and the community can raise appropriate concerns about the safety and possible recidivist behaviour of an offender before his or her release impacts on our community. These reviews could be further strengthened through public scrutiny by a parliamentary committee.

The issue of sex offenders and supervised release is both a politically and community sensitive issue of increasing concern. Rehabilitation programs do not appear to be highly successful. The media interest in stories regarding these types of offences is increasing. We saw this in today's media. The government needs to demonstrate that the risk to the community is properly managed and that significant community resources are provided to address any community concern.

Of particular interest to the community is the ability of this legislation and this government to reintegrate offenders back into the community. Generally the early offender release process has relied on the provision of basic support, including accommodation, social security benefits, monetary assistance and other physical support programs. This approach has not been managed or coordinated well and there is often a very limited assessment of the community's capability to deliver ongoing services, employment, training and the other specific needs of the person. Certainly family is critical to the reintegration process. I note the comments of the member for Gaven in this regard that offenders and people who are incarcerated behave better when they feel they have family support.

However, offenders more often than not come from at-risk family relationships and government agency support is insufficient to provide the secure safety net to support the prisoner's reintegration. There is a definite need for a more vigorous assessment strategy to enable offenders and community networks to be managed and coordinated to address the reintegration and resettlement of offenders. This is one area that needs further consideration and particularly more open scrutiny and reporting of the outcomes provided to parliament on an annual basis.

The increased visiting arrangements with family members are supported and should be encouraged and marketed by Corrective Services. The family linkage appears to be a critical issue. A better defined strategy for the reintegration and unification of an offender into a stable family structure after release should be examined by the government. These contact visits should be expanded to increase pastoral care and religious connection. These groups are often a major part of the external network of support in our communities. Certainly research from the USA demonstrates that behaviour has changed in individuals who have acknowledged a need to improve themselves through education, family and religious involvement and have become tolerant and respectful of their fellow citizens.

The role of the chief inspector, which is dealt with at page 14 of the explanatory notes, in providing an inspectorate function for correctional services is critical in addressing risk management strategies and identifying improvements to systems, processes and audit functions to address major issues in correctional services facilities. Perhaps there is scope for the audit and review process of the chief inspector to provide further confidence to the public with transparent information to the parliament. It is acknowledged that the issues of security and safety may need to be exempt from open scrutiny, but the context of the review and the recommendations to improve services would add public support to Corrective Services' efforts to improve their overall service delivery standards.

The introduction of an eligible persons register is supported and would address the issues of victims who have safety concerns. However, the content of the register should be accessible to other agencies in the criminal justice system since these agencies often have ongoing involvement with victims and offenders. The register should also be integrated into the criminal justice information system so that advice and any other relevant information could value-add to existing information provided by the victims of crimes.

We also support the continued substance testing of offenders involved in the use of illicit drugs and the necessity for risk management strategies and increased security to reduce the flow of illicit drugs within correctional services facilities. The issue of drug trading within prisons and external to the facilities should be appropriately addressed with improved intelligence and detection resources. Also any external benefits obtained from drug distribution or benefits received whilst incarcerated should be properly addressed under the confiscation of property legislation.

With regard to the section on submissions from victims on pages 34 and 35, the application of natural justice principles applying to a prisoner's response to a victim's submission for parole should not be a primary concern to a parole board. Should these principles be applied, then verification of the response by the prisoner should be carefully reviewed and scrutinised prior to acceptance of such material. In the case of parole of a prisoner, natural justice principles should be reviewed to determine their applicability to the parole process. Also the parole board should provide a reasoned statement to the victim and the judicial system when parole is given and considered outside the recommendations of the court process. Where the parole board departs from the court's finding, an audit process and reporting of the parole board's justification should be reviewable by interested parties and open to public scrutiny.

At page 77 of the explanatory notes support is given to the *Work Outreach Camps Community Engagement Report 2005* recommendation regarding offenders who have been convicted of a sex offence or have a history of repetitive violent offences not being eligible to be transferred to a work camp. Country communities have to be reassured that their safety and the work performed by prisoners is in accordance with best practice rehabilitation programs and will not cause anxiety or harm to that community.

The issue of a prisoner being dealt with for a breach of discipline or charged with an offence and applying the principle of double jeopardy is a vexed approach in clause 115. Neither the police nor other public sector employees are given this privilege in the workplace, yet a prisoner is given a right not accessible to the general public when applying administrative law and criminal law. Perhaps the prisoner should be treated with the same standard as the rest of the community where double jeopardy is not considered an issue in differing levels of law—namely, administrative and criminal law. However, the use of a disciplinary breach register is necessary and I promote the scrutiny of such a process by the community and specific government agencies. Also the use of technology should expand in the monitoring and supervision of offenders to support rehabilitation programs rather than as a means to address cost-efficiency measures.

Should these matters be addressed in the Corrective Services Bill, I believe the ultimate outcomes for the people of Queensland would be less controversy and frustration in areas of prison reform, a decrease in criminal recidivist rates and less of a tax burden on our community.

Mrs ATTWOOD (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (9.49 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services Bill 2006. It is my intention to comment on the provisions contained in the bill that relate to the handling of prisoners' complaints and requests for the review of decisions.

It is a fact that a component of any correctional environment is a requirement to effectively manage complaints from prisoners as well as their requests for decisions to be reviewed. Any system devised to handle prisoner complaints and review decisions must be transparent and accountable and must be able to resolve matters fairly and quickly. However, it is important to remember that the purpose of corrections is the secure containment of prisoners. To achieve this, a raft of decision-making processes and structured procedures and routines must be followed. Any challenges to those presents a challenge to the good order and security of the correctional environment.

In Queensland, on admission prisoners are provided with information about the internal and external complaint mechanisms available to them and are encouraged to raise complaints at a centre level. A prisoner at a corrective services facility is able to make a complaint on a request form to a correctional officer or by a confidential letter to prison management, the director-general or the minister. The investigation of complaints can be conducted by official visitors. Prisoners are also able to make complaints to prisoner advocacy agencies that visit prisons. The Ombudsman is able to hear and investigate prisoner complaints, and specific provisions apply to the making of a complaint to the Ombudsman by a person in custody or detention. A prisoner is also able to make a complaint to other agencies including the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Commission, the Health Rights Commission and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. Prisoner correspondence addressed to any of those commissions is regarded as privileged mail.

Correctional managers make decisions affecting prisoners daily. Some of those decisions may be minor in nature, such as whether a prisoner will work in the prison kitchen or in the garden. Other decisions have a legislative base and will impact more significantly on a prisoner, for example, decisions relating to a prisoner's security classification.

It is hardly surprising that some prisoners do not like some of the decisions made that affect their time in prison. In the past few years there has been a trend for prisoners who are aggrieved by decisions to take correctional managers to task through costly and time-consuming judicial review processes.

Under the Judicial Review Act, legal challenges have been made by prisoners in relation to any number of issues, including security classification and transfer orders. Each year those challenges drain the department of hundreds of hours spent in the preparation of court material and hundreds of thousands of dollars. More often than not, those challenges are brought about by prisoners who are attempting to pressure the department into making a decision in the prisoner's favour.

Some prisoners are using judicial review to try to frustrate the management process. Two of the most significant areas of challenge have related to remission and classification. Under the new legislation those areas of challenge will be largely eliminated with the abolition of remission and the introduction of court ordered parole. The classification system will also be simplified.

The bill makes it absolutely clear that decisions relating to a prisoner's security classification and transfer orders will not be subject to challenge by prisoners through the judicial review process. The bottom line is that prisoners in Queensland will no longer be able to use the legal system to frustrate management decisions made to ensure the safety and security of a prison.

As I have already mentioned, prisoners aggrieved by these management decisions can continue to request that an internal review of a decision takes place. It is important to note that no other corrective services legislation in Australia provides for an internal administrative review of a decision relating to classification, placement or transfer. Other jurisdictions have provisions for the internal administrative review of separation orders or breaches of discipline. I commend the minister and the bill to the House.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (9.53 pm): I rise to briefly participate in the debate on the Corrective Services Bill 2006. I am aware that it is almost 10 o'clock, so I will restrict my comments to a few sections of the bill.

Firstly, I refer members to the provision in the bill that requires any person in the chief executive's custody who desires to change his or her name under the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act to seek the prior approval of the chief executive. In determining whether to grant the approval to a person in the chief executive's custody, there needs to be consideration of many matters, including a proper scrutiny of the application.

This is very important. Many years ago there was a horrific sexual assault on a young girl on the Sunshine Coast. A few years ago it was revealed to the community that one of the people convicted of that very serious offence had made an application to change their name. I vividly recall the outrage in the community that there seemed little avenue of objection or redress by either the community or the victim's family. Therefore, I congratulate the minister on this initiative. It is very important. I feel very confident that the minister is certainly capturing the view of many in the community that there needs to be a balance between prisoners' rights and, importantly, the rights of the victim and the victim's family when considering the very vexatious issue of a prisoner's application to change his or her name.

I wish to comment on the issue that deals with submissions from victims. The bill provides that within seven days of receiving a prisoner's application for parole, the parole board must—and I stress the word 'must'—give notice to the chief executive of the application. The chief executive must give an eligible person such as the victim or the victim's nominated representative notice that a prisoner has applied for a parole order so that the eligible person may make a submission about the prisoner's parole application. There may be a possible breach of the fundamental legislative principle of natural justice if the prisoner is not afforded the opportunity to respond to the victim's submission. However, we need to have a very clear balance between the victim's rights and those of the victim's family, and the prisoner's rights. Again, I believe that the minister has captured an issue that is very real in the community's mind about the need for victims of serious offences and their families to have some input and real rights so that their issues of concern are taken on board.

The other issue I wish to briefly touch on is clause 25, which provides that a birth certificate for a child must not state or contain any information that would imply that either parent was a prisoner at the time of the birth. The explanatory notes outline that if an address is required by the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003 the address must be a city or town and not a corrective services facility. I believe that is common sense. It is a compassionate and sensible requirement.

In relation to clause 227, the explanatory notes state—

Clause 227 enables the Minister to make guidelines for the Queensland Parole Board in relation to the policy to be followed by the board, and for the Queensland Parole Board, in consultation with the chief executive, to make policy and administrative guidelines to be followed by the regional boards.

Can the minister assure the House that those guidelines will be finalised prior to this bill becoming a valid law in Queensland?

Lastly, I turn to clause 352, which provides that a minister must review the efficiency and efficacy of this bill within seven years of its commencement. I believe it is very important that we have these reviews. When all of our bills become law in Queensland, it is a normal requirement that there will be a report back to the parliament at a future date.

I commend the minister on the bill. I believe that it is a good law. I look forward to this debate proceeding to the consideration in detail stage.

Ms MALE (Glass House—ALP) (9.58 pm): I wish to speak in support of the Corrective Services Bill. One of the most important areas for which we are responsible in Queensland is the department that provides for the secure containment of prisoners and the safety of the community—that is, the Department of Corrective Services. Today my comments will be restricted to the important issue of releasing prisoners back into the community.

There is no doubt that the majority of people sent to prison will be released back into the community at some time. Only a very small percentage of prisoners are serving sentences that may never facilitate their release. Considering that nearly all people who enter prison will be released back into society, the manner in which this is done is key and can impact on a prisoner's rehabilitation and reintegration and on the safety of the community.

The social, economic, physical and psychological problems faced by prisoners upon release can be huge. Releasing prisoners straight onto the street before the end of their sentence with no supervision or structured reintegration plan may increase an offender's likelihood of reoffending.

The protection of the community is always paramount for the government. The early release of prisoners into the community should therefore only be done in such a way that it minimises the risk of a prisoner reoffending. The expectation of the community is that criminals will be sentenced by a court and will have to serve 100 per cent of their sentence. The community believes that a prisoner should not be able to serve some of their sentence decided by a court and then have that sentence cut short by correctional administrators. Community expectations should be respected. If a prisoner is handed a sentence by a court, that prisoner should serve the entire sentence.

The Minister for Police and Corrective Services has introduced to the House a bill ensuring that the entire sentence handed down by a court is carried out in full and that the protection of the community is the No. 1 consideration when prisoners are released from prison. This means that no prisoner will be eligible for remission and conditional release will be phased out. The only way a prisoner sentenced after commencement will be released from prison before their full-time discharge date is if they are going to be supervised and monitored in the community on a parole order. Determining the point at which a prisoner is to be released to parole will be the responsibility of a court or a parole board. Sentences will not be cut short by administrative processes or for 'good behaviour'.

These changes mean that every prisoner released from custody before the expiry of their sentence will be subject to supervision and monitoring in the community on a parole order. Prisoners declared by a court to be serious violent offenders will only become eligible for parole after serving 80 per cent of their sentence. Other prisoners serving over three years imprisonment will be eligible for parole after serving 50 per cent of their sentence or at a point recommended by a sentencing court.

The bill sets out the conditions that a prisoner released to parole by a court must abide by. These conditions include requirements to report to and receive visits from probation and parole staff, submit to drug testing and notify the department of any change in address or employment details within 48 hours. The bill also provides that when the parole board is making an order for parole the board may place conditions on the order that will ensure the prisoner's good conduct or stop the prisoner committing an offence. For example, the board may provide direction about where a prisoner is to live, participation in employment or programs or that the prisoner must comply with a curfew. If a condition is breached, an order can be suspended or cancelled and a prisoner can be returned to custody.

In my opinion, the bill signals a common-sense approach to releasing prisoners back into the community. The Beattie government has reaffirmed its commitment to enhancing community safety by introducing to the House laws that will ensure that every Queensland prisoner will serve 100 per cent of their sentence.

I support the Corrective Services Bill 2006, and I am proud to be part of a government that is taking an approach to the release of prisoners that will lessen an offender's likelihood of reoffending, deal swiftly with those who do reoffend and, ultimately, further protect our community. This is an area that I have long spoken about within my community and within government, and I am pleased that the minister has taken such positive steps to keep our community safe. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs SMITH (Burleigh—ALP) (10.03 pm): I would like to congratulate the Minister for Police and Corrective Services, the Hon. Judy Spence, for bringing the Corrective Services Bill before the House today. The bill strengthens the government's commitment to supporting victims of crime by enhancing provisions relating to the provision of information to victims and the ability of victims to provide information about prisoners.

The bill institutes a register that, like the concerned person's register which was established under section 242 of the Corrective Services Act 2000, records the details of persons who are eligible to receive certain prisoner information. I know that the department has received extremely positive feedback about the operation of the register. Victims have said that the ability to access information about the prisoner who offended against them has given them peace of mind and enabled them to prepare for the prisoner's release.

Importantly, the bill recognises the ability for victims of violent and sexual crimes to have a say when the prisoner who has offended against them makes an application for parole. Submissions provided by victims will be retained by the parole board so that, should a prisoner be refused parole, a victim will not be required to make subsequent submissions if the prisoner reapplies for parole.

I would like to comment on corrective services from another point of view—that of a friend or relative of a prisoner. In 2003-04 I spent two hours every week visiting my son who was on remand in the Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre. This is not something I ever expected to happen and certainly not something I recommend, but my eyes were opened. We hear stories of how prisoners live the life of Riley. How far from the truth that is!

Members may not be aware that prisoners are allowed only one two-hour visit per week. I believe that contact with a supportive family, in the main, has a positive influence on a prisoner, and I ask the minister to consider allowing two one-hour visits as an option for families, particularly those with small children, who find the two-hour visit arduous.

There are quite rightly a number of rules relating to visitors attending a prison, but a first-time visitor can often fall foul of the system. Fortunately, I was never forced to miss a visit because of a breach of visitors rules, but I saw other people turned away for failing to stick to rules—rules that none of us knew about. When I had the temerity to suggest the rules should be made available to first-time visitors, I was told they were—we just had to ask.

I know that people are in prison because they have committed, or are charged with having committed, a serious crime, but their families have not. Families are unwilling participants in the legal, justice and corrective services systems and they deserve to be treated with respect. Whilst I and my family were strong enough to cope with the indignities of being visitors, my concern is for those families who are intimidated by the surroundings and do not have the confidence to speak up for themselves. Not all staff members were so inflexible or unkind, however, and I did meet employees who were compassionate, professional and courteous and that made a tremendous difference.

After my son's release, I raised some of my concerns with the minister, to whom I am very grateful. She allowed me to tell her of the indignities that prisoners' families suffer and she undertook to consider these incidents when drafting the amendments. The minister included me in a visit she made to the Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre. I think they were rather more polite when I was with the minister, but I am satisfied that she understood and appreciated the issues that I brought to her attention.

I am very pleased to support the amendments, particularly those relating to the safety orders for prisoners. It is a sad fact that many offenders in our prison system suffer from mental illness, and these safety orders will allow time for their mental health to be assessed before they are integrated into the mainstream prisoner population. I again congratulate the minister on the bill and reiterate my support.

Debate, on motion of Ms Spence, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.05 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

African Vision

Mr CHRIS FOLEY (Maryborough—Ind) (10.05 pm): I rise to bring to the attention of the House a wonderful organisation called African Vision. African Vision is a newly established committee of 21 year 12 students from Grace Lutheran College in Redcliffe, led by their teacher Miss Rebecca Scales. These students have embarked upon the ambitious journey of raising $20,000 to build an orphanage home in Uganda, Africa, with Watoto Child Care Ministries. This three-bedroom house will become home to eight orphaned children and one house mother, all of whom have suffered the consequences of AIDS.

Watoto Child Care Ministries was established by Gary and Marilyn Skinner in 1994, in response to the critical AIDS crisis confronting the east African nation of Uganda. Watoto aims to raise the next generation of Ugandan leaders by discipling parentless children for Christ. It is strongly committed to placing the children in a family environment, rather than in large institutional orphanages. Individual brick homes are constructed in small clusters to maintain the traditional village environment. Today Watoto is impacting the lives of more than 1,400 orphans in 130 homes by providing physical, emotional, educational and spiritual care to some of Uganda's most vulnerable children.

People are dying of AIDS every day. In 2005, 40 million people were living with AIDS; 14,000 people get infected every day; and last year three million people died of AIDS. Every minute, six people die of AIDS—which is 8,500 just today. The number of people dying due to AIDS is equivalent to 18 tsunamis every year, which is the same as four 9-11s every single day of every single week of every single year. The children are the ones who suffer. They are the ones who have been robbed of their parents, their childhood and their future. Every day there are 6,000 new orphans.

The students' goal is to raise the $20,000 by October of this year. Then, in the September school holidays of next year, Rebecca is planning to take a team of students, parents, teachers and staff to physically build the home. In hearing those statistics, the students could quite easily have thought that as individuals their impact could only be minimal. However, they are quickly realising that when a group of individuals unite for the one purpose they can indeed change their world.

People talk about the day when the world will become a better place, when AIDS will decrease, when peace will reign, yet we often forget that we need to play our part. African Vision has such an incredible opportunity. These students have the potential to inspire, lead, encourage, equip and empower the people around them to be all that they were created to be; to stir within them the passion to succeed; to motivate their lives to greatness, not in fame or fortune but in character and dignity.

The motivation for the students wanting to pursue this dream was inspired by one lady. In April last year, Rebecca's mum, Bev Scales, and her dad, Paul Scales—and the family are here tonight—after hearing about Watoto had committed to financing a home as a family. Unexpectedly, Rebecca's mum passed away in July and the family responded by deciding not to simply finance the orphanage home but to physically go and build it in memory of her. I commend this speech to the memory of Bev Scales, who was one of the most gracious and inspiring women I have ever met.

Time expired.

'Quiet Nights in Noosaville'

Ms MOLLOY (Noosa—ALP) (10.09 pm): I would like to make the House aware of an initiative that has achieved great results in my electorate. Nicknamed 'Quiet Nights in Noosaville', this project came about when I invited representatives from the police, Queensland Transport, Sunshine Coast cabs and Villa Noosa to work with me in developing a response to an increase in reports of antisocial behaviour in the Noosaville area. Our initial meeting was very successful and opened the way for increased coordination and information sharing amongst stakeholders. The issue of crowd dispersal after closing time was identified as one matter that would need to be addressed. If late-night antics are to be avoided, people need to be able to get home safely and quickly.

The police and the owners of Villa Noosa had already been looking at the behaviour problems. Villa Noosa had put in place some mechanisms to help calm the crowds at the end of night. However, transport remained a problem. Taxi drivers were giving the venue a wide berth as they had been victims of bad behaviour in the past. Action had to be taken to bring them back. One month on, Villa Noosa and police had met with taxi owners and drivers to advise them of the measures that had been put in place to discourage antisocial behaviour from patrons. These measures included a temporary taxi rank and additional crowd control at the Villa, plus an assurance from police that complaints would be acted upon.

Earlier this month, the committee met again and could report a dramatic decrease in instances of adult-age drinking offences. It was also reported that Sunshine Coast cabs were providing excellent service and that the Villa Noosa car park was clear of patrons within 30 minutes of closing time.

'Quiet Nights in Noosaville' is an excellent example of stakeholders working together to achieve a positive outcome. I must acknowledge the efforts of police Inspector Tony Lewis, Senior Constables Steve Fitzpatrick and Don Graham of the Tewantin Police Beat, Thor Vallmurr and Greg Powell of the Allied Liquor Hotels Group, Bruce Jackson and Cathy Kennedy of Queensland Transport, Clark Chappell, and Peter and Kerry Cammilleri of Sunshine Coast cabs, Noosa Council's Ron Thomas and my senior electorate officer, Duncan Thompson.

Tonight we heard a lot about the Liquor Amendment Bill, which was passed through the House, and the knocking and shenanigans that came from members opposite. They really need to bring people together.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms MOLLOY: Just behave yourself over there. I take that interjection.

The lockout was established in 1996 in Mooloolaba as a voluntary agreement between four nightclubs. As trading hours were to 3 am, the agreed lockout was from 1.30 am. This is just another example of a lockout formed by a community group. Within that process, a lot of the drunken and hooligan type behaviour has been addressed. Bad street behaviour saw a late-night bus service provided to Mooloolaba, council security levies, dog patrols and so on. This is all about community groups and police working together to address problems.

Time expired.

Betfair

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—Lib) (10.12 pm): I take this opportunity to give an update on an issue about which I have advocated action in this House for some time. Members may recall the private member's bill that was introduced to protect Queensland's racing industry from the threat of Betfair and similar online betting exchanges. The bill was unashamedly modelled on Victorian legislation that was brought in with the same aim in November last year. It was to stop Betfair from being able to publish Queensland racing fixtures and to restrict wagering to approved providers who contribute back to the racing industry, which Betfair does not.

The Beattie government rejected the private member's bill, labelling it 'untested'. Well, the test results are in and the legislation has passed with flying colours. The 'untested' Victorian legislation has effectively stopped Betfair from operating on Victorian racing. However, it is now negotiating to pay a fee so that it can operate. I cannot help but wonder how the members for Toowoomba North and Fitzroy feel now about 'untested' legislation, after seeing just how effective the private member's bill introduced by the coalition could have been in Queensland.

Racing Victoria's integrity department and senior management are now able to evaluate, without fear, whether they want to grant approval for Betfair to operate in Victoria on their terms. This is all because Victoria safeguarded itself and its racing revenue by stopping Betfair from just setting up shop. Racing Victoria now decides whether Betfair can operate in Victoria, not Betfair. Victoria saved itself from the potentially devastating effect of Betfair on its racing industry. It is now able to dictate whether or not it will allow Betfair to enter the Victorian racing landscape. Racing Victoria holds the upper hand—an upper hand afforded to it through its government passing safeguarding legislation.

The Queensland government did not care to give the same advantage to Queensland Racing. It sat on its hands and rejected the coalition's call to action. It was reported in the *Australian* only yesterday that Racing Victoria and Betfair are now conducting a series of meetings and negotiations to work out how a working relationship can be arranged. I table a copy of that article.

Racing Victoria is obviously seeking an appropriate economic contribution to the Victorian industry from approved operators, which may include Betfair but only after a decision is reached as to how much Betfair will give back to Victorian racing. Therefore—unlike Queensland, thanks to members opposite—by not lying down and letting Betfair sneak into its industry, Victoria is now in a position to gain a contribution from online exchanges. Betfair is prepared to pay the Victorians because legislation was framed that stopped it from operating there in the first place.

I call on the minister to try to extricate the same deal for Queensland that Victoria obtains from Betfair. I call on the minister to ensure that he attempts to have any fruitful discussions that Betfair may be willing to have with Queensland. As far as I am concerned, the minister is obliged to at least try. The minister and the government failed to protect the industry by rejecting the coalition's private member's bill. Do something now—get some redemption and something back for the racing industry.

Tabled paper: Courier-Mail article dated 23 May 2006 titled *Betfair set to get licence in Victoria*

Burleigh Heads State School, Breakfast Club

Mrs SMITH (Burleigh—ALP) (10.15 pm): I would like to tell the House about a wonderful program that is being run by parents at Burleigh Heads State School. It is a breakfast club that operates four days a week. It is an initiative of the school's P&C and is operated under the watchful eye of its president, Susan Martinez. The club provides a substantial and nutritious breakfast to any student who attends. There are no restrictions on students. If they want it, they can have it.

We all know that many children do not eat breakfast for a variety of reasons. This leads to poor concentration, increased absenteeism, fatigue and generally poor long-term learning outcomes. Working parents who are rushing out the door in the morning often have difficulty persuading their children to eat breakfast. In fact, from my own experience, it is often difficult to persuade kids to eat their breakfast whether you are a working parent or not.

I am sure that all of us have been through the 'eat the toast in the car' deal or have desperately given the kids something wildly inappropriate for breakfast because they refused to eat anything sensible. Eight-thirty never seems to come so early in the morning as when you have kids to get off to school. With programs like this—and I know that there are others around the state—parents can get their kids to school, get themselves to work, avoid the arguments or the persuading, and be sure that their children will have a good start to the day.

This simple program makes a tremendous difference to the students in more ways than one. Many things other than breakfast are provided. The encouragement of courtesy and good manners by the parents who serve the food is having a very positive effect. It also gives students the opportunity to sit down together and enjoy a meal and a chat. Very often these days, everyone is so busy that kids eat meals in front of the television or standing around the kitchen. It is a good social event and an important learning experience for them to sit with their peers to eat and talk. They get a great deal of enjoyment out of the whole experience, as well as a positive physical and emotional start to the day.

I recently became a volunteer at the breakfast club and would like to congratulate the volunteers who are part of this marvellous program. They have undertaken to provide a very simple service which makes a big difference to a lot of children. The students are offered cereal, toast with a choice of spreads, orange juice and milk. Sometimes the principal, Mr Ivory, joins us and plays a few tunes on the piano. This program is a good example of the community working together to solve community problems. I am very proud to be part of the Burleigh Heads school community.

Darling Downs Electorate, Bus Services

Mr HOPPER (Darling Downs—NPA) (10.17 pm): I would like to bring to the attention of the House my concern with respect to bus runs in my electorate—to be more specific, bus run P698. I have met with Mr Stan Harvey, Senior Operations Officer (Passenger Transport), Darling Downs Passenger Transport Services to discuss this particular case. I acknowledge the great work that Stan Harvey is undertaking on behalf of the department. I understand that he has certain criteria that he must abide by, which is regulated by state government policy. I would like to ask the minister to consider a review of this policy which would allow for special or unique circumstances to be accommodated.

I refer the minister to the P698 bus run which operates within my electorate of Darling Downs between the townships of Oakey and Biddeston. We have a unique situation. The existing bus run cannot be extended to accommodate all families due to the fact that there is another bus run which would fall within a 3.2 kilometre buffer zone.

Currently we have four families consisting of seven children who cannot access this service as a direct result of the buffer zone exclusion. I have personally met with these families and I believe that they are making a fair and realistic request. Parents have expressed safety concerns in relation to the existing run. An extension of this run would alleviate the need for the bus to negotiate the turnaround at the front of the Biddeston State School as the extension would allow the bus to collect all children from the side of the school rather than alongside a main road that is becoming increasingly busy with heavy transport vehicles.

I am of the belief that the department should be offering the most efficient, effective and safest service to transport our children to their respective schools. However, here we have a service that is clearly not working and is being restricted by the buffer zone exclusion. Even though we have a workable solution to this service it cannot be changed due to the government's policy. This is an extremely frustrating situation for all concerned.

The problem is that there are only one or two kids on that far run and there are another seven kids to be picked up and the buffer zone comes into that distance. It would be more realistic and would be just great if they could go out and do that. I ask the minister to seriously look at the situation.

Yallambee Lodge

Mr NUTTALL (Sandgate—ALP) (10.20 pm): Yallambee Lodge is an aged-care facility within my electorate. Within the next couple of years it will no longer meet Commonwealth government standards in terms of providing aged care for those in nursing homes. For a number of years now we have endeavoured to try to find a new home for Yallambee Lodge so that they could build a new facility. I am pleased to be able to advise the House today that after extensive consultation with the department of health we have acquired some land adjacent to the Eventide Nursing Home at Sandgate which is on the foreshore of Bramble Bay.

Mr English: It is a great nursing home.

Mr NUTTALL: It is a great nursing home. I thank the member for that. There are a couple of old huts on that site. We will move those huts, and some master planning will go ahead and a new facility will be built for the new Yallambee Lodge. The Blue Care nursing home will be adjacent to the government Eventide Nursing Home on the foreshore. It is something that all of us have worked extremely hard for, and I know that the residents and Blue Care are extraordinarily pleased with the end result.

In relation to the old Yallambee Lodge, it is adjacent to public transport, both train and bus, it is across the road from a shopping centre and I have in the past raised this with my colleague, the minister for public works and housing, and we are having a look at whether or not it is possible to convert that into housing. It may well not be the case, but it is something that I understand the department is exploring. The beauty of that is the fact that, as I have said, it is adjacent to public transport, across the road is a chemist and there are doctors and a shopping centre. It is an ideal location. It may be that it will be a win-win situation for everybody concerned.

I am extraordinarily pleased with the outcome in relation to the nursing home. We are hoping, with the master planning, that Blue Care will be able to build a facility of some 80 or 90 beds. Some of the honourable members here one day may be able to use one of those beds. You never know.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr NUTTALL: Not for me. I have a granny flat at my house and I have promised my kids that whoever looks after dad gets the house. I reckon that is a good outcome for me, so I will not need that. I have put Foxtel and air conditioning into the granny flat, so everything is all set up for when I reach ripe old age.

Mr Shine: Do not transfer the title.

Mr NUTTALL: No, that is staying in my name, that is for sure. I want to thank the people of Blue Care for their patience and cooperation in this long task.

Teenage Adventure Camp Queensland

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—Lib) (10.23 pm): Hurrying into the Currumbin RSL last Friday, 19 May, to attend a luncheon, I was thinking about all the work piled up on my desk and messages to return when I got back to the office. As I walked into the function room I could not help but be drawn into the relaxing atmosphere of the large and happy group that was gathered there. Mind you, this was no ordinary luncheon. This was the Teenage Adventure Camp Queensland's annual luncheon and charity auction to raise funds to host the popular camps held each year at Currumbin for teenagers with severe illness or disabilities. The sense of humility, patience and friendship literally filled the room.

Patron Scott Sattler, who is the football manager of the new Gold Coast NRL team, the Titans, set the pace telling tales of his earlier footy days and, of course, included the try-saving tackle in a grand final when he was playing for Penrith. His good-natured and down-to-earth humour was enjoyed by all.

Next onto the stage was ventilated quadriplegic Perry Cross, who shared his darkest moments after breaking his neck during a Rugby game. Perry talked about his philosophy for life outlined in his book, aptly titled *Still Standing*. Recently returned from China, a feat in itself, Perry told of the difficulties experienced in a country that did not provide any facilities for disabled persons such as him.

The third speaker, Kate Ferguson, was a dynamic young lady still in her teens who inspired everyone with her strong will to live and to lead as active and independent a life as she possibly could. Kate was severely disabled from birth and was not meant to live, let alone speak. Her zest for life was as contagious as her determination to spread the word that being disabled is only as limiting as you make it.

Founded in 1995, TAC-Q is a registered benevolent society under the Taxation Act. Unlike many other charities, TAC-Q does not cater for a specific illness. Young adults who attend the camps suffer from cystic fibrosis, muscular dystrophy, Hodgkin's disease and various forms of cancer. Each year they host a camp in resort-style accommodation. Activities and food are provided at no cost to campers or their parents. Camp activities are varied. They breakfast on Currumbin Beach at Vikings Surf Club, visit Dracula's Theatre Restaurant, ride on a Harley Davidson, travel to Dreamworld and have an experience on an extreme jetboat.

Congratulations to TAC-Q for their marvellous efforts over the past 11 years. President Craig Dick and his terrific band of volunteers really do create miracles that were evident from the teenagers who attended the lunch and from the camp memories beamed onto the walls. The Palm Beach Lionesses, together with the rest of the TAC-Q team, provide an opportunity of a lifetime for these kids amid an atmosphere filled with laughter and love. Nine-year-old Sam Dick summed it up perfectly in a speech he wrote for his school—

> Next time you see someone with a disability, smile. And if you have the chance to say hello and think of something positive you can do to help the disabled, please do it.

Friendships made are difficult to quantify. Alyce Nelligan from Toowoomba wrote—

> The TAC-Q people aren't just my friends, they're my family and always love me for who I am.

After a recent trip to hospital where her lungs and heart failed, Alyce was placed on life support with a tracheotomy and her parents were told she would probably die. It was the support from friends, family and TAC-Q when she was afraid and sick that made her brave enough to pull through.

Broadwater Electorate, Road Projects

Ms CROFT (Broadwater—ALP) (10.26 pm): The Beattie government is committed to addressing the challenges associated with massive population growth in south-east Queensland and in particular the northern Gold Coast. With population growth also comes increased traffic, and since my election I have been actively advocating for funding to start and expand road projects in the Broadwater electorate. Completed in September last year, the $14 million upgrade of Oxley Drive, from Columbus Avenue to Lae Drive, was an election commitment delivered by the Beattie government. There were 43 construction personnel employed on site for this project that delivered 27,365 tonnes of asphalt, 79 new traffic signal lanterns, 116 new street lights, 1,500 metres of stormwater drainage pipes, 7,400 metres of new kerbing and 9,300 square metres of turf to cater for 26,000 cars per day.

At the commissioning of the new upgraded Oxley Drive I was delighted that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads announced that the government had committed further funding to expand the project. I cannot tell members how many times I have seen the minister and Main Roads staff and met with local residents about the need to upgrade Hope Island Road. There have been too many times to remember. This road was not included on the Main Roads 10-year plan, the Roads Implementation Plan, until Labor represented Broadwater, and I must thank the minister for listening to my lobbying by delivering a funding commitment to get an upgrade project underway.

The total funding commitment for the Hope Island duplication project amounts to over $120 million, with $100 million coming from the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program funding. The next stages to be undertaken are stage 1 from the M1 to Gracemere Drive and stage 2 from Santa Barbara Road to Boykambil Esplanade. These two stages will cost $34 million and include main features such as an upgraded roundabout at Monterey Keys Drive, new traffic lights at Crescent Avenue and improved community links for pedestrian and bicycle access. Construction will begin in 2007.

Another project that will provide for the growth on the Gold Coast that was never on the Roads Implementation Plan is the $19.4 million Frank Street project. This project is underway, with Energex's temporary location to Loders Creek now complete and all necessary property to complete the project being acquired. Service relocation works are expected to commence in June 2006.

These projects I believe demonstrate the Beattie Labor government's commitment to addressing residents' concerns about increased traffic and the need to provide safe road networks that provide for smooth traffic flow now and for the future. I will continue to work with the minister to deliver good funding outcomes for the northern Gold Coast.

Driver Reviver Program

Mr MALONE (Mirani—NPA) (10.29 pm): The Driver Reviver program that is in place throughout Queensland is an excellent program to create safety for the driving public, particularly during school holidays and public holidays throughout the year. The program attracts a considerable amount of sponsorship, and the facilities that are set up throughout Queensland for the Driver Reviver program are essential for combating fatigue when driving during those periods.

I would like to comment on a very essential Driver Reviver stop at Waverley Creek, just south of St Lawrence. It is located in a significantly dangerous area on the Bruce Highway between Rockhampton and Mackay. It has a history of major crashes and fatalities, and it is a snooze zone, I guess, between Cairns and Brisbane. It is about a 10-hour trip from Brisbane and about a 10-hour trip from Cairns. We are finding during school holidays and public holidays when people drive through St Lawrence-Waverley Creek that they tend to doze off.

I have a real problem with the Waverley Creek Driver Reviver station, as it is in a remote location. We have a lot of service clubs and volunteers serving in that area, sometimes up to five days at a time on a 24-hour basis. Service clubs like Rotary, Apex, Lions, Scouts and many other volunteers, including quite often young people from the schools, often volunteer their time. The facilities have not been upgraded for many years. There have been meetings with Transport to endeavour to overcome some of the problems. During summer the area that the volunteers work out of is very hot. It is a storage area in normal circumstances. It has no real ventilation and no fans. Indeed, to maintain the refrigerator in some sort of working condition they have to put a fan in front of it to keep the milk and goodies cool.

I will quickly go through the issues that have been raised with Transport. Volunteers require the removal of a tank on the eastern side of the building so that a large shutter or a window can be put in the wall so at least some breeze can flow through that section of the building. They require a window to be secured on the northern end. They need a new tank to be repositioned onto one of the shelters. They need an extension of the roof on the western side of the building for shade which will include part of the work area. They require the installation of a large rainwater tank. Currently there is only a very small rainwater tank attached to one of the buildings. They need a ceiling fan or fans of some sort in the work area. Permanent seats and tables in the rest area are needed. They also require the removal of all stock from the building that they are currently using. I implore the department of transport to look at that facility and upgrade it as quickly as possible.

Time expired.

Clayfield Bowls Club

Ms LIDDY CLARK (Clayfield—ALP) (10.33 pm): Last weekend saw in the centenary of the Clayfield Bowls Club—yes, 100 years!

Mr Terry Sullivan: My dad plays there.

Ms LIDDY CLARK: I will take that interjection. What a weekend of celebrations it was. At dinner on the Friday night we heard about the history of the club and its members. Like many clubs, it has seen the good times and the lean years. The good times were many but, like most clubs, at some time during

their evolution they do require help. In 2004 Pine Rivers joined to take control of the management of the business and put in the needed funds to see a magnificent refurbishment of the clubhouse. With the support of Pine Rivers, Clayfield bowls is in a better position now to continue well into its second century.

The dinner was magnificently emceed by the incomparable Mr Chris Robson. We also heard from the president of the club, Mr Michael Morrow, who gave great testament not only to past members and current members but also to the lady bowlers who were not given status until 50 years later—and great contention that saw. Past president John Burly was in fine form. Great speeches were given by Mr Ken Baker, who is from the Brisbane North District Bowls Association; Mr Bob Woodland, representing Bowls Queensland; and Mrs Marilyn Head. The lord mayor was also there, and the cake was dutifully cut by the patron, Mr Len McSweeney. A great night was had by all.

The following day was the celebration lunch and the first game of the new century. We were honoured by the presence of Her Excellency the Governor of Queensland, Mrs Quentin Bryce, patron of Bowls Queensland. Not only did she speak with great deference to the club; she also rolled the jack for the first game. The jack that Her Excellency rolled was the same one that was rolled 98 years ago. What a moment!

A number of teams played the first game for the new century, and we had a parliamentary bowls team there. Let me tell the House the members of the team. The team skip was the Hon. Ken Vaughan, former minister and former member for Nudgee; the lead was the Hon. Gordon Nuttall, member for Sandgate; second, the Hon. Liddy Clark, member for Clayfield; and, third, the Hon. Pat Purcell, who is the Minister for Emergency Services and member for Bulimba. I thank the team for their time and for their sense of fair play.

I must take this opportunity to acknowledge members of the club who have made great contributions over the years. I must acknowledge the women's president, Mrs Helen Turner, and the men's president, Mr Brian Turner. I cannot really speak about the club without referring to Ford Green, George Corones, Les and Dorothy McSweeney, Maurie Dingle, Frank and Tyse Vincent, Lorna Anderson, Margaret O'Reilly, Judy Howell, Libby Yap and George McKennariey. George designed the centenary medal and edited the centenary booklet. I will finish with a poem by George Corones—

An ode to Friday 19th May 2006
We are here today, for all to see
The Dawning of our Second Century
And with this Flag—its first Break-Free
Celebrates our 100th Anniversary

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.36 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Attwood, Beattie, Bligh, Boyle, Caltabiano, Choi, Clark E, Clark L, Copeland, Croft, Cummins, Cunningham E, Cunningham N, Douglas, English, Fenlon, Finn, Flegg, Foley, Fouras, Fraser, Hayward, Hobbs, Hoolihan, Hopper, Horan, Jarratt, Johnson, Keech, Knuth, Langbroek, Lavarch, Lawlor, Lee Long, Lingard, Livingstone, Lucas, McArdle, McGrady, McNamara, Male, Malone, Menkens, Messenger, Mickel, Miller, Molloy, Mulherin, Nelson-Carr, Nolan, Nuttall, O'Brien, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Pratt, Purcell, Quinn, Reeves, Reilly, Reynolds, Rickuss, Roberts E, Roberts N, Robertson, Rogers, Rowell, Schwarten, Scott, Seeney, Shine, Simpson, Smith, Spence, Springborg, Stone, Struthers, Stuckey, Sullivan C, Sullivan T, Wallace, Welford, Wellington, Wells, Wilson