PROOF ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

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

Tuesday, 28 November 2006

L J OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

N J LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

Table of Contents — Tuesday, 28 November 2006

TUESDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2006

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. MF Reynolds, Townsville) read prayers and took the chair at 9.30 am.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Governor's Message

Mr SPEAKER: Admit the messenger.

Messenger admitted.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I table the message for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Message No. 1/06, dated 28 November 2006, from Her Excellency the Governor advising of assent to Bills.

The Governor informs the Legislative Assembly that the bills entitled a bill for an act to amend the Nature Conservation Act 1992, a bill of an act to amend the Criminal Code and for other purposes, a bill for an act to amend legislation about primary industries, a bill for an act to amend the Fire and Rescue Act 1990 and for other purposes, a bill for an act to amend acts administered by the Treasurer and the Premier, a bill for an act to amend acts administered by the Minister for Health, a bill for an act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for departments for the financial year starting 1 July 2005, a bill for an act authorising the Treasurer to pay an amount from the consolidated fund to the Legislative Assembly and Parliamentary Service for the financial year starting 1 July 2005, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for royal assent, were assented by the Acting Governor in the name of Her Majesty on the 10th and 13th day of November 2006. The Governor now transmits the bills to the Legislative Assembly to be numbered and forwarded to the proper officer for enrolment in the manner required by law.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Appropriation (Parliament) Bill (No. 2); Appropriation Bill (No. 2)

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that on Monday, 13 November 2006 I presented to His Excellency the Acting Governor the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill (No. 2) and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) for royal assent and that the Acting Governor was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent thereto in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Alleged Failure to Register an Interest

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 13 November 2006 the Acting Premier and Minister for Trade, the Hon. Anna Bligh MP, wrote to me requesting that I refer a matter of privilege to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee for consideration. The matter concerns an allegation that a former member and minister, Mr Gordon Nuttall, failed to declare a private loan of $300,000 from a businessman in accordance with the requirements of the Register of Members' Interests. I have considered the Acting Premier's letter, noted recent media reports and consulted with the Clerk as the registrar of the Register of Members' Interests. I have, after considering all material available, decided to refer this matter to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee. In referring the matter to the committee, I also wish to note that I have consulted with Mr Robert Needham, Chair of the Crime and Misconduct Commission. Mr Needham has confirmed that the nondisclosure of this loan is a subject of interest of the Crime and Misconduct Commission. I have, therefore, requested that the committee not take any action until it has established that any action the committee takes will not jeopardise the commission's investigations.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Allegation of Misleading the House

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 1 November 2006 the member for Currumbin wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Communities, Disability Services, Seniors and Youth, the Hon. Warren Pitt MP, deliberately misled the House on 11 October 2006. The complaint relates to three statements made in response to a question without notice concerning an approach by *A Current Affair* for the minister to appear in programs broadcast on 9 and 10 October 2006. I have studied *Hansard* and the material provided by the member for Currumbin. I have also studied a further statement made by the minister to the House on 12 October 2006.

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

In respect of one of the statements the subject of the complaint, I note that the member for Currumbin in her correspondence has misquoted the official *Hansard* record. When the official *Hansard* is considered, it is clear that no matter arises. I caution members to be careful when making serious complaints as to the accuracy of their complaints.

In relation to the other two statements, on the face of it there appears to be conflicting versions of events. It may well be that there is a satisfactory explanation for this conflict, but I am restricted by standing orders to the extent that I can investigate the matter. In short, I consider that the matter warrants further investigation. I will, therefore, refer those matters to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling—Allegation of Misleading the House

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 31 October 2006 the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the Premier deliberately misled the House on 12 October 2006. In essence, the Leader of the Opposition alleges that the Premier, on 12 October 2006, misled the House by suggesting that Dr Patel sought an agreement to appear before a court in secret without any publicity, that is, that the court proceedings were to be in secret. The Leader of the Opposition points to contradictory reports from Dr Patel's lawyers who reportedly did not seek a restriction on the reporting of court proceedings.

I have studied *Hansard* and relevant media reports provided by the Leader of the Opposition. I also note that in the media on 18 October 2006 and in the House on 31 October 2006 the Premier clarified the context of his earlier statements to the House. I am unconvinced that what the Premier said in the House on 12 October 2006 was, in fact, incorrect or misleading, rather than simply being capable of being open to different interpretations.

Mr Seeney: Ha, ha!

Mr SPEAKER: Excuse me, Leader of the Opposition, if you are making a slight on me it is a reflection on the chair and I ask you to not reflect on the chair. You are making a reflection on the chair and I ask you to apologise in that regard.

Mr Seeney: I withdraw whatever reflection, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: No, I want you to do that in an unqualified way, Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Seeney: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: I am unconvinced that what the Premier said in the House on 12 October 2006 was in fact incorrect or misleading rather than simply being capable of different interpretations. In any respect, there is no evidence that there was an intention to mislead and the Premier has explained and clarified his statements. The Premier's explanation of his statements and clarifications are more than plausible. I therefore find that there is no basis to demonstrate a prima facie contempt of deliberately misleading the House and I intend to take no further action in respect of the matter.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Death of Mr RG Akers MP

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.40 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Robert George Akers, a former Member of the Parliament of Queensland.

2. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the Members of the Parliament of Queensland, in the loss they have sustained.

Robert George Akers, better known as Rob Akers, was born in Brisbane on 17 October 1941 and educated at Strathpine State School and Brisbane Grammar School, later completing a Bachelor of Architecture at the University of Queensland. From 1963 to 1969, Mr Akers worked as a student and architect for the Queensland Department of Works. He also worked as an architect with Conrad, Gargett and Partners from 1967 to 1970, and ran his own architecture practice from 1970 to 1973 before becoming a councillor for the Pine Rivers shire until 1978.

He was elected as the member for Pine Rivers in 1974, which was one of those bloodbath years for the Labor Party, Mr Speaker, as you may recall. Mr Akers's first speech focused on the lack of community facilities in the Pine Rivers electorate. He also spoke about architectural issues and fire-fighting equipment within school grounds.

Mr Akers married fellow parliamentarian Rosemary Kyburz. That was the first time that sitting members had married. Maybe they have begun a tradition, who knows. Due to Mr Akers's understanding of the workings of the Queensland Department of Works, he became a member of the department's Works and Housing Committee. Mr Akers also became deputy chairman of the Pine Rivers shire from 1976 until 1978 and later became the shire chairman until 1994.

Robert Akers was a member of various sporting and community organisations and was honoured by the Pine Rivers shire which named the Rob Akers Reserve after him. Mr Akers was a recipient of the 2001 Centenary Medal for distinguished service to the community through parliament, local government and the Lions Club. A funeral service for Robert Akers was held at the Lions Hall in Lawnton on 3 November 2006.

Those of us who were around in the 1970s and 1980s, which includes you, Mr Speaker, and some members of this House will recall Rob Akers and Rosemary Kyburz. They were, if you like, the firebrands in the Liberal Party at that time. They were not the only ones. There was a bit of a ginger group around. Many will recall that they stood up and had the courage to take on the then dominant National Party. Out of that there were all sorts of fireworks from time to time.

In those days the Liberal Party did not always agree with the National Party. We know things have changed since then, of course. In those days they had their differences. Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, who was the Premier at the time, did not have a very high regard for some sections of the Liberal Party. But anyone who lived through that time would know that it was a very fiery time.

Rob Akers was well regarded by both sides of politics, as was Rosemary Kyburz, for having the courage to stand up for matters of principle and conviction. It would be remiss of me on an occasion like this not to acknowledge that. Let us forget about the sensitivities that may have existed then and now. It would be wrong of me not to acknowledge that.

As I said earlier, Rob Akers was a person of courage, he was a person of principle and he was a person of conviction—as was Rosemary Kyburz. I was very active in the Labor Party in the 1970s and early 1980s as the party secretary. I was one of the many people who had a lot of respect for their courage. It was not easy; it was a difficult time. Rob Akers will be well remembered as someone of courage, principle and conviction. He was one of those people who is regarded as a little bit more than just an ordinary politician because he certainly was not. I take this opportunity to extend my sympathy and that of this House to his wife, Rosemary, and to their children.

Dr FLEGG (Moggill—Lib) (9.45 am): On behalf of the Liberal Party and the coalition I rise to second the motion and to pass on to the family and friends of the late Rob Akers our sympathies and condolences. Robert George Akers was born in Brisbane on 17 October 1941—that is, during the war. His parents were James Henry Akers, who was a produce merchant and company director, and Mary Beatrice Farlow.

Rob was educated at Strathpine State School and the Brisbane Grammar School. He attended the University of Queensland and graduated with a Bachelor of Architecture. He found immediate work as an architect within the Department of Public Works with whom he had worked as a student while still at the UQ. Whilst he was working for the department he married his first wife, Ilse Frances Gaylard. They had two sons and one daughter. He left the department to work with Conrad, Gargett and Partners until 1970 when he set up his own architectural practice. From 1974 onwards he was a partner in Akers, Tan and Associates.

Rob took an interest in politics at an early age serving as a facility representative on the student union council at UQ. His first role in public life was as a councillor for the Pine Rivers shire to which he was elected in 1973. This is a position which he held until 1978. He also served as deputy chairman of the shire from 1976 to 1978.

Rob stood for the state seat of Pine Rivers and won comfortably in the 1974 electoral landslide in which the ALP was reduced to the cricket team of 11 MPs. Rob's first speech was an interesting one and I encourage members to take the time to read it. Three topics contained in the speech caught my eye. First was his criticism of the behaviour of all political parties, including his own party, the Liberal Party, since that 1974 election. He said—

> These actions are not what Queensland voters asked for on December 7. These actions, together with those on both sides in Canberra, have brought Parliamentary Government to a low ebb in the public esteem.

Not only was this a brave thing to say—attacking one's own party in one's first speech is a bold way to start one's parliamentary career—but it underlined the character of the man. Parliamentary accountability and behaviour was of paramount importance. If that included attacking members of one's own government, then so be it.

Secondly, Rob bemoaned the absence of public facilities in the Pine Rivers area. Given the fact that Pine Rivers had the largest enrolment of any electorate in Queensland, it is a testament to his inexhaustible efforts as an MP and while serving on the Pine Rivers Shire Council that it has now has public amenities and facilities deserving of one of the fastest growing areas of Queensland.

Thirdly, Rob demonstrated a passion and depth of knowledge for his original profession, architecture, by examining public housing and more efficient ways to run the Department of Works, once again not being afraid to criticise his own government's approach to the area. In reading his first speech it is not surprising that Rob became a member of the so-called small 'l' group of Liberal Party MPs who over a period of years were not afraid to voice their disapproval of government policies or even vote against them.

One of the most well-known occasions of this independence was the crossing of the floor of 13 Liberal MPs over the demolition of the Bell Vue Hotel in April 1979. Rob Akers was one of those MPs who crossed the floor and, along with Rosemary Kyburz, the Liberal member for Salisbury, threatened in fact to become an Independent. I spoke to Rob's friend and former Liberal leader Terry White, who in expressing his sympathies reminded me that heritage issues such as the Bell Vue enjoyed nowhere near as much public popularity and support as those issues would today. This was a courageous position, and with Rob's background in architecture he had a passion for this sort of issue.

Two years later he married fellow rebel Rosemary Kyburz, which was the first time, as the Premier told us, that two current members of the Queensland parliament had married. They had two sons, both of whom were born while Rob and Rosemary were still in office. Rob was a firm supporter of the push to establish a Public Accounts Committee which was the catalyst that led Premier Bjelke-Petersen to call the 1983 state election. He and wife Rosemary were defeated at that election, but Rob did not sit idle for very long. He stood unsuccessfully for his old seat of Pine Rivers in 1986 and 1989 and in 1995 for the seat of Kurwongbah. Rob had more success back in his old stomping ground of local government, being re-elected as a councillor for Pine Rivers shire in 1985 and he served as shire chairman from that time until 1994. Rob was honoured by Pine Rivers shire, as the Premier has mentioned, with the naming of the Rob Akers Reserve after him and the receipt of the Centenary Medal.

Rob Akers gave outstanding service to his community, his state, this parliament and the Liberal Party. At his memorial service, which was held at the Lawnton Showground Lions Hall—a building that he in fact had designed as a student—his son Sean said of him in what I found to be a truly moving tribute—

> Dad was the sort of character that seems to be getting a little thin on the ground lately—a gentleman in all senses of the word. He preferred to get his message across with intelligent conversation and quiet action rather than employing loud and flamboyant methods ... He was invariably helping somebody or devoting himself to some cause in need of assistance. I cannot but be humbled by the selfless dedication to these people, these causes and the Pine Rivers area. We are so proud of his legacy.

Rob Akers passed away on 22 October 2006 and is survived by his wife Rosemary and his sons Lachlan, Justin, Blakely and Sean and his daughter Jacqui and his four grandchildren Rebecca, Nicholas, Imogen and Tyler. I find condolence motions one of the very valuable things we do in this parliament because we remember people's contributions, putting aside the politics and the argy-bargy of the day. This is the first such debate that I have spoken in and it is for someone that I knew personally. Rob and I even contested a preselection at one stage against each other, in a very good spirit I might add. I think you could describe Bob as being an enigmatic person. He was an ideologue who found some of the compromise in politics difficult. It would be fair to say—and I am sure that he and his family would concur—that he was not much fussed with politicians. My colleagues in the Liberal Party, in the Liberal Party organisation and in the coalition join with the Premier in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Rosemary and to his family.

Mr SEENEY (Callide—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.53 am): I rise to endorse the remarks that have been made by my colleague the member for Moggill and to extend my sympathies to the family of the late Rob Akers. As my colleague the member for Moggill outlined, he was elected to parliament on 7 December 1974 and served the electorate of Pine Rivers until October 1983. I never knew Rob Akers, but he will be remembered by all who did know him as a man of principal and a person who displayed the courage of his convictions and was prepared to stand up for what he believed in, and that is something that I admire. Issues raised in his maiden speech are as relevant today as they were in 1974. In his maiden speech Rob Akers stated that he wanted the government 'to be strong and democratic'. He said—

I do not want the mumbo jumbo of politicking at the expense of the state of Queensland.

And how relevant that is today. He said—

I want assistance for fast-developing local authorities and a serious reconsideration of Queensland's public housing.

That, too, is still relevant today, and many of us as local members still have to deal with that issue.

Rob Akers's role as chairman of the fast-developing local authority area of Pine Rivers saw him having constant battles with state and federal public servants, and he fought hard for regional planning advisory groups to ensure that the state government created a broad conceptual plan for future development which allowed local government to administer it. In 1994 he was at the forefront of challenging the then Deputy Prime Minister and federal housing minister, Brian Howe, who wanted to penalise people who lived on city fringes with higher charges in a plan to reduce urban sprawl. Rob saw this as nothing more than a new tax on people who could not afford to live closer to the city. As my colleague and the Premier have mentioned, he will be remembered by his colleagues as a man of courage but he also will be remembered for his dedication to the community and for his strength of conviction. I join with my colleagues in the coalition in honouring his memory and extending our condolences to his family.

Hon. DM WELLS (Murrumba—ALP) (9.56 am): The successor in this place of Rob Akers is Linda Lavarch, whose electorate of Kurwongbah incorporates the geographical area that Rob Akers represented. Due to illness, Linda is unable to be here but she wished some words to be said in tribute to Rob Akers and she has asked me to say these words. Rob Akers was a fixture in the public life of Pine Rivers shire for over 30 years and it was a great honour for us to know him and work with him for much of this period. Rob was a Liberal in the true sense of the word. A man of conscience and principle, he was a believer in individual enterprise but he was not a mindless conservative. His unease with the Bjelke-Petersen government grew to opposition of it as the corruption of that regime became more apparent. He was one of the handful of Liberal members of parliament who had the fortitude to stand up for basic standards of good government.

In Pine Rivers Rob was regarded as a tireless worker with a genuine commitment for our community. Linda says that her husband, Michael, recounts a story which sums up Rob's approach. In 1985 Rob was elected chairman of the Pine Rivers Shire Council, defeating the sitting Labor chairman Allan Hughes. Prior to the first meeting of the new council, Rob pulled aside Michael and the other Labor councillors and made it clear that, although politics had a lot to do with their election, he now wanted to put politics aside and work cooperatively and collegiately in the interests of the shire. These were not hollow words but genuinely reflected the way Rob approached his role as council chairman. Linda says that in recent years they enjoyed working with Rob in community organisations and events such as the annual Lions Youth of the Year Quest. He was also a regular at the Pine Rivers Show. Rob will be sorely missed, but his legacy will be long remembered and well regarded. Linda says that Michael and she extend their deepest sympathy to Rosemary and to all of the Akers family. They can all be so justifiably proud of Rob for he stood by his principles, served the community in so many ways and left Pine Rivers a better place for his having been here.

On my own behalf, I want to say that my electorate includes part of the Pine Rivers shire. I have worked with Rob Akers and knew him well. I have been to many functions that he attended and observed his work closely. His principles were not my principles but he was a man of principles, and principles which I respected. On behalf of many of my constituents who are his beneficiaries, I would like to thank Rob for his life's work and the improvements that he has made to the life of our community. On behalf of my constituents and my own family, I wish his family well in their time of tribulation.

Motion agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

PROCEDURE

Speaker's Statement—Loan of Tabled Papers

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that I have approved the loan of tabled documents under standing order 19 to the Supreme Court Library for its display on 16 November 2006 to 15 December 2006.

TABLED PAPER

Auditor-General's Report

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that today I received from the Auditor-General a report titled *Report No. 8 for 2006: results of performance management systems audit of the management of departmental fees and charges*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Report to Parliament No. 8 for 2006, by the Auditor-General of Queensland, titled 'Results of Performance Management Systems Audit of the Management of Departmental Fees and Charges'.

PETITIONS

The following honourable members have lodged paper petitions for presentation—

Patient Transfer Subsidy Scheme

Mrs Menkens from 174 petitioners requesting the House to immediately increase Patient Transfer Subsidy Scheme payments, in line with the increase in transport and accommodation costs since the present subsidy amounts were calculated, and thereafter index the subsidies in line with inflation.

Kulangoor, Landfill

Mr Wellington from 147 petitioners requesting the House to ensure that when the application for the proposed landfill site at Ferntree Creek Road Kulangoor is submitted to the Government, it be thoroughly scrutinised and rejected, so that the Government ensures the current permitted land uses on this site remain unchanged.

Bli Bli, Land Development

Mr Wellington from 126 petitioners requesting the House to have the Minister for Environment use her call-in powers to review the Maroochy Shire Council's approval with conditions of the development of land at Bli Bli for urban subdivision.

Nambour, Petrie Creek Road

Mr Wellington from 1,771 petitioners requesting the House to consider an alternative southern arterial route into the town of Nambour from the Bruce Highway via the Petrie Creek Road precinct.

The following honourable members have sponsored e-petitions which are now closed and presented—

Vegetation Management Act 1999

Mr Lee from 1,083 petitioners requesting the House to amend the Integrated Planning Act 1997 and the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2005-2026 to allow the provisions of the Vegetation Management Act 1999 to apply to all of Queensland without exception.

International Football Matches

Mr Lee from 1,090 petitioners requesting the House (through Queensland Events corporation) to reassess its current position on attracting International Football (soccer) matches to Queensland.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

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

3 November 2006—

- Response from the Minister for Environment and Multiculturalism (Ms Nelson-Carr) to a paper petition presented by Mr Lucas from 672 petitioners regarding the Lytton Quarantine Jetty
- Office of the Governor—Annual Report 2005-06
- Office of the Information Commissioner—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Tourism, Fair Trading and Wine Industry Development—Annual Report 2005-06
- Dumaresq-Barwon Border Rivers Commission—Annual Report 2005-06
- Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Valuers Registration Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Water—Annual Report 2005-06
- Darling Downs-Moreton Rabbit Board—Annual Report 2005-06
- Chicken Meat Industry Committee—Annual Report 2005-06
- Sugar Industry Commissioner—Annual Report 2005-06
- Letter, dated 1 November 2006, from the Premier and Minister for Trade (Mr Beattie) to the Clerk of the Parliament enclosing a copy of a letter from the Commonwealth Parliament's Joint Standing Committee on Treaties listing a proposed international treaty action tabled in both houses of the Federal Parliament on 17 October 2006 and the National Interest Analyses for the proposed treaty action listed
- Interim Government Response from the Premier and Minister for Trade (Mr Beattie) to the Legal, Constitutional and Administrative Review Committee Report No. 55—Voices and Votes—A Parliamentary Committee Inquiry into Young People Engaging in Democracy, August 2006

- Queensland Health—Annual Report 2005-06
- Office of Health Practitioner Registration Boards—Annual Report 2005-06
- Chiropractors Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Dental Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Dental Technicians and Dental Prosthetists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Medical Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Medical Radiation Technologists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Mental Health Review Tribunal—Annual Report 2005-06
- Occupational Therapists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Optometrists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Osteopaths Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Pharmacists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Physiotherapists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Podiatrists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Psychologists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Speech Pathologists Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Nursing Council—Annual Report 2005-06
- Far North Queensland Hospital Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Ipswich Hospital Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Redcliffe Hospital Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital Research Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Royal Children's Hospital Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Sunshine Coast Health Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Toowoomba Hospital Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Institute of Medical Research—Annual Report and Financial Report 2005-06
- Health Rights Commission—Annual Report 2005-06
- Report to the Legislative Assembly by the Minister for Natural Resources and Water (Mr Shine) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 with respect to the Aboriginal Land Regulation 1991
- Report to the Legislative Assembly by the Minister for Natural Resources and Water (Mr Shine) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 with respect to the Land Regulation 1995
- Report to the Legislative Assembly by the Minister for Natural Resources and Water (Mr Shine) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 with respect to the Torres Strait Islander Land Regulation 1991
- Project Deed and Project Scope and Technical Requirements Exhibits (Volumes 1 to 18) to the Road Franchise Agreement between the State of Queensland and Queensland Motorways Limited regarding the Gateway Upgrade Project

6 November 2006—

- Department of Housing—Annual Report 2005-06
- Residential Tenancies Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Building Services Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Building and Construction Industry Payments Agency—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Public Works—Annual Report 2005-06
- Board of Professional Engineers—Annual Report 2005-06
- Board of Architects of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland State Archives—Annual Report 2005-06
- Greyhound Racing Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Harness Racing Board—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Thoroughbred Racing Board (Queensland Racing)—Annual Report 2005-06
- Trustees of Parklands Gold Coast—Annual Report 2005-06
- Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Lucas) to an E-petition sponsored by Mr Caltabiano from 145 petitioners regarding the Nielsens Road interchange upgrade

7 November 2006—

- Grain Research Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Safe Food Production Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- QRAA—Annual Report 2005-06

8 November 2006—

- Environmental Protection Agency—Annual Report 2005-06
- Statutory Authorities reporting to the Minister for Environment—Annual Report 2005-06

- Wet Tropics Management Authority—Annual Report 2005-06 and State of the Wet Tropics Report 2005-06
- The National Trust of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Response from the Minister for Police and Corrective Services (Ms Spence) to a paper petition presented by Mrs Stuckey from 4798 petitioners (640-06) and an E-petition sponsored by Mrs Stuckey from 30 petitioners (605-06) regarding law and order on the southern Gold Coast
- Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Lucas) to a paper petition sponsored by Ms Clark from 1152 petitioners regarding the proposed Airport Link project
- Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee—Report No. 72—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of State Development, Trade and Innovation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Forestry Plantations Queensland and Forestry Plantations Queensland Office—Annual Report May-June 2006
- Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries—Annual Report 2005-06
- QLeave—Annual Report 2005-06
- Contract Cleaning Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Industrial Relations—Annual Report 2005-06
- President of the Industrial Court of Queensland in respect of the Industrial Court of Queensland, Queensland Industrial Relations Commission and Queensland Industrial Registry
- Gladstone Area Water Board—Annual Report 2005-06
- Mount Isa Water—Annual Report 2005-06

9 November 2006—

- Government Response from the Acting Premier and Minister for Trade (Ms Bligh) to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee—Report No. 78—Matter of Privilege Referred by the Speaker on 16 February 2006 Relating to Matters of Privilege Arising from the Crime and Misconduct Commission's Report into the Honourable Gordon Nuttall MP
- Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Tourism Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Lucas) to a paper petition presented by Mr Cripps from 670 petitioners (717-06) regarding Kirrama Range Road

10 November 2006—

- Queensland Ombudsman—Annual Report 2005-06
- Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Education and the Arts—Annual Report 2005-06
- Australian Agricultural College Corporation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Training and Employment Recognition Council—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Tertiary Education Foundation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Non-State Schools Accreditation Board—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Performing Arts Trust—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Art Gallery—Annual Report 2005-06
- Library Board of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Studies Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Museum—Annual Report 2005-06
- Training Ombudsman—Annual Report 2005-06
- Report dated 30 October 2006—Compliance with the Integrated Planning Act 1997 by the Gold Coast City Council

13 November 2006—

- Auditor-General of Queensland—Report to Parliament No. 6 for 2006—Results of Performance Management Systems Audit of Workforce Planning at the Department of Education, Training and the Arts and the Department of Health
- Response from the Minister for Emergency Services (Mr Purcell) to an e-petition sponsored by Mr English from 78 petitioners (625-06) regarding a fire station in the southern part of the Redland Shire
- Report to the Legislative Assembly by the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Wilson) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Fossicking Regulation 1994

14 November 2006—

- Department of Energy—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Justice and Attorney-General—Annual Report 2005-06
- Land and Resources Tribunal—Annual Report 2005-06
- Legal Aid Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Public Trustee of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Crime and Misconduct Commission—Annual Report 2005-06
- Legal Services Commission—Annual Report 2005-06
- Children Services Tribunal—Annual Report 2005-06

- Report on the operations of the Land Tribunals Established under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 for the year ended 30 June 2006
- Queensland Transport—Annual Report and Financial Report 2005-06
- Department of Main Roads—Annual Report and Financial Report 2005-06
- Queensland Rail—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Rail—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Bundaberg Port Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Bundaberg Port Authority—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Cairns Port Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Cairns Port Authority—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Central Queensland Port Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Central Queensland Port Authority—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Mackay Port Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Mackay Port Authority—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Port of Brisbane Corporation—Annual Report 2005-06
- Port of Brisbane Corporation—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Ports Corporation of Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Ports Corporation of Queensland—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Townsville Port Authority—Annual Report 2005-06
- Townsville Port Authority—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Queensland Motorways Limited—Annual Report 2005-06
- The Gateway Bridge Company Limited—Annual Report 2005-06
- Logan Motorway Company Limited—Annual Report 2005-06
- Port Motorway Limited—Annual Report 2005-06
- Report of the review of the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995
- Department of Employment and Training—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Communities—Annual Report 2005-06
- Disability Services Queensland—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Child Safety—Annual Report 2005-06
- Department of Emergency Services—Annual Report 2005-06
- SunWater—Annual Report 2005-06
- SunWater—Statement of Corporate Intent 2005-06
- Report tabled by the Acting Premier and Minister for Trade (Ms Bligh)—Department of Premier and Cabinet Ministerial Gift Register—Ministerial Gifts Received since June 1998
- Ninth Annual Report of the Public Interest Monitor delivered pursuant to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Crime and Misconduct Commission Act 2001—Reporting period 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2006

17 November 2006—

- Guardianship and Administration Tribunal—Annual Report 2005-06
- Office of the Public Advocate—Annual Report 2005-06
- Queensland Law Society—Annual Report 2005-06

21 November 2006—

- Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Lucas) to an E-petition (692-06) sponsored by Mr Fraser from 40 petitioners regarding Carrington Street, Paddington
- Response from the Minister for Communities, Disability Services, Seniors and Youth (Mr Pitt) to paper petitions (731-06 and 730-06) presented by Mr Wells from 162 and 40 petitioners respectively regarding the Queensland Government Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme

22 November 2006—

- Auditor General of Queensland—Report to Parliament No. 7 for 2006—Results of Audits as at 30 September 2006
- Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Lucas) to a paper petition (727-06) presented by Mr Knuth from 654 petitioners regarding the Clermont to Alpha Road

23 November 2006—

- Queensland Gaming Commission—Annual Report 2005-06
- PA Foundation—Annual Report 2006

24 November 2006—

- Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Robertson) to a paper petition (713-06) presented by Mrs Menkens from 2626 petitioners regarding the Patient Transfer Subsidy Scheme

27 November 2006—

- Erratum to the explanatory notes for the Wild Rivers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006
- Queensland's Category 2 Water Authorities—Summary of Annual Reports and Financial Statements 2005-06
- Queensland's River Improvement Trusts—Summarised Annual Reports and Financial Statements 2005-06
- Report by the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure (Ms Bligh) on the Queensland Treasury Corporation Overseas Investor Program delegation led by the Deputy Premier from 17 to 28 October 2006

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Fisheries Act 1994—

- Fisheries Management Plans Amendment Management Plan (No. 3) 2006, No. 265

Fisheries Act 1994—

- Fisheries Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 266

Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966, Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, Apiaries Act 1982, Brands Act 1915, Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988, Drugs Misuse Act 1986, Fisheries Act 1994, Stock Act 1915, Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936—

- Primary Industries Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 267

Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—

- Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2006, No. 268

Liquor Act 1992—

- Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2006, No. 269

State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999—

- State Penalties Enforcement Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2006, No. 270

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991—

- Uniform Civil Procedure Amendment Rule (No. 1) 2006, No. 271

Lotteries Act 1997—

- Lotteries Amendment Rule (No. 2) 2006, No. 272

Private Health Facilities Act 1999—

- Private Health Facilities (Standards) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2006, No. 273

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971—

- State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2006, No. 274

Integrated Planning Act 1997—

- Integrated Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2006, No. 275

Maritime and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2006—

- Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 276

Queensland Building Services Authority Act 1991—

- Queensland Building Services Authority Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2006, No. 277

Food Production (Safety) Act 2000—

- Food Production (Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 278

Electricity Act 1994—

- Electricity Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 279

Evidence Act 1977—

- Evidence Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 280

Water Amendment Act 2005—

- Water Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2006, No. 281

Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000—

- Vocational Education, Training and Employment Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2006, No. 282

Liquor Act 1992—

- Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 7) 2006, No. 283

Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973, Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003, Electoral Act 1992, Evidence Act 1977, Freedom of Information Act 1992, Integrated Planning Act 1997, Justices Act 1886, Justices of the Peace and Commissioners for Declarations Act 1991, Land Court Act 2000, Legal Profession Act 2004, Property Law Act 1974, Recording of Evidence Act 1962, Small Claims Tribunals Act 1973, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991—

- Justice and Other Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2006, No. 284

Forestry Act 1959, Nature Conservation Act 1992—

- Forestry and Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2006, No. 285

Water Act 2000—

- Water (Pricing Direction Notices) Repeal Regulation 2006, No. 286

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

- Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2006, No. 287

MINISTERIAL PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland (Mr Shine)—

- Report to the Legislative Assembly by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland (Mr Shine) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992

MINISTERIAL PAPER

The following ministerial paper was tabled—

Minister for Environment and Multiculturalism (Ms Nelson-Carr)—

- Proposal to revoke the setting apart and declaration of certain land as State forest under section 26 of the Forestry Act 1959 and a brief explanation of the proposal

NOTICE OF MOTION

Beerburrum State Forest

Hon. LH NELSON-CARR (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Multiculturalism) (10.03 am): I give notice that after the expiration of at least 14 days as provided in the Forestry Act 1959, I shall move—

1. That this House requests the Governor in Council to revoke by regulation the setting apart and declaration as state forest under the Forestry Act 1959 of those areas as set out in the proposal tabled by me in the House today on 28 November 2006; viz—

Description of areas to be revoked

Beerburrum East Forest (SF 611)	Area described as Lot 1 on SP185011 and containing 21.17 hectares as illustrated on the attached sketch marked "B".

2. That Mr Speaker and The Clerk of the Parliament forward a copy of this resolution to the Minister for Environment and Multiculturalism for submission to the Governor in Council.

Tabled paper: Map indicating area proposed for excision from Beerburrum East State Forest.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Palm Island

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.05 am): In 2005 my government gave a commitment to improve services and opportunities on Palm Island and we are honouring that commitment. Since then significant improvements have been made, and these are detailed in the progress report on the implementation of the government response to the Palm Island Select Committee, which I am tabling this morning.

Mr Speaker, I know that as the local member you have a strong personal interest in the report, which shows that an alcohol management plan commenced in June this year and a Community Justice Group has been established. Funding has been provided for initiatives that give local people alternatives to alcohol and assistance in dealing with its impacts. A land use plan is in place that will assist the Palm Island Aboriginal Shire Council plan for future development.

The preparatory year commenced in 2006 on Palm Island and planning is underway to enhance early childhood education services by focusing more on early literacy skills. The youth centre continues to be well used.

We are also working to improve transport options for the people of Palm Island. An extra daily ferry service will be running from 13 December 2006. Cheaper fares will also be available and construction on the upgrade to the airport is about to start. Just yesterday, as a further indication of our ongoing commitment to improve infrastructure and services for Palm Island, on the initiative of the minister for transport, state cabinet approved additional funding to repair and upgrade the jetty and barge ramp. Therefore, $4.5 million is now available to do this work over the next two years. However, we have not achieved everything we set out to do and I will not pretend that we have. In particular, land and leases for a number of government facilities and infrastructure need to be resolved, including the Palm Island Community and Youth Centre. Today I urge the council to move quickly and work with us to fast-track those matters so that we do not lose our momentum. Those land use issues are crucial to the future of Palm Island and delays are unhelpful to the people of that island.

The responsibility for securing a brighter future for the people of Palm Island has to be shared by individuals, families, community leaders and all levels of government. I have asked the newly appointed Government Coordinator for Indigenous Service Delivery to drive implementation of the government's commitments to Palm Island. I now table a copy of the report.

Tabled paper: Queensland Government Progress Report on Implementation of the Government Response to the Palm Island Select Committee, dated November 2006

I have also arranged for individual members to receive copies, bearing in mind that a select committee of this parliament examined the issues on Palm Island.

Nuclear Power

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.07 am): This week we will introduce legislation that is vitally important to protect the lifestyle of Queenslanders and our wonderful regional and rural communities. Under a plan being pushed by the Howard government, our towns and shires face the very real threat of becoming homes to nuclear reactors and a dumping ground for dangerous nuclear waste. If the Howard government has its way, we will turn from paradise one day to a radioactive dump the next. That is against Queensland's interests and we will fight it every step of the way. Cabinet approved this legislation yesterday.

So this week the Minister for Mines and Energy will introduce a bill to prohibit nuclear facilities including uranium enrichment plants, nuclear power stations and nuclear waste sites in Queensland. One thing that has been lost in the debate is this: if we have nuclear reactors, frankly something has to be done with the waste and it has to be dealt with in Australia. I ask those on the other side of politics who support this to put their hands up if they want a nuclear dump in their backyard.

The Nuclear Facilities Prohibition Bill 2006 will help protect regional and rural Queensland from the threat of nuclear facilities being built in their neighbourhood. As part of the legislation we will also make provision for a future plebiscite on the issue. We want to make sure that Queenslanders have a chance to have their say—democracy in action.

In the event that the Commonwealth government adopts a policy position in support of allowing the generation of nuclear power, uranium enrichment or the creation of nuclear dumping facilities, we will put a plebiscite to the people of Queensland to ask them whether they support the location of such facilities within Queensland. My government does not support the use of nuclear power in this state. We do not want nuclear generators and we do not want nuclear waste dumped here. Our concerns are many, including the management and disposal of high-level radioactive waste, and the cost and risk of transporting nuclear waste on public infrastructure.

Secondly, we are concerned about the safety of facilities located near major centres of population. The industry safety record of the industry has improved since the incidents at Three Mile Island in the United States and Chernobyl in the former Soviet Union, but there are still major concerns. Our concerns also include the requirement of nuclear power stations for significant quantities of water. A recent independent study that we commissioned shows that a nuclear power station would use 25 per cent more water than a coal-fired power station. Finally, there is the impact on our multibillion-dollar coal and mineral industry.

If the Howard government will not move to protect Queensland communities, we will. The Howard government argues that nuclear power is an essential response to climate change. We do not agree. We believe that clean coal technologies and renewable energy are safer and more economically sensible options for Australia compared to nuclear power. We are happy to engage in a public debate with the Prime Minister and the federal government in relation to it.

Gallery of Modern Art; State Library of Queensland

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.10 am): Queenslanders have another great opportunity this weekend to celebrate Brisbane's growing status as a centre for culture and learning. A gala people's day has been organised on Saturday, 2 December to mark the opening of the new Gallery of Modern Art and the redeveloped State Library of Queensland, where cabinet met yesterday. It is an ideal opportunity for Queenslanders to experience the $291 million redevelopment of the Cultural Centre, which is home to our flagship arts and cultural institutions.

Visitors will be treated to the fifth Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art—the opening exhibit at the new Gallery of Modern Art and the refurbished Queensland Art Galley. There will also be great entertainment for the whole family, including James Morrison and his band, with fun activities happening across the entire cultural precinct.

It is a fantastic follow-up event to last weekend's official opening of Queensland's new world-class State Library, which I had the honour of performing with my ministerial colleagues Rod Welford and Robert Schwarten. Also, the Deputy Premier, Anna Bligh, was there as the local member. The State

Library is spread over five levels with more than 3.5 million items to explore. The new library includes an information zone for wireless internet access, multiple galleries and display spaces.

Mr Speaker, I seek leave to have the rest of my ministerial statement incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

There is also an Indigenous Knowledge Centre and wide decks with stunning views of the river and Brisbane's CBD.

The Gallery of Modern Art and the new State Library of Queensland are the largest cultural infrastructure projects in Queensland in more than 30 years.

They highlight Queensland's emergence as an international cultural destination.

The project supported more than 12,000 jobs during the three year construction phase with more than 72 per cent of contracts awarded to Queensland-based contractors.

But just as importantly, we now have a new, world-class venue for staging modern art exhibitions that will become major drawcards for national and international tourists—and another major contributor to the intellectual and cultural life of the Smart State.

Some time ago there was some debate as to whether the library and gallery should go ahead. My government had the fortitude to go ahead and invest this money—the only government that allocated money towards this project. On Friday, I will have the honour of opening the GoMA with my ministerial colleagues. I want to make the point that wherever these projects come up, they benefit the whole state. I notice that we have had some criticism along the way. The former Leader of the Opposition criticised it. He said—

The money should be spent on bringing the best of the world's art to Queensland, not on constructing monument buildings.

Of course we want to see the best of the world's art come here, and we will, so I would like to hear the member say that about the GoMA on Friday and Saturday. It is a shame the member is not in the chamber. The reality is that my government has delivered this. The Smart State is about innovation, it is about learning and it is also about the arts. I want to put clearly on the public record my thanks to all of those who have made it possible. I want to thank the Department of Public Works. I also want to thanks the arts ministers—and there have been three of them—who have been involved in all of this: Matt Foley, Anna Bligh and now Rod Welford. We had the courage to deliver this. This will provide a better quality of life. We have a smart library for the Smart State. We have a gallery that is going to be among one of the best in the world—in the top 10—and will be the largest modern art gallery in Australia. We built it. I am very proud of it and so should every other member of this parliament.

Ministerial Gift Register

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.13 am): Earlier this month the Deputy Premier tabled the Ministerial Gift Register. Under Queensland government rules, premiers, ministers, parliamentary secretaries and their staff, and the Leader of the Opposition must notify the Ministerial Services Branch of the Department of Premier and Cabinet of any gift that could have a wholesale value of $300 or more in its country of origin. The branch ascertains the value of the gift through research, by checking with the manufacturer or sending it to an antique dealer, the Queensland Art Gallery or another specialist dealer. If ministers want to keep gifts worth $300 or more they must pay the value of the gift above $300 personally.

Obviously, gifts of significant or cultural value are not available to ministers to be kept personally, and are retained by the Queensland Art Gallery or the Queensland Museum. Otherwise they must display them in their ministerial offices or in their departments, but those displayed gifts remain public property. They also may be donated to some charity or some organisation and there is a process by which those donations could be made.

My government has never hidden material on the Ministerial Gift Register, and I table it in this House.

Tabled paper: Report, dated 14 November 2006, by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet titled 'Gifts Received by Specified Dates (start date 26/09/98 end date 14/11/06)'.

Open access to ministerial gift data has been provided in the past and I have even taken the media through the gift storage room. It is part of an open and transparent government. Some members will recall that recently I held an auction to sell off some of the gifts. The money that was raised through that auction was then donated to charity. We did not retain that property. It was auctioned and the money raised through that auction was used for the public benefit. I note that the opposition supported our initiative to table the document, and I thank it for its support. In line with this support I know that the opposition will welcome my decision to extend the gift register to all shadow ministers, because I believe that it should apply equally to both sides of the House.

Extending the register will bring shadow ministers into line with their government colleagues and afford them the same opportunity to have openness and accountability, which is the hallmark of my government.

Mr Horan interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Next the member will say to me that shadow ministers do not get any gifts. The members opposite should give us a list of their gifts; otherwise they will say that they do not get any gifts. I am happy to encourage accountability for those opposite.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I see that the Leader of the Opposition wants to have spot checks on various things. I have spelt out our strategy. We would like to apply this standard to his shadow ministers.

Mr Seeney: Absolutely.

Mr BEATTIE: Has the Leader of the Opposition asked all of his colleagues? Has he conducted spot checks? The first thing that the Leader of the Opposition can do is come forward today and disclose every one of the gifts the shadow ministers have received. I have tabled the list of gifts my ministers have received. Where is the gift list for the shadow ministers?

Mr Johnson: We haven't got any.

Mr BEATTIE: The opposition does not receive gifts? Is the opposition so unpopular that no-one gives it gifts? If the opposition members think that Queenslanders do not believe that they receive gifts, then they are kidding themselves. My challenge to the Leader of the Opposition is to table in the parliament this week details of all the gifts that every one of his shadow ministers has received. If the Leader of the Opposition cannot do that, then he has been caught out. The Leader of the Opposition should follow my lead. I am not asking him to do anything that I am not prepared to do. A list of every one of the gifts that all of my ministers have received have been tabled. The Leader of the Opposition should also table a list of the gifts that his shadow ministers have received.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: The Leader of the Opposition is so unpopular that he is given only lollies. I do not know why people bother to even do that.

Election Commitments

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.16 am): On 1 November 2006—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: The first gift they could give the member would be a brain. On 1 November 2006 I advised members of the government's progress in meeting its election commitments. I am delighted to be able to inform the House that we are continuing to meet our targets and delivering on the promises we made during the 2006 election. Seventy-seven days on, the following initiatives have now also been completed.

We promised to advertise nationally and internationally for extra staff to boost paediatric cardiac services at Prince Charles Hospital. Delivered. In the area of water infrastructure we have delivered the following commitments. Promise: to deliver the initial report on the south-east Queensland water regulation to help coordinate the drought response across councils. Delivered. Promise: to extend the Home WaterWise Rebate Scheme statewide. Delivered. Promise: to progress geotechnical and environmental studies on the Eden Bann and Rookwood weirs. Delivered. Promise: to identify or progress identification of corridors for pipelines between Connors River Dam and the surrounding shires from the Burdekin to Bowen and Proserpine. Delivered.

In terms of the environment, we have delivered the following commitments. Promise: to establish the Clean Coal Technology Project Board and initiate action to test new technologies in the generation of clean power from fossil fuels. Delivered.

In terms of roads and transport we have delivered the following commitments. Promise: to initiate works on major road projects including release of the environmental impact statement on Airport Link, the awarding of the construction contract for the Ipswich-Logan Motorway interchange and the final investment decision on Northern Busway. Delivered. Promise: to facilitate the development of a new, alternative crossing for the Toowoomba range and CBD bypass, which is currently being developed as a public-private partnership. Delivered.

In areas designed to make the lives of all Queenslanders better, we have delivered the following commitments. Promise: to introduce legislation to outlaw ticket scalping at major sporting and entertainment events in Queensland. The legislation is before the House. Promise: to open the new Gympie Police Station and Rainbow Beach Police Beat. Done. Promise: to introduce laws to ensure children cannot legally obtain spray-paint cans. Done. Promise: to enact legislation to outlaw drink spiking. Done. Promise: to enact legislation to authorise courts to apply electronic monitoring devices to persons previously convicted for paedophilia offences. Done.

This brings the number of initiatives that are already completed to 31. Many more are well advanced. We are building a better Queensland. Our capital works spending this year alone tops $10 billion for the first time ever. Since being elected in 1998, we have increased funding to health by more than 64 per cent, funding to education by more than 55 per cent, and funding to welfare and housing by more than 110 per cent. I look forward to providing the people of Queensland with a full report on the delivery of our commitments. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* an update on each one of those commitments.

Leave granted.

FULL LIST OF 100 DAYS COMMITMENTS

Health

A year on from the release of the Health Action Plan, we're continuing to deliver on a better health system.

1. Promise: Finalise the acquisition process for the Sunshine Coast Hospital at Kawana and begin detailed design and planning.

   Action: The Heads of agreement has been executed; the final signing off on the Heads of Agreement to purchase the new Sunshine Coast Hospital site has been extended to mid-January 2007 at the vendor's request. Traffic infrastructure issues that may affect the contracts for sale are being reviewed at present with a meeting held in November 2006 to finalise road design issues.

2. Promise: Establish a project team to ensure fast tracking of construction of new University Hospital at Parklands on the Gold Coast.

   Action: Queensland Health and Griffith University are committed to undertaking the joint master planning of the university and hospital with the objective of ensuring optimal integration. Both parties met in October 2006 to initiate joint master planning and prepare a Heads of Agreement.

3. Promise: Commence scoping and design work for capital projects to create extra beds at hospitals, including Princess Alexandra, Townsville, QEII, Robina, Caloundra, Nambour, Rockhampton and Bundaberg hospitals.

   Action: Consultants have been engaged to assist with the scoping and design work for all but one project. Tenders for health service planning of the remaining project closed on 20 November 2006, with appointment expected by the end of the month, at which point the scoping and design process will have been commenced for all indicated projects.

4. Promise: Employ staff, purchase equipment and open additional theatres to ensure elective surgery centres at Redcliffe and Caboolture start operations as soon as possible.

   Action: Three Orthopaedic Surgeons were interviewed and one has accepted a position.

5. Promise: Appoint Dr Alan Isles to lead the consultation process for the creation of the new Queensland Children's Hospital.

   Action: The New Queensland Children's Hospital project structure has been refined to include the coordinating committee, integration with Capital Works and Asset Management Branch work plans, Children and Young Peoples Council, Parent Council, Human Resource and Change Management committee, Governance sub-committee and Finance committee.

   The Paediatric Cardiac Services five year service plan has been developed with clinician's involvement. General agreement has been reached on the level of services and resources required for the new Paediatric Cardiac Services. The draft function design brief is on track for completion by the end of November 2006.

6. Promise: Create a separate Medical Board to focus solely on doctor registration issues.

   Action: The necessary legislation was introduced on 31 October 2006 and is now before the House.

   An experienced consultant, Mr Jim Birch, has been contracted to examine the administrative process and assist in managing the transition to the new office of the Medical Registration Board.

7. Promise: Complete an independent review of the Mental Health Act 2000.

   Action: Former Crime and Misconduct Commission chair Brendan Butler is due to present his report on his independent review of Queensland's mental health laws by 11 December 2006.

8. Promise: Advertise nationally and internationally for extra staff to boost paediatric cardiac services at Prince Charles Hospital.

   Action: An International recruitment campaign is underway with advertisements scheduled for November 2006 in the United Kingdom. A Queensland Health representative from the Prince Charles Hospital commenced interviewing staff in the United Kingdom on 20 November 2006.

9. Promise: Introduce legislation to accelerate the acquisition of the site for the new Yeppoon Hospital.

   Action: The Yeppoon Hospital Site Acquisition Act 2006 received Royal Assent on 13 October 2006.

10. Promise: Continue aggressive recruitment of health professionals from interstate and overseas to build on the 311 extra doctors, 1,358 nurses and 546 allied health staff recruited over the last 12 months.

    Action: By continuing our aggressive recruitment campaign we have successfully increased those totals previously announced to recruit 472 extra doctors, 1,885 extra nurses and 690 extra allied health professionals.

11. Promise: Offer jobs to all students graduating as nurses.

    Action: 874 nursing graduates have accepted offers of employment into start-of-year 2007 positions. The number of acceptances is likely to increase with second round of offers continuing.

12. Promise: Conduct consumer focus groups in Health Service Districts across the State as part of the public consultation process for introducing a Consumer Health Council as a fearless, independent voice for health consumers.

    Action: Numerous consumer focus groups across Queensland are planned. The Consumer Health Council will be developed in early 2007.

13. Promise: Continue to publish 'Our Performance' Related Reports on hospital activity (monthly) on Queensland Health website www.health.qld.gov.au; elective surgery waiting times (quarterly), emergency department performance (daily) and staffing (monthly).

    Action: We are continuing the regular release of information as promised with the monthly Extra Staff Progress Report and the new and expanded Hospital Performance report all updated for October 2006.

14. Promise: Finalise negotiations with Griffith University for the establishment of a third Queensland Academy at the Smith Street campus on the Gold Coast focused on Health Sciences.

    Action: The steering committee for the Gold Coast based Queensland Academy has met to continue negotiations in relation to the establishment of the Academy. A project manager has been appointed to the initiative.

Water

15. Promise: Deliver the initial report on the South East Queensland Water Regulation helping co-ordinate the drought response across Councils.

    Action: September reports received from all service providers 6 October 2006. Summary report completed and published.

16. Promise: Extend the Home WaterWise Rebate Scheme State-wide.

    Action: The Call Centre and the Home WaterWise Rebate Scheme project team are ready to deal with new applications.

17. Promise: Set water savings targets for all new residential subdivision developments under the Local Government Act 1993.

    Action: By 18 December 2006, the Queensland Development Code under the Building Act 1975 will be amended to introduce mandatory requirements for new housing to achieve initial water saving targets. The Government is likely to introduce stricter targets for some new residential developments in South East Queensland by early 2007.

18. Promise: Commence construction on the Southern Regional Pipeline.

    Action: On 18 October 2006 the Deputy Premier and I witnessed the installation of the first pipes being laid for this vital project.

19. Promise: Commence site works for Gold Coast desalination plant.

    Action: Site works are continuing with a formal contract to be signed in November 2006.

20. Promise: Commence site works for Western Corridor Recycling Scheme.

    Action: Site establishment commenced in early September 2006. Pipe laying for the Bundamba to Swanbank section commenced on 17 October 2006. The contract for Stage 1A advanced water treatment plant at Bundamba has been signed and work is underway.

21. Promise: Commence action to obtain easements to set in place the South East Queensland water grid.

    Action: Acquisition notices for the pipeline easements for the Western Corridor Recycling Scheme and the Southern Regional Pipeline Project continue to be issued.

    Our preference is to purchase the land by agreement but will use compulsory acquisition processes to ensure any delays are kept to a minimum.

22. Promise: Declare Traveston Crossing dam, Wyaralong dam and Bromelton off-stream storage as projects of State significance and commence consultation on terms of reference for an environmental impact statement.

    Action: The Coordinator-General declared these projects to be Significant on 20 October 2006 and we plan to release the draft terms of reference for each environmental impact study before the end of the 100 days.

23a. Promise: Invite tenders for construction of Cedar Grove Weir.

    Action: We will release Expressions of Interest tenders for the construction of the weir before the end of the 100 days.

23b. Promise: Negotiate arrangements for raising of Hinze Dam.

    Action: The Coordinator-General declared the project to be Significant on 20 October 2006. The Gold Coast City Council selected the alliance partners for planning and construction on 2 October 2006.

24. Promise: Complete drilling of the initial production bores of the Nambour/ Landsborough Basin.

    Action: Three bores have proved unproductive. Drilling is continuing at two bores in which small quantities of water have been encountered.

25. Promise: Finalise report and act on recommendations from the Toowoomba Water Futures Taskforce.

    Action: A third meeting was held on 9 November 2006. The next meeting is anticipated to be in late November 2006 and the Taskforce is confident it will be able to finalise its recommendations prior to submitting them to the Premier with a target date of 15 December 2006.

26. Promise: Progress geotechnical and environmental studies on the Eden Bann and Rookwood Weirs.

    Action: Drilling has commenced.

27. Promise: Complete First Stage of the Burdekin to Moranbah pipeline.

    Action: Pipe laying for the first stage of the pipeline, from the Burdekin Falls Dam to Eungella, is due for completion by 15 December 2006. However, full consultation will not occur until early 2007 when power supply is connected.

    In addition, the eastern pipeline from Moranbah to Coppabella has been completed and work has started on the southern pipeline from Moranbah to the Dysart area.

28 Promise: Conduct preliminary feasibility study of Connors River Dam.

    Action: We have commissioned SunWater to undertake a "fatal flaws" analysis as the preliminary feasibility study. This will be completed in December 2006.

29. Promise: Identify or progress identification of corridors for pipelines between Connors River Dam and surrounding shires, Burdekin to Bowen and Proserpine.

    Action: A broad corridor for a pipeline or channel from Burdekin to Bowen has been identified. In addition, we will start identifying a pipeline route from Bowen to Proserpine. We will also declare Water for Bowen as a significant project under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. Declaration is expected by end of November 2006.

30. Promise: Commence acquisition of corridor to connect Rockhampton and Gladstone supplies.

    Action: We have completed investigations to determine the optimum alignment of the Stanwell (Rockhampton) to Gladstone Infrastructure Corridor.

    Following community and landowner consultation between mid-November and mid-December 2006 we intend to recommend to The Governor in Council declaration of the corridor as a State Development area. Following declaration, acquisition of the corridor will commence.

31. Promise: Extend the Business Water Efficiency Program State-wide.

    Action: The Business Water Efficiency Program is an incentive scheme funded by the State Government to help businesses save water by adopting sustainable water use practices.

    We are extending the program. Outside South East Queensland the program will be delivered through organisations such as existing water service providers. Priority target industries and regions for the roll-out of the program are being identified to ensure maximum water savings are achieved, with businesses able to access the program from early 2007.

32. Promise: Finalise and release the Central Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy.

    Action: The strategy is being finalised and will be released in the near future.

Infrastructure and economic development

33. Promise: Outline a blueprint that will see the emergence of Mount Isa, Townsville and Bowen as a triangle of industrial development and mineral processing over the course of the next half century.

    Action: A Scoping paper outlining the intent of this initiative and the key elements of the Blueprint will be submitted to the Government seeking approval to proceed to public consultation with a view to finalisation and development of the strategy in early 2007.

34. Promise: Announce preferred developer status for the development of the Aurukun Bauxite Deposit.

    Action: We have awarded preferred developer status to Chalco and are now finalising agreements with Chalco and the Aurukun community on the feasibility study.

35. Promise: Establish the Clean Coal Technology Board and initiate action to test new technologies in the generation of clean power from fossil fuels.

    Action: The board met on 24 November 2006 and considered Queensland new technologies in the generation of clean power from fossil fuels this includes Stanwell Corporation's ZeroGen project, a leading-edge demonstration project to efficiently generate power from coal and to capture and sequester the carbon dioxide produced.

36. Promise: Amend the State Development and Public Works Act 1971 and related legislation to provide the Coordinator-General with powers to take over approval processes where agencies have not made decisions in 20 working days.

    Action: Legislation was introduced to Parliament on 2 November 2006. Bill to be subject to review by scrutiny committee.

37. Promise: Select six regions as Centres of Enterprise in key areas of industry strength to seize upon opportunities for economic growth.

    Action: The Minister for State Development, Employment and Industrial Relations announced the initiative in North Queensland on 7 and 8 November 2006. The six regions have been nominated as Cairns and Far North Queensland; Townsville and North West Queensland, Mackay and Whitsunday, Fitzroy and Central West, Wide Bay Burnett and Darling Downs and the South West. The first region to be addressed will be Darling Downs and the South West, commencing with a regional leaders' function in Toowoomba on 4 December 2006.

38. Promise: Identify private sector partners and prioritise areas for the implementation of the mineral exploration program and the collaborative drilling program.

    Action: An approach is being developed for implementation of the mineral exploration initiative and the collaborative drilling initiative, and a list of potential private sector partners has been developed. Guidelines relating to the implementation of these initiatives will be available by 18 December 2006. Formal contracts for this collaborative work are to be prepared by 31 March 2007 and submission of proposals for grants under this program will be sought during the first half of 2007.

    These initiatives have been placed in a four-year plan, budgets have been assigned and arrangements are being made to acquire geophysical data in conjunction with Geoscience Australia and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. Timing of data acquisition will depend upon the availability of contractors and weather conditions.

    The areas for acquisition of new geoscientific data have already been prioritised based on areas nominated in the Smart Mining—Future Prosperity policy which includes areas with no modern geophysical survey coverage. Many of these areas have been nominated as high priority for acquisition of geophysical data by the Queensland Resources Council.

39. Promise: Initiate works on major road projects including release of the environmental impact statement on Airport Link, awarding of construction contract for Ipswich-Logan Motorway interchange and final investment decision on Northern Busway.

    Action: The Airport Link environmental impact statement and the Northern Busway were released on 11 October 2006.

    I announced on 8 October 2006 that business cases for both the Airport Link and the Northern Busway show that both projects are viable, The State Government is funding construction of the busway and the Airport Link will be delivered as a public private partnership. A presentation to industry was held on 20 November 2006.

    I announced on 3 November 2006 awarding of the construction contract for the federally-funded Ipswich-Logan Motorway interchange upgrade project to Leighton Contractors Pty Limited.

40. Promise: Accelerate major rail projects by awarding tender for the Mitchelton to Keperra second track, awarding tender for Nerang to Robina second track, complete track works on Ormeau to Coomera duplication and commencing construction of Salisbury to Kuraby third track.

    Action: A contract for the duplication of the track between Mitchelton and Keperra and for station upgrades has already been awarded. Early track works have commenced.

    Tenders for construction of a second track and new bridgeworks between Nerang and Robina closed on 3 November 2006. Assessment is being fast tracked and I am advised that the contract is expected to be awarded this calendar year.

    The second track between Ormeau and Coomera has been completed and is operational.

    Construction of the third track between Salisbury and Kuraby is already under way and progressing well.

41. Promise: Appoint successful tenderer to duplicate the Gateway Bridge and upgrade 20km of the motorway.

    Action: A Leighton Abigroup joint venture for the $1.88 billion project was appointed in September 2006. Preliminary investigative works on the upgrade have commenced with construction work to start in early 2007.

42. Promise: Take investment decision on Springfield Road Rail corridor.

    Action: This will be made within the 100 days. A draft Business Case was issued to Government on 14 November 2006.

43. Promise: Facilitate the development of a new, alternative crossing for the Toowoomba range and CBD bypass which is currently being developed as a public private partnership.

    Action: Tenders for construction of the test tunnel were called on 15 November 2006. A proposal for commercial advice and financial modelling is being prepared.

44. Promise: Commence site plans for five bridges and resurface 71km of the Dawson Highway between Calliope and Banana.

    Action: Intersection and access works on the Biloela to Banana section are complete. Final strengthening and resurfacing works commenced on 6 November 2006. Access works and a passing lane on Calliope to Biloela stretch well underway. Design for all bridges were completed in early October 2006, with piling complete on the first two bridges west of Banana. Detour on Deep Creek complete and old bridge demolished. Piling work on Double and Deep Creeks is underway.

45. Promise: Establish a whole of Government review process to identify risks in each portfolio area leading to the development of a State-wide Infrastructure and Services Plan to identify future need and impact on resources.

    Action: We will establish a rigorous process based on international best practice that will include external checks and regular review of the risks faced in each portfolio.

46. Promise: Develop an integrated strategy to assist development of the industrial and enterprise precincts in the western corridor of South East Queensland.

    Action: This strategy was completed on 27 October 2006. I anticipate being able to make major announcements as a result of the strategy within the 100 days.

47. Promise: Complete preliminary planning for final alignment of corridor and station locations on the Sunshine Coast CAMCOS Rail corridor.

    Action: Queensland Transport have undertaken preliminary engineering planning work on the realignment of the southern section of the CAMCOS corridor between the Bruce Highway and Caloundra. This work has been provided to Caloundra City Council and has been included in Council's draft Local Growth Management Strategy. The draft Strategy depicts an alternative corridor in this location with a caveat 'subject to State Government investigation'. The Strategy was released for public consultation on 26 October 2006 closing 8 December 2006.

    Since the promise was made, Horton Park Golf Club at Maroochydore has decided to sell the golf course. This may allow a better route, necessitating a fresh study of the location of Maroochydore Station. On 22 November 2006, Maroochy Shire Council considered a recommendation to endorse an option for the Maroochydore Town Centre Master Plan which would involve a realignment of CAMCOS through the golf club land and a station location closer to Horton Parade. This outcome is likely to better serve the town centre in its role as the Principle Activity Centre for the Sunshine Coast as designated under the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2005-2026.

    Following a request from Maroochy Shire Council, Queensland Transport has provided preliminary engineering advice on the technical feasibility of such a route. A consultant brief has been prepared and consultants will be invited to undertake the first stage of an Environmental Impact Assessment on this alternate corridor alignment. Queensland Transport is aiming to have a stage 1 report by the end of December 2006 with a final Environment Impact Assessment report by September 2007. Queensland Transport will continue to protect the existing alignment until this time.

48. Promise: Complete and open the new Gallery of Modern Art as part of the Millennium Arts project.

    Action: The new Gallery of Modern Art will open to the public in December 2006.

49. Promise: Complete and open the refurbished State Library as part of the Millennium Arts project.

    Action: It was my great pleasure to officially open the redeveloped State Library of Queensland on 25 November 2006.

50. Promise: Launch the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Facility at the Institute of Molecular Bioscience.

    Action: I was delighted to launch the $17 million Queensland Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Network on 25 September 2006 at The University of Queensland.

51. Promise: Open the new Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation at Queensland University of Technology.

    Action: I was proud to launch the new $70 million Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation based in a state of the art facility at the Queensland University of Technology's campus in the Kelvin Grove Urban Village on 24 October 2006.

52. Promise: Open the Australian Institute of Bioengineering and Nanotechnology at the University of Queensland.

    Action: It was my pleasure to launch the $70 million Australian Institute of Bioengineering and Nanotechnology at the University of Queensland on 23 October 2006.

Jobs, industry and skills

53. Promise: Commit to an extra 1,000 apprentices and trainees in the first 100 days as part of our agenda to increase apprentice training places by 17,000 each year by 2010.

    Action: User Choice contract allocations have been made to training providers ensuring that funding is available for an additional 1,000 apprentices and trainee training places.

54. Promise: Open Acacia Ridge campus of the Trade and Technical Skills Institute.

    Action: The campus, involving a first stage of ten new classrooms, toilets and 8,300 square metres of flexible learning space and stores, will be ready for opening in the 100 days.

55. Promise: Introduce legislation to support $1.1 billion Queensland Skills Plan.

    Action: We will introduce the legislation this year.

56. Promise: Establish ten new sites for Skilling Solutions Queensland.

    Action: Leases have been established at all ten locations across Queensland.

    The first Skilling Solutions Queensland centre is scheduled for opening in Hervey Bay by early December 2006, with the remaining centres being rolled out from early 2007

57. Promise: Establish three new Training Centres of Excellence.

    Action: The three new training centres of excellence are designed to provide industry leadership and influence and be the focal point for industry and government to deal with vocational education and training, skills development and similar labour market issues.

    They will also provide government with industry advice on skills shortages and develop strategies to enable the continued growth of the industries.

58. Promise: Work with industry to identify locations for five new industry trade training centres.

    Action: Potential school industry partnerships have been mapped for the five regions in which the centres will be located. Consultation with industry and schools will inform specific school industry partnership sites.

59. Promise: Work with industry, the Queensland Catholic Education Commission and Independent Schools Queensland to double the number of school based apprenticeships and traineeships from the beginning on the 2007 school year.

    Action: Strategies will include improving employers', parents' and students' perceptions and understanding of school-based apprenticeships and traineeships and establishing productive relationships across these stakeholders to increase the uptake of school-based apprenticeships and traineeships.

60. Promise: Finalise the Queensland College of Wine Tourism at Stanthorpe.

    Action: Construction of the College has been completed. Fit out is being finalised and will be completed within the 100 days. Training has already commenced and industry has accessed the College for a number of specific events.

61. Promise: Undertake work with the Aviation Industry on the creation of a specialist Aviation High School at Hendra.

    Action: Students, parents and staff of Hendra State College have recently been consulted on transitioning the College to 'Aviation High' from the start of 2007. The Government will continue to work with industry partners in overseeing the establishment of the school.

62. Promise: If WorkChoices is validated, the Government will amend State legislation to ensure the employees of statutory authorities caught by WorkChoices are transferred to a non-corporate entity so the employer becomes the Crown.

    Action: Following the High Court's decision to uphold the validity of Work Choices, the Government is proceeding to finalise amending legislation that will re-establish state industrial coverage of employees of statutory authorities.

63. Promise: Under the Tomorrow's Schools program provide $50 million in capital works grants to State school communities and issue guidelines to access $850 million in capital works to modernise existing infrastructure and provide new facilities required for the future in State schools.

    Action: Submissions closed on 3 November 2006 with a 100% return rate.

64. Promise: Establish the Queensland Academy of Science, Maths and Technology at Toowong.

    Action: Student enrolment, staff recruitment and redevelopment of the Toowong site is on track for the start of school 2007.

65. Promise: Establish the Queensland Academy of Creative Industries at Kelvin Grove.

    Action: Student and staff recruitment for the start of school 2007 is on track. For 2007, the Academy will operate from temporary accommodation on our partner university's site at QUT Kelvin Grove. Renovation of K block is on schedule, ready for occupation by staff within the 100 days.

66. Promise: Appoint 14 literacy co-ordinators across the State, roll out competency training for early years teachers (Prep to Year 3) and finalise negotiations with the Queensland Catholic Education Commission and the Independent Schools of Queensland on the roll-out of additional literacy support for children in years 5 to 7.

    Action: There have been 15 Regional Literacy Managers appointed to cover the whole State. The Managers have been training since October 2006, and will continue until January 2007. When the training is completed, they will return to their Regions to begin the rollout of training.

    The training begins in February 2007, and will begin with the early years teacher aides. In Semester Two, training for teachers from Years P to 3 will begin.

Community, social, and law and order

67. Promise: Identify priority areas and develop construction timetable to roll-out the cyclone proofing of public buildings initiative on coastal Queensland and roll-out education and awareness program on cyclone preparedness.

    Action: The State Disaster Management Group has already met to discuss a submission on the initiative.

    The Department of Public Works has initially identified the priority areas and is working with Cairns City Council on a test project to document the council's community public shelter requirements.

Funding for this work has been provided by the Government. Once this project has been finalised, it will be used as the basis for a planning guideline to be produced for use by all other local governments in the cyclonic zone.

It is proposed that the majority of the shelters will be developed through 'strengthening' suitable new public buildings on existing or future capital works programs such as school gymnasiums and community halls.

Within the 100 days we will have developed a construction timetable which will identify projects from the present and future capital works programs for targeted communities in the priority areas so that suitable buildings including school and TAFE gymnasiums, multi-purpose halls, workshops and community entertainment centres, can be constructed to the standards necessary in a cyclone shelter.

We will have education and awareness advice ready to distribute before the end of the 100 days.

68. Promise: Introduce legislation to apply the Australian Sports Drug Agency drug code to Queensland athletes.

Action: We will introduce legislation that will be complementary to the Commonwealth Government's Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Act 2006 and the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority which has replaced the Australian Sports Drug Agency before the end of 2006.

69. Promise: Enact legislation to clarify that any parliamentary allowances apply only for the term of incumbency and ensure that any funds advanced to members are repaid on a pro-rata basis.

New Action: As I advised on 11 October 2006 I have written to the former Members who received the allowance and requested that they contact the Clerk of the Parliament to make arrangements to repay the relevant amounts.

I understand that former Members are liaising with the Clerk and he will be advising me of progress in these repayments.

70. Promise: Introduce legislation to outlaw ticket scalping at major sporting and entertainment events in Queensland.

Action: This legislation is now before the house.

71. Promise: Induct 220 new police before the end of 2006.

Action: By 25 October 2006, 225 new police officers had been sworn in since the State Election.

72. Promise: Ensure ongoing increases in police numbers to keep pace with Queensland's rapid population growth.

Action: With the recent increase in new police sworn in, this is promise is being met.

73. Promise: Establish a new police squad to crack down on violent bikie gangs.

Action: Within the 100 days we will establish an Outlaw Motor Cycle Gang Squad under the Organised Crime Group.

74. Promise: Legislate to give police the power to confiscate the vehicles of repeat drunk drivers, unlicensed drivers and those who drive unregistered and illegally modified cars.

Action: The Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006 was introduced into Parliament on 2 November 2006 and is currently awaiting debate.

75. Promise: Commence scoping and design work for the rollout of new and upgraded police stations.

Action: This has already been achieved with work underway to plan the upgrade works and the search for suitable sites on which to build the new stations.

76. Promise: Open the new Gympie Police Station and Rainbow Beach Police Beat.

Action: The Gympie Police Station became operational in mid-October 2006. Rainbow Beach Police Beat became operational on 30 October 2006.

77. Promise: Introduce laws to ensure children can't legally obtain spray-paint cans.

Action: The Summary Offences and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2006 was introduced into Parliament on 2 November 2006 and is currently awaiting debate.

78. Promise: Enact legislation to outlaw drink spiking.

Action: The legislation was assented to on 10 November 2006.

79. Promise: Enact legislation to authorise courts to apply electronic monitoring devices to persons previously convicted for paedophilia offences.

Action: The legislation was enacted on 10 November 2006 and the commitment has been completed within the 100 days.

Queensland Public Service

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.19 am): At a time when we are experiencing unprecedented population growth, together with a world skills shortage, we need to ensure that we are geared to continue to provide top-class public services to the people of Queensland. Over the next 10 years the government faces many challenges. Not only are we in a rapidly tightening labour market; our workforce is ageing. About 40,000 people will leave the Public Service through retirement. This is a major problem that we are confronted with, but we are up to the challenge. My government is doing great work to attract and keep quality people to continue to deliver services to the people of Queensland.

The government is developing a 10-year strategy to make the Queensland government an employer of choice, looking at a variety of options. We are already on the job. My government is championing more flexible and modern recruitment practices; a government-wide graduate program; work-life balance to encourage people to re-enter and stay in the service; and strategies for attracting those 'in demand' professions, such as engineers and health professionals. I should say—and the minister for transport, Paul Lucas, knows this—that even in areas such as engineering people are pinching our best people every day, so we need to retain them.

We understand that with the unemployment rate at its lowest in over 20 years it has become a sellers market. It is important that we as a government position ourselves to be competitive in obtaining and keeping the people who will be able to deliver the best services. My government recognises the shift in the way people look for jobs, especially young people. Where previously job seekers would pore through Saturday's paper, research shows that over the past two years the use of the internet as the preferred channel for job searching has increased from 28 per cent to nearly 40 per cent.

The use of the Queensland government's own jobs web site 'Smart jobs and careers' increases monthly, with tens of thousands of subscribers. A new whole-of-government graduate program attracted nearly 1,000 applicants, two-thirds through the internet and a quarter through newspapers. Through our own 'Smart jobs and careers' web site alone, 2,800 people viewed our program.

We also understand that people now demand more flexibility in their work life. We will look at redesigning jobs, opening up new career pathways, working with tertiary institutions as feeders for government, increasing training and development opportunities and improving how we manage our staff. Some of the effort I have already mentioned may be challenging and may challenge traditional views, but my goal is for Queensland to be a leader in innovation and smart thinking, the Smart State. The Queensland government offers a fantastic variety of challenging and rewarding jobs and we will be out there ensuring that we are a first choice employer.

I table for the House our graduate program for 2006 and the trend that is occurring in terms of where we are recruiting from.

Tabled paper: Statistical information relating to advertising of the Queensland Government Graduate Program 2007

I do that simply to highlight the challenge that lies ahead. I have asked for copies to be provided to all members of the House. The Public Service is my responsibility as Premier, and I will be ensuring that everything is done to get the best for this state.

Trade Mission

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.22 am): Between 6 and 19 November 2006 I led a trade mission to the Middle East, Monaco, the United Kingdom, Italy and Germany. A total of 22 Queensland companies participated in the trade mission. The focus of the trade mission was to forge business links with Middle Eastern and European countries, further trade opportunities for Queensland companies and promote the Smart State as a key investment and recruitment destination. In the Middle East I was able to announce that Queensland had become the first Australian state to establish trade representation in Abu Dhabi and Riyadh. This is the first report on my trip. I seek leave to have further details incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

In meetings with key industry representatives from the Saudi Chamber of Commerce and the Abu Dhabi Chamber of Commerce there were wide ranging discussions on opportunities for Queensland companies in infrastructure, construction and services.

The capabilities of Queensland firms in these areas are unquestionable and Queensland's formal presence in both the United Arab Emirates and in Saudi Arabia will ensure our companies are able to make the most of the enormous opportunities arising in the Middle East.

In London, I signed a major trade and investment agreement with the Yorkshire Forward Regional Development Agency.

The agreement targets business opportunities for Queensland companies from the estimated $24 billion to be spent in the sports and sports events sector for the 2012 London Olympic Games.

Already I am exploring options for building on the Yorkshire agreement, and the Department of State Development and Trade has secured the services of mjaMatchpoint Pty Ltd, a Sunshine Coast-based event consultancy to prepare a report on London 2012 and the related opportunities.

While in London I was also able to present works by two of Queensland's acclaimed Indigenous artists—Fiona Foley and Denis Nona—to the prestigious British Museum.

I can also report that interest in working in Queensland remains at a high level in the UK. We are continuing to promote Queensland as the destination of choice for highly qualified professionals, particularly in the engineering and health industries.

As the House is aware, Brisbane has announced its intention to bid to host the 2011 World Athletic Championships. I travelled to Monaco, as part of the Trade Mission to meet with the International Association of Athletics Federation which has its headquarters there.

I was able to advise the President of the International Association of Athletics Federations, Mr Lamine Diack, and the Federations Council members, Prince Albert II of Monaco and Lord Sebastian Coe of Queensland's intention.

In Italy, I signed a formal bilateral agreement with the Lombardy Regional Government and discussed developments to date under the Agreement with the Piedmont Region signed in July this year.

In Milan, the Queensland-Lombardy Region Protocol of Cooperation was signed to facilitate closer business and scientific ties between Queensland and Lombardy.

Mr Roberto Formigoni, President of the Lombardy Region, and I agreed to focus particularly on increasing collaboration in the biotechnology sector. This is an area of particular strength in the Lombardy region and presents opportunities for Queensland researchers hoping to commercialise their research.

The President of Piedmont, Ms Mercedes Bresso and I met and reviewed progress under the Statement of Intent between Queensland and Piedmont.

Mr Rodolfo Zich, Chairman of the Torino Wireless Foundation, a major partner under this Agreement has accepted my invitation to lead a delegation to Queensland in 2007 to explore the potential for collaboration on joint projects and on wireless technologies, including Global Navigation Satellite Systems and the Galileo project.

The Galileo project is a joint initiative of the European Commission and the European Space Agency and is valued at approximately $€3.6 billion.

In Berlin and Frankfurt I met key Australian Government officials and parliamentarians to discuss trade and skilled migration opportunities and the proposed reforms to German Federalism, particularly in the areas of fiscal reform, education and the labour market and how they might apply in Australia.

I will have more to say on the issue of the German model of Federalism—and in particular the role of their State's house in coming days.

In addition in Berlin, I discussed with Mr Rudolf Anzinger, State Secretary of the Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs the value of a joint Statement of Intent between Germany and Queensland to investigate possible collaboration regarding attracting and exporting skilled labour.

One key topic of discussion with government representatives across Europe—most especially in my meetings in the UK, Germany and Italy—was that of Queensland's leading role in the development of clean coal technology. The Queensland Government sponsored project to develop clean coal technology is ahead of the international pack on this issue and I know members of this house will welcome yesterday's announcement that the State funding ($300M) will go ahead following the agreement on the sale of Sun Retail electricity retailing business with Origin Energy.

Mr Speaker, my trade mission for Queensland was an outstanding success. As Minister for Trade I will continue to promote Queensland as the Smart State to maximise opportunities for Queensland businesses to achieve their global export potential, and drive export growth for Queensland. I will provide a detailed report on the mission, as is usual, within the next 20 days.

Mr BEATTIE: I will provide information on additional matters to the House, but that is my first report.

Video Broadcast of Parliamentary Proceedings

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (10.22 am): One of my priorities since becoming Premier has been to engage with the Queensland community and endeavour to bring government closer to the people. I am therefore delighted that planning for the video broadcast of parliamentary proceedings is well underway. I look forward to hearing more about the progress of the broadcasting of parliament in the new year. Mr Speaker, I wish you well with it. I seek leave to have further details incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

While there are still some matters to be finalised before broadcasts begin I congratulate you on the initiative and thank the Parliamentary Service staff for their efforts to date to implement this important initiative.

Once in place all Queenslanders with access to the internet will be able to view proceedings of Parliament and develop a better understanding of our democratic processes.

Queensland is the most decentralised State in Australia, so it is important that we continue to find ways to assist Queenslanders, wherever they live, to become more involved in our democratic processes.

The video broadcasting initiative will build on the audio broadcast of proceedings that started in 2003. It also builds on the Regional Parliament initiative which has seen two very successful Regional Parliaments held in Townsville in 2002 and more recently in Rockhampton in October last year.

I look forward to hearing more about progress on the broadcasting of Parliament in the New Year.

South-East Queensland Water Projects

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure) (10.23 am): Delivering south-east Queensland's future water supplies in the face of the worst drought on record is a priority for our government. I am pleased to report that since parliament last sat work on the government's commitment to build a comprehensive water grid with pipelines linking existing and new water storages is occurring on a number of fronts. Let me start by outlining activity in the area of pipelines.

Last Friday I signed letters of intent sent to three pipe manufacturers for the pipes for three critical projects—the western corridor recycled water project, the southern regional water pipeline and the Gold Coast desalination plant network. The three pipe suppliers are Tyco, Orrcon and Iplex, and the new orders for 240 kilometres of pipe represent an outlay in the order of $200 million. The bulk of the order will be undertaken in Queensland. However, we have cast the net nationally and internationally to ensure that this very important project stays on track.

Last Wednesday I officially launched the western corridor recycled water project—a key part of the government's south-east Queensland water grid. Stage 1A of the advanced water treatment plant at Bundamba is under construction.

Mr Johnson: You need rain, Anna. You just need rain.

Ms BLIGH: Pray for us, won't you, Vaughan. The recycled project will be the largest of its kind in the Southern Hemisphere and it will actually be the third largest water recycling project in the world. This project has global significance. Pipe laying is underway on the southern regional water pipeline and members may be interested to know that the water grid in total will require almost 550 kilometres of pipes for the south-east Queensland projects.

In relation to the desalination plant, the state government and the Gold Coast City Council in the last three weeks have both approved the funding of the desalination plant at Tugun. Early site works are continuing on the Tugun site.

In relation to new dams and storages, since parliament last met I have attended public meetings at Gympie and Boonah to outline the final boundaries of the proposed Traveston Crossing and Wyaralong dams. On 14 and 16 November 2006 respectively, the government referred the Traveston Crossing and Wyaralong Dam projects to the federal Department of the Environment and Heritage, to seek a controlled action determination under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. We are awaiting a reply from the Commonwealth.

Last Saturday the government placed advertisements alerting the market to a call for expressions of interest next month to deliver early works in the Logan River catchment, including the Cedar Grove Weir and Bromelton off-stream storage and possibly the access road for Wyaralong Dam.

In relation to other matters, on 4 November I attended the Prime Minister's water summit in Canberra with the premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. Queensland has agreed to be part of a national program to examine the sustainable yield of water available in the Murray-Darling Basin. We also secured a commitment from the Prime Minister to fast-track Commonwealth assessment of major water projects submitted by states and territories under the Commonwealth's national water fund.

Queensland has also agreed to meet its share of the 10 per cent interest costs component of the Prime Minister's $210 million assistance package to extend income support to eligible small businesses in emerging exceptional circumstance areas. In addition, I met with the Prime Minister's parliamentary secretary for water, Malcolm Turnbull, here at Parliament House on 9 November and provided a comprehensive briefing on our western corridor recycled water project.

I can assure the House that this government is getting on with the job of delivering these crucial projects to ensure the long-term sustainable water supply to south-east Queensland residents and industry.

Seniors Task Force Report

Hon. JC SPENCE (Mount Gravatt—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services) (10.27 am): Today I am tabling the seniors task force report, which is a comprehensive document about crime prevention and the fear of crime as it affects seniors living in Queensland.

Tabled paper: Report, dated March 2006, by the Seniors Task Force to the Minister for Police and Corrective Services, the Honourable Judy Spence MP, on the investigation, prevention and fear of crime as it affects senior members of the Queensland community.

The Premier and I announced the seniors task force in February 2004. In its two years of operation, the task force has been responsible for much research and many new initiatives to enhance the feeling of safety among those aged 60 and over in our community.

In its report, the task force has made some 17 recommendations on ways to ensure its good work is continued. Already some of these are being progressed. The Queensland Police Service will appoint a state coordinator for seniors issues to coordinate senior safety issues. Twice-yearly seminars on crime against seniors, as recommended by the task force, have already begun and are coordinated by the police Crime Prevention Unit. Other suggestions include updating and reprinting the *Confident, Safe and Secure* handbook each year and promoting the task force's anti-theft campaign 'Where's your handbag?' to supermarkets statewide. These are among key recommendations from the task force and are supported by this government.

This report contains a wealth of information and will be a valuable tool for academic and seniors organisations, as well as for government. The report contains a fear of crime literature review and the findings from the safe and secure survey. This survey, which is the most comprehensive survey of fear of crime within the state since 1991, uncovered no evidence that the majority of seniors are particularly fearful of crime or have particular safety concerns or are unduly concerned about their risk of future victimisation. What it found was that seniors are in fact the least likely age group to become victims of crime statistically and that they generally contribute to their own safety through their lifestyle.

Seniors are less likely to put themselves in high-risk situations and as such are less likely to interact with offenders. However, the survey found crimes against seniors have far more traumatic consequences than other age groups. Elderly people take a longer time to recover from physical injuries and are much more anxious about crime once they have become a victim.

The Seniors Task Force, made up of a group of 17 representatives from government agencies and community organisations, has been an important initiative that has led to some valuable programs for seniors. Seniors will continue to make up an increasingly large percentage of Queensland's population. The work of the task force has ensured that we have current and accurate data on which to base our future policies for seniors.

Child Health Passport

Hon. D BOYLE (Cairns—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety) (10.31 am): In Queensland we are receiving around 35,000 notifications of suspected child abuse each year. As if this is not bad enough, I have some further bad news, although I suppose in one sense it is not surprising. Early information is that the children who come into our care have a multitude of health problems.

One of the new initiatives of the Department of Child Safety and Queensland Health is the establishment of the child health passport. In fact, Queensland is the first state to institute this system which I have no doubt other states will follow.

Each child entering care will undergo a full health check-up. A health plan will then be developed to meet the child's needs. For as long as the child remains in care the health plan will be reviewed at least yearly and more often if required. The health plan, medical records and information on how to meet the day-to-day health needs of the particular child will be contained in his or her child health passport. A copy of the passport will be given to any new carer or to the parent if the child returns home.

The child health passport has been trialled with 70 children aged from three months to 17 years of age. I acknowledge the excellent work of Royal Brisbane Hospital paediatrician Dr Maree Crawford. Of the 70 children, 66 had multiple health problems and only four were found to have no health problems. Nearly half of the children have behavioural and emotional health problems including attachment issues, separation issues, reactions to visits and aggression. Some have depression and suicidal thoughts More than a third have speech and language delays. Other medical problems include asthma, foetal alcohol syndrome, cerebral palsy and autism. Of the 70 children, 29 per cent were not up to date with their immunisations and a quarter had dental decay.

These findings demonstrate the range and complexity of health problems faced by children coming into the child protection system. They also demonstrate the difficult and hard work done by child safety officers and foster-carers to compensate for the dreadful failure of so many parents. The child health passport will be progressively implemented for all children in our care commencing in early 2007.

Mr LINGARD: I rise to a point of order. Because this is the first morning of the operation of the sessional order in relation to condolence motions I believe it would be beneficial to the House if the clock was adjusted so that members knew exactly how much time was left for this first hour.

Mr SPEAKER: I indicate that question time will commence at 11 am. I will just confer with the Clerk. Affirming what I have indicated to the member for Beaudesert, the condolence motion finished at 10 am and I have taken it an hour from that, so question time will commence at 11 am.

Mr LINGARD: We are satisfied with that, but surely you would not have to make that announcement if it was put up on the clock that there was 27 minutes to go.

Mr SPEAKER: I take the member's point. Perhaps in future when there is a condolence motion we may indeed make an announcement to that effect, but I do not think we will adjust the clock.

Patel, Dr J

Hon. KG SHINE (Toowoomba North—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland) (10.33 am): As honourable members would know, an application for arrest warrants for Jayant Patel was approved last week. This is an important part of the process seeking to extradite Dr Patel from the United States. The next step is for the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions to forward an extradition request and affidavit to the Commonwealth Attorney-General's department. The extradition process is a complex one, which will ultimately involve US authorities and courts.

Separately, the government established a special process to provide compensation fairly and quickly for former patients of Patel. I can advise the House that a total of 156 claims lodged under the special process have been settled to date. A further 20 mediations are scheduled for this week. A total of 382 claims were lodged under the special process. Of those claims, 47 claims have been closed. Therefore, more than half—52 per cent—of the eligible claims under the special process have been settled or are currently subject to mediation.

As Attorney-General I share the determination of my predecessor that the special process provides fair and reasonable compensation to those people adversely affected by the direct actions of Jayant Patel.

Mr SPEAKER: I welcome to the public gallery today teachers and students from the Northside Christian College, which is in the electorate of the member for Everton.

Currumbin Valley, Hideaway Development; Blue Care Development

Hon. AP FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport) (10.35 am): Today I table for the House my decision and reports on the assessment of two development applications called in under the Integrated Planning Act.

Tabled paper: Report prepared pursuant to section 3.6.9 of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 relating to the decision of the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport, relating to a called-in development application by Co-You Australia Pty Ltd—Currumbin Creek Road, Hoffschildt Drive and Piggabeen Road, Currumbin (Volumes 1—3).

Tabled paper: Report prepared pursuant to section 3.6.9 of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 relating to the decision of the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport, relating to a called-in development application by the Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust (Q) trading as Blue Care.

On 19 September I called in the application by Co-You Australia Pty Ltd for a development known as Hideaway @ Currumbin. It is immediately easy to understand why the community has expressed opposition to the development. It is a very significant development in an area today designated beyond the footprint of the South East Queensland Regional Plan. It is perhaps not as easy to understand why I must approve the development. It was not lawfully open to me to decide otherwise.

In essence, the application I was able to call in relates to how development of the sort proposed would proceed on the site, not whether it would proceed. Whether or not the land could be cleared had been determined finally by the courts in November 2004. Whether or not development of this sort should occur on this site was determined finally in February 2005. Whether or not the development should be subject to full impact assessment was determined finally by the Planning and Environment Court in May 2006. Whether or not the development was subject to the South East Queensland Regional Plan was also determined by that same decision.

The proponent in this instance has threaded a needle of narrow opportunity in taking the benefit of enduring rights under the superseded Albert Shire Planning Scheme—this much has already been confirmed by the courts. That is the proponent's legal right and, regardless of any misgivings, my power under the Integrated Planning Act, while wide, does not excuse me from obeying the law.

In the context of the full circumstances of this matter, I have included significant conditions to the approval which place a higher burden on the development in terms of ameliorating or attenuating the impact on the local environment.

This development represents the echo of a different planning era—a time before the South East Queensland Regional Plan took effect. The decision I have had to make today confirms the virtue in legislating for a regional plan to ensure better planning outcomes into the future.

I have also decided the application by Blue Care to construct an integrated aged-care facility with community health services at Stafford Heights on Brisbane's north side. This application was called in by the former minister after it was rejected by the Brisbane City Council. This application presented its own challenges, requiring a careful balance between environmental and social outcomes. Part of the site is environmentally valuable and there is a clear and pressing need for extra aged-care facilities in the community.

In weighing up these factors the approval I have granted for the site reduces the building footprint to 60 per cent, increases the area of the site not covered by hardstand, reduces building height and reduces the scale of the development. I have conditioned the development to include a significant environmental offset and to rehabilitate the waterway on site. Development of part of this site has long been contemplated and the decision I have made takes account of both environmental and social needs. Neither of these decisions has been straightforward; they have both required careful consideration and extensive investigation before these conclusions were reached.

Mr SPEAKER: I welcome to the public gallery teachers and staff from Wilston State School, which is in the electorate of the Premier.

Forensic and Scientific Services

Hon. S ROBERTSON (Stretton—ALP) (Minister for Health) (10.39 am): In October 2005 cabinet approved 71 reforms arising from a comprehensive review of forensic and scientific services operated by Queensland Health Scientific Services. The government's initial $11 million investment to implement these reforms has since been boosted by an additional $30 million over four years. To date, 80 per cent of reform tasks have been completed within the first 12 months of the 16-month process and the rest are on track for completion during 2007.

I am pleased to inform the House today that 12 months on we are seeing positive results from the reform process. For example, the backlogs of DNA samples and clandestine drug laboratory cases awaiting analysis have both been significantly reduced. The backlog of clandestine drug laboratory cases has fallen from 198 cases as at 30 June 2005 to 60 at 30 October 2006. The time taken to test these drug laboratories for the courts has also fallen dramatically from an average 2½ years to six months over the same period, and the backlog of DNA exhibits has fallen 28 per cent from 23,000 in

December 2005 to 16,200 at 30 October 2006. The overall number of samples analysed over the past 12 months in the DNA laboratory for volume crime cases has increased by 135 per cent and major crime by 29 per cent. I am advised this increase ensures we are on track to eliminate the backlog of DNA samples by the end of 2007 as promised.

The improved performance by the DNA laboratory has been achieved through a number of key reforms. We have doubled staffing at the DNA laboratory to approximately 100 scientists. The laboratory itself has been refurbished to accommodate the extra scientific staff. We have four new cutting-edge automated testing machines which allow us to improve the speed of testing as well as the volume of samples being tested. Progress to date has been good, but we will continue working hard to ensure Queensland has scientific and forensic services that are world class. I table the 12-month report for the reforms of Queensland Health Scientific Services.

Tabled paper: Twelve-month report, dated October 2006, on Reforms at Queensland Health Scientific Services.

Department of Main Roads, Electrical Inspections

Hon. PT LUCAS (Lytton—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.41 am): I would like to update the House on the progress of Main Roads' inspection of cabling and circuitry associated with lighting installations that it owns across Queensland. Main Roads controls about 18,000 lighting installations statewide. During an electrical audit in north Queensland in June 2005, a number of defects were detected and fixed immediately. In some cases electrical insulation did not meet the standards of the Electrical Safety Act 2002. In other cases, where cable runs are long, the circuit breakers protecting the cables—whilst installed to the appropriate standards of the time—would not trip as quickly as the new legislation required. I would like to emphasise that this of itself does not pose an immediate electrical safety risk and that installations met, and continue to meet, the standards of the time they were installed.

As a result, I requested a statewide audit of Main Roads' electrical network, and I informed the House in August last year. I indicated at the time that this was a very serious matter that I wanted addressed. Main Roads and its contractors have inspected cabling and circuitry associated with 11,054 of the almost 18,000 installations it controls—an inspection rate of 200 installations, or 20km of road, each week. Two areas remain to be fully inspected—Mackay and metropolitan Brisbane. I am advised that inspections in Mackay will be completed next month and inspections in Brisbane by March 2007. The inspections have taken longer than originally thought due to the need for the provision of extensive traffic control measures where lighting is on high-volume, high-speed roads and the difficulty of sourcing contractors in some areas because of the booming mining and building industries. Main Roads also had to collate historical plans for the 8,000 light poles in its metropolitan district before it could call tenders for inspection.

To date, inspections have found 218 instances of immediate electrical risk—that is, defects that potentially could cause injury or fire. That is 218 out of 11,054 inspections. All were fixed immediately. The 218 instances comprise 198 earthing defects, which require a secondary electrical defect to become a safety risk. None of the 198 identified had secondary defects. The instances also comprised 16 instances of exposed conductors within pits, cabling installations, cabinets or lighting poles, which are underground or inaccessible without specialised equipment, as is the case with the majority of this infrastructure. Five of these instances were a result of vandalism. The inspections also found four instances of incorrectly connected live wires—polarity defects. This can cause lighting poles to become electrically live but did not in these four cases.

The overwhelming majority of Main Roads lighting circuits are only energised at night, with the entire circuit being turned off during daylight hours, further reducing potential risks. Main Roads concludes that the risk of receiving an electrical shock from Main Roads controlled lighting equipment is extremely low. I am advised that the Electrical Safety Office has been kept fully informed of progress with the inspection program and has endorsed the time frame to complete it as well as the approach of Main Roads to 'find it and fix it'. Main Roads has established a $5.9 million pilot program to upgrade some departmental electrical infrastructure. This program, which is set to start early next year, will let the department budget more accurately for a comprehensive program to bring its entire road lighting infrastructure up to current electrical standards.

On 1 July this year Main Roads formally introduced a new approach to asset management. Under the new approach, the previous system of ongoing maintenance and periodic audits is being replaced by a detailed and systematic inspection program which will eventually see the entire network inspected on a rolling five-year basis. That is entirely appropriate. I view the matter extremely seriously, which is why I ordered the inspections. I will continue to update the House on their progress.

Department of Public Works

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Public Works, Housing and Information and Communication Technology) (10.44 am): The Queensland Department of Public Works is the powerful driving force behind many major government construction projects worth billions of dollars in this state. The general public hears very little about the role of the department or its outstanding expertise—not through the media, anyway. After all, the engine room is never as exciting as the bridge. The department's efforts do not make glorious headlines, but the department makes these projects happen nevertheless. It runs the design process. It sets the parameters of the budget. It runs the tender process. It is the department which manages the contractor to ensure projects are delivered on time and on budget—a tough task when the price of laying a brick can treble within a couple of months.

The Gabba, Suncorp Stadium, Dairy Farmers Stadium, the Gallery of Modern Art and the State Library are the social cathedrals of modern life. They are the places that Queenslanders in their thousands will come to together to celebrate sport, art and life in general. The Gabba has been enjoyed by tens of thousands of Queenslanders in the past week. It was completely redeveloped by the Queensland Department of Public Works.

I cannot claim that the design and construction of Suncorp Stadium was responsible for the winning performance of the Broncos this year. Darren Lockyer can do that. However, I can claim that the Department of Public Works was responsible for the building of this hugely successful world-class $280 million stadium. In a fortnight one of the biggest pop stars in the world, Robbie Williams, will be performing there. At the end of the week I will join the Premier and Minister Welford in opening the Gallery of Modern Art. The Millennium Arts Precinct development is the outcome of six years of partnering between the Department of Public Works and Arts Queensland. It was overseen by the specialist in the Department of Public Works and built by Bovis Lend Lease. It is the largest arts construction project in Queensland's history and was delivered on time and on budget by this government.

Last week I visited Skilled Park at the Gold Coast and can advise the House that this $160 million project is proceeding very well. Again, it is being overseen by the Department of Public Works while this time the contractor is WATPAC.

Finally, I want to advise Queenslanders who are interested in becoming tradesmen and women that 100 Q-Build apprenticeships are on offer and will close on Friday, 1 December. We are the only government in the world, as far as I know, that trains apprentices to this extent.

Queensland Skills Plan

Hon. RJ WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Minister for Education and Training and Minister for the Arts) (10.47 am): Our government's $1 billion Queensland Skills Plan is a comprehensive response to the challenges we face in addressing our state's skills shortages. It delivers on our government's commitment to create one of the most flexible, modern and innovative education and training systems in the country. The skills plan addresses those factors which have discouraged Queenslanders from taking on a trade through an apprenticeship.

Research has shown, for example, that the length of apprenticeships has been a discouraging factor. Earlier this year, my predecessor, Tom Barton, asked the Training and Employment Recognition Council to review apprenticeship programs. That review is now complete and I am pleased to advise that, from 1 January next year, 75 apprenticeships will have potentially shorter durations. This is more than half of all apprenticeship programs. Some trades, including hairdressing, hospitality, food processing and some automotive areas, will be cut from four years to three years. A range of other trades will give apprentices the option of finishing their training in 42 months instead of 48 months. These will include bricklaying, carpentry, solid plastering, wall and floor tiling, and some off-site construction trades such as shop fitting, joinery, stair construction and sign writing.

These changes will allow young apprentices to complete their apprenticeship as soon as they fulfil all the competencies necessary. However, these trades will also keep their longer standard durations in the event that an apprentice requires longer to finish. At this point, there will be no change to some trades given the complexities around licensing requirements. These trades include plumbing, gas fitting, aeroskills, civil construction, electrotechnology and automotive trades including electrical, light vehicle, diesel fitting and heavy vehicle trades.

For those apprenticeships with a shorter duration, apprentices who work hard will be able to achieve their trade competence sooner. This approach will help address the needs of industry for skilled workers. We will also ensure off-the-job training is aligned with the shorter apprenticeship durations. The training provider, the employer and their apprentice will work together so that all training, both off-the-job and in the workplace, can be completed within the shortest reasonable time frame.

The review process which has led to these changes involved a wide range of stakeholders through briefings, formal submissions and hearings, and the government listened to the issues they raised. I want to thank employers, industry and unions for their assistance. We will continue to work with employers, industry and training providers, as well as the unions, to achieve innovative initiatives to combat the skills shortages in line with our state's skills plan.

Cyclone Larry

Hon. FW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Disability Services, Seniors and Youth) (10.50 am): It has been eight months since Cyclone Larry devastated communities in the far north. Over that time the Department of Communities has played a leading role in helping to restore the economic, social, physical and emotional wellbeing of the affected communities. I am pleased to report that very significant progress has been made. Last week's report from General Cosgrove on the number of homes and buildings repaired is proof of that.

The department has 36 dedicated recovery workers delivering support services through our one-stop shops in Babinda, Malanda and Innisfail, the 1800 recovery phone line and a specialist case management service which assists clients with repairs to homes. A further 21 support staff are also part of this recovery program. As of last week, these officers had handled more than 50,000 contacts with local people who were affected by the cyclone. To date, we have also distributed $11.4 million in relief assistance payments to eligible applicants, covering emergency relief, essential home contents and repairs to dwellings. This is excellent progress and these efforts have made a big difference to people's lives.

North Queenslanders have shown plenty of spirit in what has been a very tough year, and now a sense of stability and optimism is being restored in these communities. A great example of this community spirit is the recent launch of a book produced by local Innisfail group, Mothers Helping Others. The book—*Cyclone Larry: tales of survival from the children of North Queensland*—is a collection of stories and artworks by local children who experienced the cyclone. It includes contributions from more than 300 children, from kindergarten age to secondary school students.

All proceeds from the sale of the book will go towards upgrading local playgrounds, so in effect these children are part of local efforts to rebuild their communities. I understand the books retail for around $25 and can be purchased online through eBay. This example shows that these communities have come a long way since March, but there is more work to do, and Cyclone Larry recovery efforts will continue into 2007. I look forward to reporting on further progress in the new year.

MEDICAL BOARD (ADMINISTRATION) BILL
HEALTH SERVICES AMENDMENT BILL

Remaining Stages; Cognate Debate

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.52 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with Standing Order 129, the Medical Board (Administration) Bill and the Health Services Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages—

(a) one question being put in regard to the second readings;

(b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and

(c) one question being put for the third readings and long titles.

Motion agreed to.

POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL
POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL

Remaining Stages; Cognate Debate

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.53 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with Standing Order 129, the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages—

(a) one question being put in regard to the second readings;

(b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and

(c) one question being put for the third readings and long titles.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTRICITY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL
ENERGY OMBUDSMAN BILL

Remaining Stages; Cognate Debate

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.53 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with Standing Order 129, the Electricity and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Energy Ombudsman Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages—

(a) one question being put in regard to the second readings;

(b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and

(c) one question being put for the third readings and long titles.

Motion agreed to.

SCRUTINY OF LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Report

Mrs SULLIVAN (Pumicestone—ALP) (10.54 am): I table the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's *Alert Digest No. 10 of 2006*.

Tabled paper: Scrutiny of Legislation Committee Alert Digest Issue No. 10 of 2006.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Ministerial Gift Register

Mr SEENEY (Callide—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.54 am): Earlier today in the parliament the Premier tried to pull one of his pathetic political stunts when he tabled a gift register. He tried to give the House the impression that the gifts that were received by the Leader of the Opposition were not declared in some way. The document that he tabled clearly outlines a whole series of gifts that have been declared by my predecessor and by his predecessor. The Premier has been caught out by his own words.

Gifts that may have been received by other members of the coalition team are declared in another document. The Register of Members' Interests requires us to declare gifts over $500. I am confident that every one of my team has declared the gifts that they should have. I am prepared to stake my job on the fact that there are no $300,000 gifts received by members on this side that have not been declared in this document. The challenge for the Premier is to come in here, stand up and give the same assurance—that is, that he will stake his position on the fact—that no more $300,000 gifts have been received by members—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SEENEY:—on that side of the House.

Procedure—Speaker's Ruling—Complaints Procedure

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, when I state 'order' I think you hear me. I note that this matter that you are referring to has been referred to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee. Standing order 271 provides that a matter referred to the committee must not be debated in the House until such time as the ethics committee has reported on the matter if, in the opinion of the Speaker, such debate could prejudice the matter. I believe debate on a matter of this nature has the propensity to prejudice and I therefore rule debate on the matter out of order. I am aware that you are not debating, but can I ask you to be careful in that regard.

Mr SEENEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I did not refer to any specific matter, I do not think, but I accept your ruling. What I am confident about is that there are no gifts worth hundreds of thousands of dollars being given to members of the opposition that are not in this document. I am prepared to stake my leadership and my reputation on the fact that these people have been honest enough to declare any gifts, let alone gifts worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. The challenge for the Premier is to do the same thing. Let us see the Premier come in here and give the same assurance.

Torres Strait Transport Infrastructure Plan

Mr McNAMARA (Hervey Bay—ALP) (10.58 am): Two Tuesdays ago I was delighted to be able to represent the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, the Hon. Paul Lucas, and join with the member for Cook, Jason O'Brien, on Thursday Island to launch the Torres Strait transport infrastructure plan. It was a very important event for the region and will provide a blueprint for the development of transport infrastructure and services for the next 20 years.

I take this moment to remind honourable members who have taken to writing to me about their potholes about some of the challenges faced by a member like the member for Cook in his region. The Torres Strait is a 20,000-square kilometre area comprising 17 inhabited islands out of 100. There are some 8½ thousand people spread throughout the area. That represents enormous challenges for planners trying to enhance the system of transport delivery in the area.

The plan recommended refurbishment and ongoing maintenance of existing facilities together with targeted improvements to key elements of the network. I want to take a moment to particularly thank the Torres Strait Regional Authority, the island coordinating council, the Torres Strait shire and various island chairpersons for their contribution to the development of the plan. It has not been easy. It is an enormous area and an enormous challenge.

The plan recommended completing the airstrip paving and sealing program on the outer islands, raising the causeway at the Horn Island jetty and continuing the current barge ramp dolphin replacement program for the outer islands of the Torres Strait. It also recommended a number of other options for further investigation. They included investigating what lengthening and strengthening of the Horn Island airstrip would be required to remove the current Dash 8 passenger load restriction; carrying out an economic analysis of a roll-on, roll-off ferry between Horn Island and Thursday Island; investigating the possibility of establishing a serviced small craft facility on Thursday Island; and carrying out a long-term sea access and dredging strategy for the outer islands of the Torres Strait. I commend the plan to the House.

Mr SPEAKER: I welcome a second group of students and teachers in the gallery today from the Wilston State School in the electorate of the Premier, Peter Beattie.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Ministerial Accountability

Mr SEENEY (11.00 am): My first question without notice is to the Premier. I note that the Premier has claimed in numerous media reports that he has been 'disappointed and betrayed' to learn that Gordon Nuttall had lied to him about receiving a $300,000 loan from a prominent businessman.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, I did make a reference to this earlier and I will go back to my ruling in that regard for all members. I note that this matter has been referred to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee. Standing order 271 provides that a matter referred to the committee must not be debated in the House until such time as the ethics committee has reported on the matter if in the opinion of the Speaker such debate could prejudice the matter. I believe debate on a matter of this nature has the propensity to prejudice and therefore I rule debate on the matter out of order. Leader of the Opposition, do you have a second question?

Miss Simpson: You haven't heard the question yet.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Hang on a second. The member for Maroochydore says that I have not heard the question. I heard the question being asked, and that was the prelude to the question. I am taking that as part of the question. The prelude is actually implicit with regard to the question you are asking, and I will rule that way.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I had not come to the substantive part of my question yet.

Mr SPEAKER: I rule once again that you are asking a question based on what you are saying at the start of your question, so I am ruling that way.

Mr SEENEY: Thank you. Mr Speaker, is this my first question or my second question?

Mr SPEAKER: I will go back to the first question—

Mr SEENEY: You are ruling the first one completely out of order. Does that mean that I get the option to ask another question or are you ruling—

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, do not be too testy. I just actually said—

Mr SEENEY: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, but I am looking for direction. That is all.

Mr SPEAKER: I gave you the direction just before you objected and I said I will go back to the first question and then you asked me again. But I am going back to the first question. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ministerial Accountability

Mr SEENEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question then is still to the Premier. The Premier claims to have been disappointed and betrayed to learn about a so-called loan of $300,000. Premier—

Mr SPEAKER: I am ruling today consistently on the matter. I am not going to read out again what I have ruled, but I have indicated to you matters relating to this question under standing orders. There is plenty of precedent in this House by a number of Speakers that have ruled this way, and I so rule again. I will therefore ask again that you take that into account.

Mr SEENEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Could the Premier inform the House whether a loan that involved no documentation, no interest and no repayments could rightfully be considered to be a loan or a bribe?

Mr BEATTIE: I take that question from the Leader of the Opposition. As far as I am concerned—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier—

Mr BEATTIE: I am happy to answer this of course, but I am in your hands, Mr Speaker.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Can I indicate to the orchestrated laughter on the left—and I say that with respect—that that is a hypothetical question and I am not allowing that under standing orders. I know the Premier is willing to answer that question. I am ruling that that is a hypothetical question and we are not going to go down that track.

Ministerial Accountability

Mr SEENEY: My second question is also to the Premier. In recent times the Premier has spoken about being disappointed and betrayed. Premier, is it not the people of Queensland who should feel disappointed and betrayed by the hypocrisy and the corruption that has been evident in his government?

Mr BEATTIE: I am happy to answer any of these questions. The importance of answering them is this: I have made it clear since I have been leader of my party, which will be 11 years next year, that I will not tolerate anyone who behaves inappropriately or dishonestly. The real mark of leadership is what one does when these matters become drawn to their attention or they become aware of them. I take the view that anyone—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I am happy to answer this. If the member opposite wants to be rude, that is fine. If they want an answer, I will give it to them. The position is this: anyone who behaves dishonestly under any circumstances is not welcome in the Labor Party and it is my view that anyone who behaves inappropriately should be thrown out—should be thrown out—and I do not have any qualms about doing it. I make this point: there will be no National Party-like crooks in my show as we saw when the National Party brown paper bags took place. There was a royal commission into how crook you lot were. Let me make it clear—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BEATTIE: Let me make it clear: I am prepared to get rid of anyone who misbehaves in my party. You make them deputy leaders when it comes to the Liberal Party. So do not talk any nonsense about this. You promote them. You promote people—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: They do not like it, Mr Speaker, do they? Those opposite do not like it. They have people who aspire to—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think I am giving you a fair bit of latitude on both sides here.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gregory, order! I will let the Premier resume his answer.

Mr BEATTIE: We have somebody who ripped off little old ladies and those opposite made him Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party! Those opposite have the audacity to come in here and—

Mr McARDLE: I rise to a point of order. I find the words offensive and ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr BEATTIE: I withdraw, and they made him shadow Attorney-General, which is even worse!

Mr SPEAKER: I think if you just withdraw.

Mr McARDLE: Mr Speaker, I ask for the withdrawal to be without reservation whatsoever.

Mr BEATTIE: I withdraw. I have made it clear. Let me be really frank about all of this. Let me be really frank about it. Leadership is about what one does—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Excuse me. I ask the Premier to resume his seat just for a moment. I am giving all members a lot of latitude on this, but let the Premier resume his answer.

Mr BEATTIE: We can talk about the Russ Hinzes if you like. I was a lawyer at the Fitzgerald inquiry. I know how crooked the National Party was. You do not need to be smart with me about it. I know how stinking you lot were. I know how crooked you lot were. The standard is this: what do you do when you find these things out? You throw the people out. As far as I am concerned, the sooner I throw Gordon Nuttall out of the Labor Party the better.

Electoral Redistribution

Ms NOLAN: My question without notice is to the Premier. The Goss and Beattie governments have ensured that we have a fair electoral system in Queensland. Will there be a redistribution in this term and will the fair electoral boundaries continue?

Mr BEATTIE: Unlike the corrupt gerrymander and malapportionment that we had under the National Party, there will be a redistribution in the next year. It happens after—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Do those opposite want to be rude or do they actually want to be a bit decent? The people of Toowoomba South expect you to have some manners—

Mr Horan: They would like you to tell the truth, too!

Mr BEATTIE: The people of Toowoomba South expect you to have some manners, and I think that they would be disappointed with you today.

Mr Horan interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: It would be nice if you behaved like a gentleman.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba South, that is about the fourth time you have interjected. Please let the Premier answer the question.

Mr BEATTIE: There are two triggers for a redistribution. One is if one-third of the seats are either over or above a certain quota, and that requires 30 out of 89—there are currently 28—or after three elections on the same boundaries, which is the case now. So there will be a redistribution. It has to be within 12 months after the return of writs, which means that there will be one by October 2007 and, yes, it will be fair as usual because we are committed to fair boundaries. The redistribution commissioners will include David Kerslake, a CEO and a retired or serving judge.

Last week I was interested to see the Leader of the Opposition put forward the National Party's latest attempt at a gerrymander. With fair elections in this state now enshrined in law, the Leader of the Opposition declared that a gerrymander was the best way to ensure that he remains the alternative Premier of Queensland. His gerrymander is breathtaking and brazen, and it is as undemocratic as those of former National Party governments.

What did the Leader of the Opposition propose at the press club? As far as I know, in every parliamentary system in Australia, state or federal, the first business after a general election is for the party or group of parties with the majority of seats to meet to elect the premier or the prime minister. That will be happening in Victoria today with the election of Steve Bracks. However, the Leader of the Opposition wants to upturn this convention governing how the premier or prime minister is chosen. He wants to take a vote before the general election, not after.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. Obviously the Premier has not read my speech. I will send him a copy. He will find it is exactly the same as his system.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr SEENEY: I will even give you a—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition!

Mr BEATTIE: But the real question is: does the Leader of the Liberal Party, Bruce Flegg, agree with you? The Leader of the Opposition wants to elect the leader before the election. Members should think about this: it would mean that the current members for Mount Isa, Waterford and Chatsworth, for

example, would have had no say in determining who the Premier of the day was because it would have been decided before the election. The current member for Robina would have missed out on a vote, but Bob Quinn would have had a vote.

Mr Hobbs: He didn't say that.

Mr BEATTIE: I have not heard the member correct any of the media reports on this. What of the former member for Chatsworth? He would have had a determination on who the Premier of the day was! What sort of nonsense is that?

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. I think the Premier should save the rest of his answer until after he has read my speech. He will found out that he is dead wrong. You have not been briefed properly, old mate.

Mr SPEAKER: I indicate that the time has expired. Before calling the member for Moggill, I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he will not raise frivolous and vexatious points of order, as that second point was.

I now welcome to the public gallery students and staff from the Caboolture Harmony Montessori School in the electorate of Glass House, represented by Carolyn Male. I call the member for Moggill.

Ministerial Accountability

Dr FLEGG: I refer the Premier to his claim that eyeballing his ministers every year will provide the people of Queensland with a guarantee of their honesty. Can the Premier advise the House whether he used this eyeball method on Gordon Nuttall, Merri Rose, Liddy Clark, Jim Elder or Bill D'Arcy? Given this dubious track record, can he please give the House a guarantee that none of his past or present ministers, in their time in parliament, received any financial advantage from entities that have dealings with his government?

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the Leader of the Liberal Party for his question. At least I do have the decency to eyeball my colleagues. I do not know that he and the Leader of the National Party ever will.

I was intrigued to read a report in the *Courier-Mail* dated 25 November, about the coalition sinking deeper into the mire. The report said that in recent days both National leader Geoff Seeney and Liberal leader Bruce Flegg have stuck their heads up only in an attempt to knock the other one off. That is about it.

Mr Copeland: Corruption in your own ranks!

Mr BEATTIE: Mr Speaker, will I be allowed to answer the question?

Mr SPEAKER: I take the Premier's concern that he is on his feet and he should be given the opportunity to answer the question.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is dead right; I ask the Leader of the Opposition to ask his members to allow the Premier to answer the question.

Mr SEENEY: Absolutely.

Mr BEATTIE: I make it very clear: as the Leader of the Liberal Party well knows, while I was away on a trade mission the Deputy Premier inquired as to the compliance of current and previous members. All current ministers have complied and I have discussed this in cabinet.

Mr Seeney: But you haven't eyeballed them.

Mr BEATTIE: Please don't be the village idiot. If the member wants a serious answer, I will give it. Otherwise, I will just give up.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to let the Premier return to the topic. A serious question has been asked. Let us hear a serious answer.

Mr BEATTIE: In terms of my discussions with my ministerial colleagues and my contact with them, I am happy to accept their credibility. I do not seek to have an oath of allegiance, which the member opposite is seeking from the Liberal Party. The reality is that I have spoken to my ministerial colleagues and I have faith in their integrity.

In terms of leadership, when someone is identified as not having followed the rules, the important thing is that we take appropriate action. I remind the House of two things: matters in relation to a particular person are being investigated because I referred them. No-one else did that and I make no apology for it. I will continue to do that. Secondly, the standards that I expect from my colleagues are very high. I have checked former ministers as well as current ministers, and the Deputy Premier has already explained that publicly.

Let us be clear: we have already done it and I have indicated that in future when returns are made I will be checking with each one of my ministers to ensure that they have complied. I look forward to the Leader of the Opposition doing the same thing. I look forward to the Leader of the Opposition seeking to have spot checks on each one of his shadow ministerial colleagues and each one of his members. I look forward to the results of that being tabled in this House.

The Leader of the Opposition wants one standard for him and one standard for everybody else.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Mr Speaker, how many times will we have disruption?

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. The Premier obviously was not in the House earlier when I challenged the government to have the same standards as us.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Recycled Water

Ms MALE: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Trade, and I ask: why has he decided that the people of south-east Queensland should have a say on whether recycled water should be introduced into our state's water supply?

Mr BEATTIE: I am committed to giving people a choice because, in a democracy, that is the appropriate thing to do. There was a plebiscite in Toowoomba. Under those circumstances, there should be one across the south-east corner and it should apply to anybody who will be taking water out of the system and whether recycled water should be included in the water system. I make the point that later this week, as the minister responsible, the Deputy Premier will be outlining some of the program of how this will be done in terms of times, questions and so on, on which she is currently working.

I appeal for some sensible debate. The Leader of the Liberal Party has come out saying that we should go ahead. The Leader of the National Party is opposed to it, so presumably we will not get a coalition view on it. The member for Kawana believes that we can catch AIDS from recycled water, which is pretty stupid. Even the Leader of the Liberal Party understands that. The worrying thing is that he believes that one can catch HIV AIDS, and Hepatitis A, B, C and D from this water. For some reason he thinks that they are a bacteria. Perhaps the Leader of the Liberal Party could explain the differences between viruses and bacteria to the member for Kawana. If we are going to have a debate, let us have a sensible one, and we might get some constructive outcomes as a result.

I hope we can have an intelligent debate on the issue of water. The people of the south-east corner are entitled to participate in such a debate in a democratic way. The only way to do that is to use some common sense. My worry is whether we can get any common sense out of the leaders of the National and Liberal parties. If we look at their conduct in relation to recent matters, such as this one, it is fairly clear that those opposite cannot agree. The Leader of the National Party says he is opposed to recycled water and the Leader of the Liberal Party is in favour of it. Therefore, I do not know what coalition view we will get on recycled water.

If we look at what has happened over the past few weeks, full and frank discussions have taken place. On 9 November, the Leader of the Opposition told the media that he was embarrassed by Dr Flegg. He may well be, but the reality is that this issue is important.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: That is what the member is quoted as saying. The Leader of the Opposition can correct it if he wants to. He pointedly refused to publicly back his Liberal colleague saying only, 'I work with the Leader of the Liberal Party, whoever that is.' We do not care either, but on the issue of water we want the opposition to have a constructive approach. He could not even bring himself to say whether Dr Flegg is doing a good job. Asked if the Leader of the Liberal Party was doing a good job, he said that he wouldn't give a yes or no answer. Hopefully, we will get one on recycled water.

Then the Leader of the Opposition came up with another plan to solve the coalition leadership question. Whatever the rights or wrongs of his speech, the Leader of the Opposition did not even have the decency to talk to the Leader of the Liberal Party. He looked like he had eaten a bad oyster. Afterwards he stormed out without making any comment and then the Leader of the Liberal Party said that he did not agree with the Leader of the Opposition.

Ministerial Accountability

Miss SIMPSON: My question is directed to the Premier. How many of his ministers has he eyeballed since he returned from overseas? What assurances has the Premier received from them in regard to undeclared loans?

Mr BEATTIE: I made it clear—and I have said this publicly—that all of my ministers have complied.

Mr Seeney: It's weasel words, isn't it?

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Seeney: You just can't be honest.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I am asking you to let the Premier—and I know that sometimes I have to ask you this a couple of times before you actually notice that I am asking you this—answer this important question.

Mr BEATTIE: Let us be really clear about this: I have asked every single one of them. That means the lot. Every single one means the lot. The Leader of the Opposition does not seem to understand that. Every single one of them—

Mr Seeney: Since you got back from overseas?

Mr BEATTIE: Yes, since I got back. That means when I arrived. I came back. Has the Leader of the Opposition got that? I am here. I asked every one of them. Has the Leader of the Opposition got that? I asked every single one of them. Not only did I ask every single one of them; I accepted what they said to me. I trust them and believe in them. The issue is this—

Mr Seeney: They are looking surprised.

Mr BEATTIE: Not as surprised as the Leader of the Opposition will be when he finally agrees with the Leader of the Liberal Party on anything relevant. Let me tell the Leader of the Opposition that the people of Queensland will be even more stunned when those two make sense.

The answer to the member's question is very simple: in relation to every single one of them, yes, I have eyeballed the lot of them. I believe every one of them. I do not believe that any one of them is in that position. That is the answer to the member's question.

I have made it clear that I expect the highest possible standards from my government and I expect the highest possible standards from those who are part of my caucus. I have a track record of throwing out anyone who behaves inappropriately. I have done that from a former Deputy Premier—who was Jim Elder—down to members of caucus, and I will continue to do that. I have made my view clear in relation to Gordon Nuttall. I know that I cannot talk about him today, but as soon as I possibly can I will be throwing him out of the Labor Party. I make no apologies for doing that—and he knows that. I have sent him a really clear message that I want him out. The same will apply to everybody else.

There will be no shonky cover-ups, which is what we had under the National Party. I sat in the Fitzgerald inquiry. The members opposite should not talk to me about loans. I saw Russ Hinze and the shonky loans. We saw all of the crookedness. Queensland was never governed by such a pack of crooks as it was when it was governed by the National Party. Talk about dishonest crooks! The members opposite have the audacity to come in here and talk to me about crooks. Every single one of them were crooks. I saw them go to jail—every single one of them. They were a pack of crooks. They stole public money. They did sleazy deals—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: They do not like it. Talk about a pack of crooks! They had more crooks per pound than any civilisation on the planet—either before or after. So the members opposite should not talk to me about any of that. The important thing is: what do you do? I get rid of them—every single one of them.

Water Infrastructure

Mr HINCHLIFFE: My question is directed to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure. The Deputy Premier's ministerial statement this morning detailed progress on water related infrastructure. Could the Deputy Premier expand on this and also furnish details about any reactions to this progress?

Ms BLIGH: I thank the honourable member for his question and I thank him for his commitment to working as part of the government's team to ensure that the people of south-east Queensland have the water and the water security that they need. I regret to inform the House that the member's commitment to that work is not shared. Of course, we know that it is not shared by members on the other side of the House, particularly when it comes to the important part that the Traveston Crossing and Wyaralong dams will play in that security of water in the future. Last week I was interested to read an editorial in the *Courier-Mail* that stated—

> ... only months ago that the Nationals were scolding the Beattie Government for not building any dams. Now that it is committed to one, it seems the Nationals are still not happy.

It is more than a lack of happiness; the Nationals have completely lost their way on this issue. Last week I was very disappointed to see that the Nationals's antidam sentiment is starting to infect the views of their federal colleagues. I am sure that last week members heard the comments of Queensland Senator Barnaby Joyce when he started his campaign to stop the people of south-east Queensland

getting the water that they need. What is the basis of his campaign? Let me advise members that he has said on ABC Radio that we should forget about the Traveston Dam and build a dam at Borumba. This is the view of Barnaby Joyce. According to Barnaby Joyce, Borumba Dam would give 444,000 megalitres of water whereas the Traveston Dam will only give you 150,000 megalitres. I can advise the House that we will be raising the Borumba Dam. The forecast yield from that raising is some 40,000 megalitres. So he is out by a factor of 11. But it is more extraordinary than that. The National Party mathematics of Barnaby Joyce—

Mr Lawlor: And he's an accountant!

Ms BLIGH: I understand that he is an accountant. The creative accounting on this issue is unrivalled. The inflow to the Borumba Dam area is 74,000 megalitres, but out of 74,000 megalitres Barnaby Joyce is going to get an output of 444,000. He is the Rumpelstiltskin of water. This is a man who can weave magic in the Borumba area. Barnaby Joyce needs to come clean to the people of Queensland about his new and revolutionary technology. In all seriousness, I suggest that Barnaby Joyce needs to remember that he is a senator for all Queenslanders. The people of south-east Queensland are relying on him to make his decisions on the facts, not on this sort of fantasy.

Ministerial Accountability

Mr McARDLE: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Today we have heard the Premier state that he eyeballed each member of his cabinet in regard to undeclared loans. Can the Attorney-General tell the parliament if the Premier eyeballed him? Did the Premier ask the Attorney-General about any undeclared loans that he had received? If so, when was that conversation? If the conversation did take place, where did the Attorney-General record the details of that conversation?

Mr SHINE: I refer the honourable gentleman to the Premier's statement earlier today. I confirm that inquiries have been made of me with respect to that subject matter.

Schoolies Week

Mrs SMITH: My question is directed to the Minister for Police and Corrective Services. Again this year the Gold Coast has played host to a record number of school leavers celebrating their final year of school. Media reports have said that this year the number of arrests and bad behaviour by schoolies has increased. How did 2006 compare with previous years?

Ms SPENCE: I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. I can understand her interest in schoolies on the Gold Coast, but before I refer to that I would like to acknowledge that end-of-year school-leaving festivals happened in Cairns, on the Sunshine Coast, at Yeppoon, at the Whitsundays and on Magnetic Island. Police, Emergency Services and volunteer organisations were at all of those places supervising our school leavers.

But the Gold Coast is the centre of schoolies action. Today, I would like to give the House some statistics. Despite the record numbers this year, there were five more arrests during schoolies on the Gold Coast compared to the number of arrests in 2005. During the official schoolies period, crowd numbers reached 125,000 in Surfers Paradise. Over the 10 days police made a total of 489 arrests on 529 charges. More than 70 per cent of those people who were arrested were non-schoolies—or toolies—of which 361 were arrested for public nuisance, street offences and drug possession. Of the estimated 26,000 schoolies who visited the coast, 128 school leavers were arrested. So only one per cent of schoolies found themselves on the wrong side of the law, mostly for public nuisance and drinking offences.

I took the opportunity of spending two hours around midnight last Thursday night with police on the Gold Coast to have a look at the schoolies event in action. I would like to say how well it is organised. I know many parents worry about their children who attend this festival. I think the police and other providers do an excellent job of making this festival as safe and secure as they possibly can. I would particularly like to acknowledge the terrific work of so many volunteers who spend their nights on the Gold Coast with our young people, particularly people like the hotel chaplaincy, who are well known for giving out their red frogs and providing schoolies with water. Volunteers from Crime Stoppers are there night after night, and a host of other volunteer groups put in the hard yards at this event every year to make sure that our young school leavers have a very safe and enjoyable schoolies festival.

At the end of the day it is up to the police to make sure that these school leavers are safe and secure. This year we put an additional 300 police on the Gold Coast for the schoolies event, so there were a lot of blue uniforms out there amongst the crowd. My observation was that young people acted and interacted exceptionally well with the police. They stopped to talk to the police and they gave the police high fives. They engaged in conversation with the police and were not afraid to ask them and, indeed, other volunteers for assistance. So it was a job well done.

Water Tank Registration

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Premier. Rural and regional Queenslanders thank the Premier for the rollout of the water rebate. However, concerns have been expressed that the government proposes to introduce registration of tanks, including registration fees. This would undermine the rebate and effectively tax rainwater. Is there to be a registration of tanks and will fees be imposed on householders trying to be waterwise?

Mr BEATTIE: I have to say to the member for Gladstone that this is all news to me. I am not sure of the details to which the member refers. In terms of the program that we are rolling out, the only comment that I have made in recent days was in partnership with Lord Mayor Campbell Newman in relation to ensuring that people were not being ripped off. There were some suggestions of this, and I think Channel 10 approached the Lord Mayor and he subsequently spoke to me to ensure that people were not being ripped off. There is a bit of folklore around that some suppliers have increased the value of tanks to take into account the Brisbane City Council rebate and the state government rebate—in other words, it was neutralised. I am not sure whether that is true.

What Campbell Newman and I decided to do—and the Deputy Premier and I worked on this—was come up with a system whereby various suppliers are listed on the web as well as give some idea of the costs involved so that people are not ripped off. That statement was made a week or so ago just after I came back from my trade and investment mission. I do not know whether that is what the member is referring to. We may want to gather information. Just so I am clear about this, can the member clarify whether she is referring to registering the suppliers or the people buying the tanks?

Mrs Cunningham: The information I received was that it was going to be a registration of tank owners, not suppliers.

Mr BEATTIE: No. I can assure the member for Gladstone—and I have confirmed this with the Deputy Premier and the minister for water—that there is no proposal to do that. I cannot see the benefit of that to us. The only interest we have is in people who acquire tanks and then apply for the rebate. We would want to know that detail but only for the purposes of paying the rebate. We have no desire to register tank owners. For example, we would want to know for strategic planning reasons how many tanks there were in a particular area, but that would simply be for planning for water demands. We would not be registering people.

Ms Bligh interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: That is right. The Treasurer has just said that not even the Treasurer has thought about raising money through that avenue! I say to the member for Gladstone that we have no plans to do that. I do not want to rule out collating statistics for planning reasons to deal with future water needs, which we do a lot of so that we can get the projections right and deal with the drought. The indications that we are getting are that the drought is getting worse, not better. That is one of the reasons why I am very keen to see that next year's recycled water plebiscite is successful and that is why I am trying to encourage the Leader of the Opposition to be supportive of it and not to be worried about the gender of fish changing and not to be worried about some of the nonsense that we have heard from the member for Kawana, who believes that bacteria and viruses are the same thing.

Time expired.

Schoolies Week

Mr GRAY: My question is to the Minister for Tourism, Fair Trading, Wine Industry Development and Women. Each year tens of thousands of young school leavers, as we have heard, flock to the Gold Coast to celebrate the end of their school days. Every year we read reports about what a great time schoolies have had while on the coastal strip. We also hear of alcohol abuse and other alcohol related incidents. Can the minister inform the House of a post-schoolies initiative that she proposes?

Ms KEECH: I thank the member for Gaven for his question and for his support of all Gold Coast members and for his support of safety initiatives for this year's schoolies. As we have heard from the police minister, this year's schoolies on the Gold Coast has drawn record numbers, and it has from all accounts—from police, Liquor Licensing and my department of fair trading—been a great success. Every year tens of thousands of schoolies find their way to the Gold Coast, and now it is time for New South Wales and Victorian schoolies to come and party.

The vast majority of school leavers are responsible and do the right thing. The police on duty at schoolies, as well as Liquor Licensing, acknowledge this. The minority, however, do get into trouble and it is the activities of the minority that generate adverse publicity. Schoolies week is far better organised and far safer than it has been in the past thanks to the coordinated activities of government and volunteers. However, whenever there are up to 40,000 people in the one area at the one time issues of noise and behaviour will arise.

I can inform the House that I will be calling a forum to discuss alcohol issues that have arisen at schoolies this year. Police have reported high levels of intoxication by under-age schoolies and they and my Liquor Licensing officers have laid some of the blame at the feet of parents who have supplied large quantities of alcohol to their children. A major concern has been the secondary supply of alcohol to young school leavers by parents, siblings and their older friends for consumption by schoolies in their units before they go out to party at Surfers. While the majority of schoolies do the right thing and are well behaved, obviously when they are heavily affected by alcohol their activities and judgements are impacted upon. Some parents have contributed to this problem by supplying full strength and strong ready-mixed drinks to young people, many of whom have little experience with the consumption of alcohol.

The supply of alcohol by parents to children is not illegal provided it is for consumption on private premises. But there has to be an element of responsibility for both parents and young people in terms of how much and what type of alcohol is supplied. Parents have to take responsibility for their children and for the conduct of their children during schoolies. That is why I am calling a forum with Liquor Licensing officers, police, the Department of Communities, the Surfers Paradise Management Association, the Gold Coast Liquor Industry Consultative Association, as well as unit owners and managers, so that we can get together to determine the extent of the alcohol problem and then consider whether action needs to be taken.

Time expired.

Prep Teacher Aides

Mr COPELAND: My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Training. As the minister would be well aware, there has been overwhelming criticism expressed by parents, teachers, early childhood specialists and the greater community regarding his government's refusal to fund full-time teacher aides for prep. In light of criticism now expressed by the Queensland children's commission that the minister's stance is very narrow and shortsighted, when will he recognise that his government has a responsibility to parents, teachers and, most importantly, to our young students to fund full-time teacher aides for every prep classroom commencing next year?

Mr WELFORD: I am happy to respond to the question raised by the honourable member. The first step is to understand that the premise to his question is very probably incorrect. The truth is that there is not overwhelming concern about the arrangements for the prep year next year. On the contrary, the 26,000 to 28,000 young people who will go into prep next year will enjoy the same fantastic play curriculum experience as enjoyed by the many thousands of students who have gone through the trials that have been conducted and who have progressed into grade 1 with great aplomb. We are very proud of how teachers and teacher aides have adapted to the prep trials. The experience that they are providing to young people is, on any view, second to none.

In relation to the so-called overwhelming concern, I received notice that a group of parents who are concerned about it propose to protest here in parliament today, and my understanding is that they informed the parliament that the protest would consist of five people. I am not sure how overwhelming that concern is in those circumstances.

I have received advice from the children's commissioner apologising for the personal comments put on a web site by one officer of the children's commission in the context of an email discussion at some point. The views expressed by that officer are not the views of the children's commissioner.

Mr COPELAND: But they are the views of an officer of the commission.

Mr WELFORD: Every individual in Australia could hold a different opinion, I would imagine. You have got yours; I have got mine. The only difference is that I happen to be the education minister—for the time being, I am humble enough to say.

I am confident that the arrangements we have in place for prep will be very effective when prep is launched comprehensively at the start of next year. There are a range of approaches across the country. Victoria, for example, has no particular allocation of additional teacher aides for prep. It is true that other states have more.

As I have indicated a number of times to those who have raised these concerns, we will monitor it throughout next year. We will be in close contact and continuing discussion with our very professional teachers in the prep year, and should we determine that some additional support is required then we will provide it, but for the moment we are providing a minimum of a half-time teacher aide for every 25 students. That means in most schools there will be a full-time teacher aide between two classes on top of the 10,000 additional hours that we have allocated.

Water Supply

Mr FINN: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Water. At the outset I congratulate the minister on his recent elevation to the ministry. I am concerned about the recent reports of proposals for water rationing, and I ask: can the minister inform the House of proposals by the federal parliamentary secretary for water to ration household water allocations and the impact this may have on families and low-income earners?

Mr WALLACE: I thank the honourable member for Yeerongpilly for my first question in this place as a minister. I look forward to making a positive contribution to this place and serving in the best interests of all Queenslanders.

It seems that the federal parliamentary secretary for water and member for Wentworth, Malcolm Turnbull, has all the answers when it comes to water. He says that Queensland should take water from northern New South Wales, although northern New South Wales seems to have little extra capacity and little enthusiasm for sharing. He wants water infrastructure privatised and says that consumers should pay much more for the commodity.

The member for Wentworth also wants an urban water trading scheme with every household given a water allocation or ration. Households which do not use all their ration could onsell it to heavy water users. However, families using more than their ration would have to pay for extra water, and extra water would be more expensive, especially when it comes to sources such as desalination plants.

The member for Wentworth also believes urban water is too cheap and should rise by up to 33 per cent. The member for Wentworth is about gain for the powerful and about pain for ordinary people. Low-income groups, including the elderly, may struggle to pay for increasingly expensive water. Mr Speaker, I know that in the electorate that you represent, the good people of Garbutt, Kurrajong and Railway Estate in South Townsville, will feel the pinch especially hard if they have to pay more for their water. They may even try to save money by selling their water at the expense of their health and their yards. In contrast, the wealthy will be able to get more water by buying up allocations of other householders and paying for the extra, more expensive water. It will give us water haves and water have-nots.

Queenslanders did not come down in the last shower. We will not have a bar of this grab for our water. The member for Wentworth wants to give water to the highest bidder including big corporations and multimillionaires just like himself. The low-income Olivers will be left holding out their water buckets saying, 'Please, sir, can I have some more?'

The Beattie government will stand up for Queensland families and their rights to water. The Howard government has stolen our work rights; it now wants to steal our water rights. The member for Wentworth's statements are big on media appeal but unfair and unworkable in practice. The member for Wentworth, a former merchant banker, wants to corporatise water, to make it a tradable commodity in our households. The Beattie government believes that water is a necessity of life and that everyone should have equal access to it. I will stand behind the Premier and I will fight for the householders of Queensland so that we can have access to our water.

Queensland Health, Medical Radiation Professionals

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health. I refer to the issue of medical radiation professionals employed by Queensland Health who are threatening to resign en masse on 29 December, and I ask: if pay rises are given to medical radiation professionals, can the minister confirm that they will not be given for at least 12 months, as the Deputy Premier has said? Have there been any cancer patients who have had their course of cancer radiation treatment—which takes some weeks—delayed due to uncertainty about the potential resignations? Finally, why is the minister treating MRPs differently to doctors and nurses in terms of remuneration increases?

Mr ROBERTSON: I thank the honourable member for the question. If I was to provide advice to the member for Surfers Paradise in coming into the health portfolio, it would be to consult with his predecessor. If he had done so he would have found out that that Queensland government's approach with respect to the current dispute with allied health professionals was actually supported by the Leader of the Liberal Party—that is, the member's predecessor actually supported our approach.

If one wanted to play politics they would take the position that the member has taken—going for rank populism as he chooses to do. The simple fact is that the member's predecessor actually understood the process that we had put in place to resolve the issues that are of concern to medical radiation professionals. That is why yesterday the representatives of the MRP group and the registered union, the Miscellaneous Workers Union, along with Queensland Health, appeared before the Deputy President of the Queensland Industrial Commission. That compulsory conference will resume tomorrow where further issues will be explored. That, as the member has quite properly said, is the environment in which these issues should be resolved.

Queensland Health has taken an appropriate position to date—that is, we have listened to the concerns of the medical radiation professionals. That is why we reached agreement with respect to their EB6 deal earlier this year which provided four per cent per annum increases plus a range of other benefits including various allowances. That is also why, in listening to their concerns, we decided to offer them a two-year agreement instead of a three-year agreement to allow negotiations under the EB framework to be opened up 12 months in advance of what it would otherwise have been.

We have not ignored their concerns. In fact, in reaching agreement with the Miscellaneous Workers Union in terms of that timetable for how their outstanding claims can be handled, the Miscellaneous Workers Union put that question to their membership and they voted overwhelmingly in favour of it. The timetable that is before us to resolve those issues of medical radiation professionals has, in fact, been endorsed by those medical radiation professionals themselves in a ballot conducted by their registered union, the Miscellaneous Workers Union.

I hope that as a result of the conference hearings yesterday and, indeed, tomorrow the issues that are of concern to that group of our workforce will be resolved. We do value their contribution. We want them to stay with us, but we need to resolve those concerns in an appropriate industrial context, and that is what we are committed to.

Global Warming

Mr McNAMARA: My question is to the Minister for Mines and Energy. Much has been said in recent times about the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and it seems like everybody from Al Gore to the diners at the Hervey Bay RSL now have concerns about global warming. Can the minister please advise the House what steps the state government has taken or is taking to address this very important issue?

Mr WILSON: I thank the member for the question. How we deal with greenhouse gas emissions is undoubtedly an extremely important policy issue not just here in Queensland but Australia-wide and internationally. I am pleased to be able to say that the Queensland government is on the front foot in dealing with sustainable energy solutions and pursuing them. We are investing in a range of initiatives to encourage further development of renewable energy generation. We have committed to buy green energy to the value of $1.4 million a year. We are developing geothermal resources—five exploration permit applications were received earlier this year for western Queensland leases. There is also our world-leading 13 per cent gas scheme which requires retailers and other large electricity users to source at least 13 per cent of their electricity from gas-fired generation. There is also more than 3,000 megawatts of gas-fired generation projects at various stages of development in Queensland.

We are also investing in a range of other initiatives. There is the Windy Hill wind farm on the Atherton Tablelands. We also have the first wet geothermal power station in Birdsville, the Swanbank B Power Station landfill gas supply. We are developing biomass cogeneration facilities in Gympie and other places as well as gas-fired cogeneration plants. There is Queensland's first trial solar farm at Windorah, potentially saving 100,000 litres of diesel and up to 350 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year. We are phasing out broadscale clearing, which the National Party opposed strenuously in this place, delivering more than a 20 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions here in Queensland. The GOC Stanwell is investing in the world's first project for construction of a coal-fired station that will produce near zero emission base load capacity. We are investing $300 million just in Queensland for developing sustainable clean coal technology compared with the federal government's $500 million for the entire country.

A government member: It's a disgrace.

Mr WILSON: It is a disgrace and they ought to be lifting their game in a very big way. We are also actively investigating carbon capture and storage technology. We are leading the field in the adoption of high-efficiency technology to reduce carbon emissions by operating power generation facilities using steam pressures that are much higher than are used in traditional coal-fired power stations. The new Kogan Creek power station, which is expected to be operational in the second half of next year, will be adopting that technology.

These new low-emission technologies are attracting national and international investment and interest as a means of reducing emissions worldwide. Queensland, indeed, is on the front foot.

Nerang, Fire Station

Mr MALONE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister inform the House of progress on the government's election promise of a new fire station at Nerang? Is it not true that the government's candidate, Phil Gray, and his supporters, including the Premier and the Deputy Premier, promised Labor would build a new fire station? I table a copy of Labor's election flyer promising a $1.33 million fire station at Nerang next to a photograph of the Premier and the Deputy Premier.

Tabled paper: Photocopy of a 2006 ALP election leaflet titled 'Our Plan for Gaven'.

This flyer was direct mailed to every voter in Gaven. Can the minister now inform the House when and where the fire station will be built, given that the member for Gaven promised that the station would be built within 12 months on a site that had already been selected, or was that a total lie to ensure his election?

Mr PURCELL: I would like to thank the member for the question. It is estimated that the construction of the Nerang fire station will be completed in this term of government—and it will. We have a block of land at the moment at Nerang that was bought for a fire station some time ago. I have been informed by the commissioner and other people in our department that it is inappropriate. It is situated on a very high hill and so it would be difficult to deliver a station there. The road access is also not good. So I have asked the department to look for another site. Before we can deliver a station, first of all we need to have a site.

We are out looking for a site at the moment. When we find that site we will consult not only with the local member but also with the community and we will make sure that our firefighters are very happy that they can respond from that site as they are required to do.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Mansfield I again welcome to the public gallery another group of teachers and students from the Wilston State School in the electorate of the Premier.

Bowel Cancer

Mr REEVES: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I refer to the fact that over 850 Queenslanders die each year from bowel cancer, and I ask: when will Queenslanders be able to take advantage of the national bowel cancer screening program jointly established by the Commonwealth and state governments?

Mr ROBERTSON: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am pleased to report that Queensland was the first state to commence the new national bowel cancer screening program. We are also the only state to have committed funds specifically dedicated to support the statewide rollout of this program. The federal government has congratulated Queensland for the leadership we have shown on this initiative.

From this week, Brisbane residents in the eligible age groups will get their first chance to receive a free test kit under the program joining those from the Mackay region who have taken part in the past few months. The state government has committed some $10.4 million to progressively roll out this program across the state over the next two years. Health ministers in all states and territories have agreed to implement the program in collaboration with the federal government.

The reason we are doing this is quite simple: bowel cancer is currently the most common cancer in Queensland men and women. In 2004 there were 2,486 new cases of bowel cancer, and 857 people died from the disease in Queensland alone. Those aged over 50 years are most at risk. Queenslanders turning either 55 or 65 between 1 May 2006 and 30 June 2008 and those who participated in the pilot program a few years ago will receive invitations in the mail sometime between now and the end of June 2008. Invitation kits will include a faecal occult blood test to be completed in the privacy of people's homes. Participants then send the completed sample to the contracted pathology laboratory for screening. All participants will receive the results in the mail. Those with a positive test will be advised to contact their general practitioner for referral and appropriate follow-up such as a colonoscopy.

We are appropriately phasing in this program with invitations starting in different areas during the next five months. Around 200,000 Queenslanders will initially be invited to complete a test as part of phase one. It is crucial that the screening program is introduced slowly so we can ensure that services such as colonoscopies are able to meet increased demands, particularly in regional areas.

I encourage everyone who is invited to take a test to take the time to carry it out, particularly men who can have a tendency to ignore their own health. Our government is committed to making sure this program is run effectively right across Queensland. Most importantly, I look forward to seeing reductions in the number of Queenslanders who die prematurely and unnecessarily from bowel cancer each and every year.

Health Quality and Complaints Commission

Mr FOLEY: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I have received a number of complaints recently alluding to the fact that the new rebadged Health Rights Commission is simply just the Queensland government investigating Queensland Health. Would the minister be able to give me an indication of how many adverse findings have been made against Queensland Health by the new entity as a percentage of the number of claims it has investigated?

Mr ROBERTSON: I thank the honourable member for the question. Off the top of my head I obviously do not have a detailed response that I could provide to the member. I can say that the Health Quality and Complaints Commission is dedicated to publishing in a quite open and transparent way the data that the honourable member is seeking.

I think it needs to be appreciated that the Health Quality and Complaints Commission has only been up and running for some four or five months. It is a bit early to be releasing that data, as committed as we are to that data. I would simply refer the member to the recently tabled annual report of the Health Quality and Complaints Commission's predecessor, the Health Rights Commission, to get an idea of the number of cases that have been dealt with in the past.

I was informed by the Health Quality and Complaints Commissioner last week that the number of cases it is dealing with are trending around the same number as were dealt with by the Health Rights Commission. That perhaps gives a very general indication of how things are going. It is early days yet. I can assure the honourable member that the release of that data will be open, transparent and timely into the future.

Mr SPEAKER: That completes question time.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Ministerial Accountability

Mr SEENEY (Callide—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.00 pm): Ministerial accountability and secrecy under the Beattie government have reached a new low point. Unfortunately, the people of Queensland will not be surprised that it is the Beattie Labor government which passed legislation in this place to make it legal for ministers to lie to parliament. In fact, parliament was recalled to pass that legislation. The government needed to pass that legislation because the last eight years of the Beattie government have been characterised by a litany of Labor ministers and members telling lies, denying lies and eventually being caught out.

Let me remind those opposite of the distinguished list of their members who fall into this happy band of crooks and conmen. There was Bill D'Arcy, Jim Elder, Mike Kaiser, Grant Musgrove, Merri Rose, Liddy Clark, Ray Hollis, Robert Poole and now, of course, Gordon Nuttall—and they are the ones that got caught.

The latest loan affair typifies this government's approach to accountability, ministerial integrity and secrecy. Today we see the standard cycle of spin and deceit. We need to clarify what this latest affair was about. It is high time that the so-called loan affair be known for what it is. The loans that members and the rest of Queensland are familiar with require repayments and interest payments to be made. This particular loan has no interest payments and no repayments.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr English): Order! I remind the honourable Leader of the Opposition of the ruling of the Speaker this morning. Move off this topic.

Mr SEENEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is safe ground for me to say that any of us in this parliament receiving a good salary would be quite welcome as customers of any bank in Queensland. None of us needs to get an undeclared loan unless we have something to hide.

The Premier is determined to shield his government and the former members of his cabinet from any scrutiny whatsoever. This is not the Smart State; it is the secret state. The Beattie government will do anything and say anything to avoid accountability. Look at the government's actions when this latest affair was exposed. The first response from the Premier was to bolt. He hastily scampered off overseas on a trade mission, which was arranged at the last minute, so that he could protect himself from any fallout. He got out of it. He cut and ran.

Left carrying the can the Acting Premier's tough stance was to seek assurances—whatever that means—from current ministers about payments they might have received. On returning, the Premier's king hit on accountability and corruption was this so-called eyeballing solution. We found out this morning that he did not even carry that out. He talked about eyeballing his ministers, but the member for Toowoomba North confirmed what we all knew when the Premier answered the question. The Premier has not eyeballed his ministers at all.

Mr SHINE: On a point of order. At no point did I say any such thing other than confirm that—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Will the minister please resume his seat. I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SEENEY: We know what the member for Toowoomba North did not say. What was important was what he did not say. What have this government and this Premier got to hide? That is the question that the people of Queensland want answered. What is this government trying to hide? What is being hidden by this whole affair?

At the time the Acting Premier made much mileage out of handing the CMC cabinet documents that she said related to Macarthur Coal. But there were countless other decisions that cabinet made that possibly could have been influenced by the business interests of the businessman who gave the loan. There was extensive interest in hotel and gaming licences and property developments.

A lot of other companies besides Macarthur Coal were involved. A quick look at those companies shows how complex their business dealings are and also shows the opportunities for them to be involved with government. Are the decisions that involved all of those companies being investigated by the CMC? The assurance that the parliament needs this afternoon and the assurance that the people of Queensland need is that all of those companies, all of those decisions, are being investigated.

All of these questions and the complexity of the matters, the proven secrecy of the Beattie government and the drip feed of revelations also show the need for the CMC to hold public hearings so that we can get to the bottom of this issue. We have seen the benefit and the role that public hearings played in getting to the truth involving past Beattie government cover-ups—cover-ups like the electoral rorting inquiry, the health inquiry and the Gold Coast City Council inquiry. The CMC needs to give other people in the community the opportunity to come forward with information. That information needs to be tested in the full glare of a public hearing.

Again, if the Premier were so confident and if the Premier were so up-front about the integrity of his government he would welcome such public hearings. Given that the chance of having public hearings is remote—I do not think the Premier is going to do the obvious—the least he could do is prove that his current and former ministers are squeaky clean. He should be seeking written assurances that they are not involved in similar deals to the one that has caused the latest controversy. Again, none of us should hold our breath.

Members will notice that there is one constant in all of this. The constant is the Premier's ability and determination to protect his ministers, particularly former ministers, from any sort of scrutiny—ministers who sat around the cabinet table at the same time, factional mates and, by the Premier's own admission, ministers whom he had hand-picked and had far more influence than some of the others. The shielding of former ministers leads to only one conclusion: there is something to hide in this Beattie Labor government. There is something corrupt that the government is trying to hide. What we have seen is the tip of a corruption iceberg.

The point that I have made over and over again should not be missed. If a junior minister who it is claimed had no influence was able to get a loan of hundreds of thousands of dollars, what other loans were available to more senior ministers?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr English): Order! Leader of the Opposition, you have been warned on a number of occasions this morning to avoid compromising the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee. I remind you yet again.

Mr SEENEY: A quick review of the former minister's entry in the pecuniary interests register is revealing. Revealing is the complete lack of information that is provided by so many former ministers. There is a list of former ministers whose details in the pecuniary interests register are minimalist indeed. They include people like Terry Mackenroth, Lesley Clark, Henry Palaszczuk and current members like Gary Fenlon and Dean Wells. All have provided very minimal information.

Let us look at Terry Mackenroth as an example. According to entries in the pecuniary interests register, after a long career in the parliament he managed to hold one asset—a 50 per cent share in a family home. He only paid off the mortgage in 2004. In all that time he did not manage to keep one other asset that he declared to the parliament. That is the sort of declaration that we get from Labor ministers. There was not one other asset.

It is simply ridiculous to suggest that any former minister had no other assets besides a half share in his family home. What did he do? Did he give the money away, hide it under the bed or, the more plausible of answers, fudge the entries in the pecuniary interests register? That is the only explanation. There is no way in the world that anyone could be expected to believe that people who have been in this place for that length of time have nothing to declare, yet that is what we are being asked to believe.

On retirement, however, the property developers could not wait to sign him up on boards around town. Achievements in making wise and astute investments were obviously not needed as part of the experience required for those jobs. All of these inconsistencies raise questions. They raise questions that need to be answered, and the Premier does not even think that it is necessary to check with former members to confirm the veracity of those final arrangements. This is despite the fact that some former members—

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Comments by Member for Callide

Hon. DM WELLS (Murrumba—ALP) (12.10 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that my pecuniary interest register, including that of other members, might not be correct. I assure the honourable member and members of the House that it is correct and that I own no property other than that declared.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Ministerial Accountability

Mr SEENEY (Callide—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.10 pm), continuing: When it comes to former Beattie government ministers, it is ask no questions and they tell no lies. That is the policy that the Premier has adopted: ask no questions and they tell no lies. It is high time Peter Beattie asked the hard questions. It is high time he asked the questions that are begging to be asked. If the Premier is serious about improving ministerial accountability in the wake of the latest revelations, he should immediately support the stance that I have taken and outlined this morning. He should allow the CMC to hold public hearings.

Prawn Industry

Ms JARRATT (Whitsunday—ALP) (12.11 pm): I bring to the attention of the House a matter that is of concern to the people of Queensland. I have participated in six of more than 40 meetings that have occurred in recent weeks from Cape York to the Queensland-New South Wales border in relation to the review of the Queensland East Coast Inshore Finfish Fishery. I want to thank all of the industry members and recreational fishers who participated in these many meetings right along the coast of this state. I attended meetings right throughout my electorate and all of them were well attended. During the meetings the department of fisheries canvassed a wide range of views, all of which will be taken into account in the development of the consequent management plan for the fishery.

While it is true that there were some divergent views expressed between the groups of professional or commercial fishers and recreational fishers, it is also true to say that there was a great deal of agreement. One area of agreement which was raised at nearly all of the meetings I attended was an expression of concern about the importation of green or raw prawns for use as both bait and culinary purposes. This is a serious issue which has been under consideration by the federal government through Biosecurity Australia for some time. However, Queensland can no longer wait for Biosecurity Australia to take stronger quarantine measures on imported raw prawns. We now have evidence that the continued support of the importation of these prawns constitutes a real and serious risk to the Queensland fisheries industry.

Test results from the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries sampling of imported products has had some startling results. Five batches of uncooked imported prawns purchased from a Queensland supermarket were recently tested for white spot syndrome virus and Taura syndrome virus. Each batch tested positive for WSSV and two batches tested positive for TSV. As a consequence of these results, further samples were taken from different supermarkets in different locations. Of the six further samples, all returned positive results for WSSV and three of the six returned positive results for TSV. The Australian Animal Health Laboratory in Geelong has confirmed the results of the viral tests undertaken by the DPIF. Both the federal minister and the Secretary to the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry have been informed of these results and Queensland has requested that the federal minister take urgent action through DAFF.

What we are asking for and what this would mean is a product withdrawal from retail outlets nationally and an immediate ban on the importation of uncooked prawn products until such time as the security of the Australian industry is no longer jeopardised. This request is not new and it does not come out of the blue, nor is it isolated in the national context. Queensland's test results follow the recent testing of imported prawns in Western Australia which also were positive for WSSV and TSV. The Queensland, Western Australian and Northern Territory governments and industry itself through the Queensland Seafood Industry Association have been extremely vocal in their opposition to these raw prawn products. Species of farmed and wild populations of Australian prawns are susceptible to white spot syndrome virus, yellowhead disease and TSV, and these diseases are highly likely to be found in imported uncooked prawn products.

While these prawn diseases will not harm humans, they have the potential to cause severe damage to the financial viability of the wild and farmed prawn industries. If imported uncooked prawns are used as bait or berley by recreational fishers, disease could be spread to our prawn stocks. Imported prawn food scraps dumped in creeks, rivers or the ocean will also threaten to infect native prawn stocks. These test results have provided unequivocal support for the stand the Queensland government has taken with regard to green prawn imports. Over the past two years the Queensland government has been calling on the Australian government to ban imported green prawns to protect Australia's fish and other marine stocks from the risk of disease. These results will now form the basis of the Queensland government's response to the revised import risk analysis for prawn and prawn products announced last week by Biosecurity Australia. While the conclusions in the IRA released last week recommended strengthening quarantine measures, action has to be taken now—not in 90 days time when the consultation period has ended. The Commonwealth, through Biosecurity Australia and AQIS, is responsible for guaranteeing that our industries are not endangered by imported products. The Commonwealth must take these results and Queensland's recommendations seriously and act now.

Stafford Electorate, Department of Housing Land

Mr HINCHLIFFE (Stafford—ALP) (12.15 pm): During this morning's ministerial statement the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport tabled his determination on a long-running controversy in my electorate. For well over 10 years 6.4 hectares of government owned land at 818 Rode Road in Stafford Heights has been subject to uncertainty fuelled by some understandable NIMBYism and a lot of politics. Today we have a clear determination about the future of the site and, frankly, a win-win outcome for the community as a whole.

Blue Care's aged care and other facilities will assist in addressing an outstanding need on our part of the north side. With 16.7 per cent aged over 70 years, my constituents have been calling for more facilities which provide opportunities for graduated care options. The minister's approval will provide 192 general nursing care beds alongside 36 serviced apartments and 164 assisted living units. Equally, these numbers are down on the original proposal which was rejected by Brisbane City Council. A reduction of 64 beds, a halving of the number of apartments and 16 fewer units means that the genuine concerns of many immediate neighbours to the site have been addressed. The significant reduction of the site's gross floor area down from 70 per cent to 60 per cent goes to underscore that local residents's concerns about the scale of the development and the probable traffic impacts have indeed been heard and dealt with.

I thank all of the local residents, both those who supported and those who opposed the Blue Care facility, for being involved in an important issue for the whole of the north side. Knowing their positions on this site well, I am sure that some local residents will not be happy with the outcome. However, I am equally sure that Blue Care will be disappointed about some of the conditions. While the site has been partly cleared and has been set aside for development for many, many decades—originally planned for the Chermside West state school—concerns have been raised about the environmental impact of development. Looking at it quickly, the minister's decision commits Blue Care to address key environmental concerns by reducing the building footprint to well less than 50 per cent of the site and re-establishing the missing link to the much-loved and widely valued Raven Street Reserve. This is a balanced positive outcome that I am sure the majority of the community will support.

Unfortunately, the controversy over the site has the fingerprints of opportunistic Liberal politicians all over it. Some 13 years ago they opposed the proposal which included public housing. Some 10 years ago the then Liberal housing minister and the local Liberal councillor supported private residential development of 100 per cent of the site while not telling the locals who had supported their earlier campaign. More recently, the Liberals in council have broken their election commitment to buy the land off the state. At the same time, they have supported clear-felling of land a few hundred metres along Rode Road. Over the same period state Labor has remained honest with the community and sought a good outcome for a range of competing interests. The completed sale will now allow the Department of Housing to inject much-needed funds into the north side for affordable housing, and I thank the minister for housing for his continued commitment throughout this controversy.

I welcome the decision and I look forward to seeing more local residents enjoying their advanced years in their own communities, maintaining their social networks and accessing local services. I also place on record the outstanding commitment of the former member for Stafford, Terry Sullivan, in support of his constituents, particularly his aged constituents and their families who are quite concerned about how they would be able to age gracefully in their own communities. He stood up for his constituents with great passion, and I am sure that that is recognised by the whole House.

Mr REEVES: He was extremely passionate about it.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: He was extremely passionate about it. I acknowledge the interjection of the member for Mansfield. I place on record my support for the decision made by the minister. It provides a win-win outcome for the whole community. I hope that the community will acknowledge it.

Prep Year

Mr COPELAND (Cunningham—NPA) (12.20 pm): As members of this parliament are aware, next year a full-time, non-compulsory preparatory year, or prep as it is known, will be introduced into the Queensland education system. This new school year aims to lift the compulsory school starting age, bringing Queensland largely into line with the rest of the states in Australia. Preschool will be abolished from 2007.

Through successful marketing by this government, the introduction of prep has been embraced by many parents across the state hoping to give their children every chance for the future. While the Queensland coalition has been wholly supportive of this new school year, on many occasions in this Parliament it has expressed serious concern about the way in which this Labor government has planned and budgeted for our children's educational future. Of particular concern to the Queensland coalition has been the failure of the Beattie government to ensure full-time teacher aides for prep classrooms and the inflexible enrolment age cut-offs that have been applied. Despite many calls by concerned parents,

teachers, teacher aides, early childhood specialists, the coalition and now the children's commissioner, not to mention the overwhelming findings expressed in the prep year trial report, this government still refuses to provide full-time teachers aides for prep. It has failed to ensure the safety, comfort and learning of our children and teachers through the employment of full-time teacher aides.

Time does not permit me to detail for parliament some of the stories that unfolded during the prep year trial in Queensland, but there is a genuine safety concern for each and every child attending prep next year, unless full-time teacher aides are in the classroom to support all class teachers. It is simply negligence on behalf of this government to place teachers in full-time care of approximately 25—or more—4½ year old students, teaching a play based curriculum without the full-time assistance of another suitably qualified adult.

With regards to the inflexible enrolment age cut-offs that this government has applied for prep next year, I was pleased to learn that the majority of children born in 2001 who made special application for enrolment in prep have been successful. However, approximately 10 per cent of 2001 born children who applied, that is roughly 400, were not successful. I ask the government whether this process has, indeed, been a fair one in what is supposed to be a universally available year of education. Parents should still be given the right to determine, in consultation with their child's school principal, when their child is ready to start school. What is in the best interests of each individual child must be the primary concern.

Children born in the latter half of 2002 have also been disadvantaged by this government's approach to how prep would successfully be implemented in Queensland. The government has failed to recognise that children who are cognitively and developmentally ready to commence their education should be able to do so. In 2007, prep will only be available to a half cohort of 2002 born children, those born between 1 January and 30 June of that year. There will be ramifications from this half cohort within the state's government and non-government education system for the next 13 or 14 years.

In representing to the minister the concerns of parents of children born in the second half of 2002, I have not been comforted by the minister's response. The minister has explained that, although early entry into prep next year is not available for children born in the latter half of 2002, parents can enrol their children in 2008. At that time, if the principal of their child's prep school considers it the best educational option for the relevant child, the principal can accelerate that child's enrolment into year 1. Practically, what this nonsensical solution means is that those children will bypass the prep year altogether. Surely the best solution is to do what is best for each individual child next year, that is 2007, and not the year after, which is 2008.

Yesterday I convened a forum at Parliament House with a group of parents and early childhood professionals regarding their well-founded concerns about prep. Aside from the issues that I have already canvassed, another significant concern expressed was the government's chronic lack of foresight and planning with general resources. I was told—and have access to correspondence direct from schools confirming this—that schools have had to plea with the local community for people to give of their time, their old toys and even money to ensure that their local prep schools are sufficiently resourced for next year. Some P&Cs are fundraising to provide full-time teacher aides in their prep classes next year. Parents have been willing to contribute to ensure that the learning and safety of their children is not jeopardised, but is it acceptable that the government, the provider of education in this Smart State, abdicates its responsibility to the community to ensure that our schools are adequately resourced?

There are fundamental questions for the educational future of our children. Every child should, indeed, be given every chance for the future. It is time that the government delivered on its own promise.

Australian Wheat Board; Queensland Aviation Industry

Mr McNAMARA (Hervey Bay—ALP) (12.26 pm): If the Howard government has one outstanding characteristic, it is its ability to look the other way while a small hot spot slowly turns into a bushfire and eventually becomes an inferno, and at that point declare that it never saw it coming and that it is not to blame. This week saw the release of the findings of the Cole royal commission into the dealings of AWB in Iraq. Those findings will stand as a monument to the ability of the federal government's three blind mice, Howard, Vale and Downer, to remain blissfully and officially unaware and uninformed about matters of the most serious import to the national interest, while warnings swirled around them for years.

The bribery of Sadam Hussein with $290 million of Australian wheat farmers' money as the federal government did its best imitation of an ostrich is now history. Today I raise a different but nevertheless vitally important issue that, if left untended by the federal government, will also have far-reaching impacts right across the economy. I refer to the changes that are currently underway in the international aviation industry.

The Queensland government is working to establish Queensland as a major aviation and aerospace hub for the Asia-Pacific region. In excess of 6,000 skilled aviation jobs have been created so far as a direct result of government investment action and industry facilitation activities.

Companies such as Boeing, Virgin Blue, Smiths Aerospace and Australian Aerospace now call Queensland home. As a result of those companies now delivering on multi-million dollar world-class aerospace projects, Queensland is widely regarded as the centre of the Australian aerospace industry.

The Department of State Development is supporting business growth by assisting aviation firms to achieve greater access to global supply chains and developing regional aviation networks in such places as Cairns, Wide Bay, the Sunshine Coast and Brisbane. To further support smaller aviation firms, the department is also providing $1.8 million over three years to assist those firms to upgrade business systems, adopt new technology, develop new products and undertake marketing.

However, the commitment of the Beattie government to growing aviation needs to be matched by a federal government that is alert to the issues that are confronting aviation worldwide. The international aviation industry has been losing $US1 million per hour every hour for the past five years. It has lost about $US45 billion worldwide since 2001. Fifty per cent of the US airline industry has filed for bankruptcy, including 'top six' airlines, Delta, United and Northwest Airlines.

While world travel numbers have grown by 34 per cent over the past 10 years, that growth has been driven by a 30 per cent drop in airfares. However, fuel prices have now put a stop to the capacity of the industry to keep price cutting. The industry that brought globalisation to the world is now facing its own shake out and the implications for Australia, and our tourism industry in particular, are immense.

Australia relies on international aviation to deliver 99 per cent of the five million foreign tourists who come to our shores every year. International and domestic tourism is absolutely vital to the future of my electorate of Hervey Bay. The story in Hervey Bay recently has been a very good one, with the number of visitors arriving by air up 66 per cent on the first quarter of this year compared to the first quarter of 2005. That reflects the opening of jet links between Hervey Bay and Sydney. However, tourism across Australia is not going anywhere near as well. As was reported this week by the Tourism Forecasting Council, Australian domestic tourism declined by seven per cent last year and is only expected to grow by half a per cent per year to 2015.

Against these figures, Queensland has done very well to hold its share of total visitors at 23.4 per cent. But the risk to our international visitors base is real. The Northern Hemisphere airlines have continued to drop the long-haul destination of Australia one by one. Only British Airlines and Virgin Atlantic now fly to Australia from Europe, with KLM, Austrian and Lufthansa all giving the route away in recent years. That is why it has been so important that the Queensland government courted and won the support of Richard Branson and his Virgin Group.

What is the federal government doing? It has stood back with its hands in its pockets and watched Qantas get sucked into the storm that is now sweeping international aviation. It was mute when the ACCC said no to Qantas's attempts to shore up the Australia-New Zealand route with cooperative flights and scheduling with Air New Zealand. Australia needs a government that is driving transport integration, airport consolidation and regulatory reform to allow for both competition and route viability. Regrettably, we have Prime Minister 'Rip Van Winkle' and a federal cabinet full of ministers with their eyes wide shut.

Tarong Energy

Mr HOPPER (Darling Downs—NPA) (12.30 pm): I wish to draw the attention of the House to a proposal by Tarong Energy to run a conveyor belt, or a train line, from Acland coalmine in my electorate to Tarong Power Station. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that, except that the train line, or conveyor belt, would cut straight through the homes and facilities of two dairy farms, which are owned by the Vonhoff and Wieck families.

The plans for New Hope Coal and Tarong Energy were brought to my attention a few weeks ago. I have to say that when I sighted the map in question and the plans for the conveyor belt, or train line, I was simply horrified. I table that map and aerial photo of the proposed route.

Tabled paper: Map and aerial photograph.

The key point is that instead of being sited in a direct route from the mine to the power station, the line, or conveyor belt, takes a five-kilometre deviation and runs straight through these two dairy farms.

I want to make my position on this matter clear. The Tarong Power Station needs a 25-year supply of coal to keep its turbines running so that we can all have electricity. We all know that power must be produced and generated in Queensland. There are a few options for Tarong Energy. One is to build this line, or conveyor belt, from Tarong to Acland. Another source of coal for the Tarong Power Station may be at Kunioon, which is just north of the Tarong Power Station. I understand that the coal in that area is being tested to see whether it will be suitable to burn. Another option would be for a rail line to be built through to Wilga Creek. About five or six years ago land for that line was sought and not one

compulsory acquisition of land was required in order to put that corridor in place. So credit must be given to those people who worked with the farmers who were involved in terms of the implementation of that proposed route.

I have been advised that no decisions will be made until June 2007. I have always had a brilliant working relationship with the Acland coalmine and I wish that relationship to continue. But this proposal to run a train line, or conveyor belt, straight through these two dairy farms is simply wrong. It means that the conveyor belt has to run an extra five kilometres. It also means the compulsory acquisition of these properties or the compulsory acquisition of the easements at taxpayers' expense.

My constituents believe that New Hope is deliberately wanting to acquire their farms to get their water allocations. Water is vital for the washing of coal and also for the Acland Pastoral Co., which was recently formed to make money from the land that was acquired around the mine. However, Acland has applied for a 10,000-head feedlot licence for a feedlot that will be situated on a neighbouring property to that of the two dairy farmers who are affected by this proposal. We all know how much water is needed for a feedlot. What better way to ruin a property than to build a train line straight through the house and dairy—actually, straight through the dining room?

The chances of the train line being positioned on these two neighbouring properties so that it goes directly through these houses, as it is shown on this map, would be a million to one. I smell a rat. I express my concerns for my two constituents. These properties are massive—over 1,000 acres each. That proposed train line will run right through their homes, a dairy and a harvest store.

This proposal needs to be questioned. Tarong Energy has advised me that there are a number of routes that could be feasible, yet no other map showing those routes has been produced. I asked Tarong Energy to show me a map of the other proposed routes. We have seen only the one map. If there are so many other routes that could be feasible, why have no other maps showing those routes been given to me?

If the proposed route that I am talking about ends up being the chosen route, as the local member it is my duty to refer this to the CMC for investigation. There seems to be so many other shorter routes that can be adopted without there being the need to destroy two family dairy farms. The Vonhoffs have planted 15,000 trees on their farm. The Wiecks have received many awards for their dairying. These people are third and fourth generation farmers. They are brilliant people who are doing a good job. They do not need this impost on them.

No doubt this train line has to be built, but it has to be done in a compassionate and sensible way. The train line can run along the boundaries of these two properties, which would cause very little angst to the people involved. We all agree that industry must be allowed to progress. I am very concerned about what I have seen on this map and the lack of consultation that has been conducted. I have been asked to call a public meeting. There is no sense in calling a public meeting until we know where the route is going.

Riverlink

Ms NOLAN (Ipswich—ALP) (12.35 pm): The Riverlink development which is currently being built at North Ipswich is the most significant development that Ipswich has seen for more than 20 years. Ironically, it is being built on the North Ipswich site that was planned by Ipswich's founding fathers to be CBD. Riverlink will change shopping in Ipswich.

For years the people and political leaders of Ipswich laboured over the decision as to whether or not Riverlink should proceed. On the downside was the strongly held concern that Riverlink would kill the existing CBD. On the other hand, there was the cold, hard truth that Ipswich's retail dollars were not going to the CBD now; they were going to Indooroopilly. In striking a balance between these considerations, the decision made by the council in early 2004 and subsequently endorsed in a state call-in was that Riverlink would go ahead if it linked well to town, such that Riverlink formed an extension, not an alternative, to the CBD.

That link was guaranteed with the development application including a condition that the developer, Leda, construct a pedestrian bridge linking Riverlink with the CBD. The bridge is to be built on the unused pylons on the eastern side of the existing railway bridge and must be built in such a way as to allow pedestrians to walk across without giving them access to the railway line itself. On the town side of the bridge, that is in the Ipswich electorate, there needs to be access to both the River Heart Parklands and Ellenborough Street. These conditions were a key factor in influencing the decision by many CBD traders to support, or at least tolerate, the Riverlink project.

For their part, the developers have never been particularly keen. Indeed, Leda's Allan Keast was reported in the *Queensland Times* on 17 March 2006 as claiming that the bridge would be a 'white elephant'. I am concerned that that lack of enthusiasm on the developer's part is now playing itself out as a lack of action on the construction of the bridge. Today, anyone who drives past the Riverlink site will see massive, somewhat ugly, concrete boxes emerging from the site. But on the bridge they will see no action at all.

The centre is due to open in March. So by late November, the people of Ipswich are rightly asking when they are going to see some action on the bridge. The building of the pedestrian bridge may not be a simple engineering or logistical matter. Accordingly, the Ipswich City Council, whose job it is to enforce the development conditions and who will ultimately own the pedestrian bridge, and Queensland Rail, who own the existing rail bridge, have met with Leda and have sought the design details that are necessary for approvals to be granted. It has been some time, but that detail has not been forthcoming.

Time is ticking away. It is now nearly December and Leda has still not met requests to provide plans, let alone had the bridge approved or started work. The council has the legal role of enforcing conditions, but I want to make it clear today that the bridge is a crucial condition for the CBD traders whom I represent and, indeed, for all the people of Ipswich. It is simply not negotiable. The mayor and I have discussed this matter and we agree that Riverlink should not open without the completion of the bridge. As such, I strongly urge the developers to get moving.

Water Supply

Mr ELMES (Noosa—Lib) (12.39 pm): I would like to spend the few minutes available to me to alert the House to yet more information regarding the self-imposed crisis of water supply to the south-east corner. Last week, the Mayor of Maroochy Shire Council, Joe Natoli, announced that he had offered the Queensland government 10 billion litres of class A recycled water that could be used in the south-east corner of the state every year, but as usual there was no response until the offer was made public and then only that the Premier wanted more information. But there is a lot more to this story.

Let us add to those 10 billion litres the three billion litres that the Noosa Council produces each year plus another nine billion litres from Caloundra and a further nine billion litres from Pine Rivers. All of this high-class recycled water goes into the creeks and rivers and the ocean. It is there and available but, as a result of continuing incompetence with infrastructure spending, it is poured down the collective drain.

Labor throws around figures like $1.7 billion to try to impress voters and at the same time destroy communities to build the disaster at Traveston Crossing, but what is it doing about moving the water around? The Deputy Premier stood up here this morning and talked about 240 kilometres of pipes worth $200 million. What she did not say in the media release that she put out on Friday last week was that the total contribution to moving recycled water, or water of any kind, around this state up until last Friday was just 60 kilometres of pipes.

We have a situation where all of this high-class recycled water is available to industry and the farming community right now. Meanwhile, the western pipeline and the other pipeline projects are little more than figments of the Premier and Deputy Premier's imagination. There is absolutely no action on a pipeline that could pump real water—up to 31 billion litres each year—to Brisbane and the south-east corner.

I note a quote from a spokeswoman for the Premier who, when asked about the 10 billion litres on offer from the Maroochy Shire Council, said, 'The transportation of 10 billion litres of water could provide logistical problems.' If the government cannot get its head around the movement of 10 billion litres of water from the Maroochy shire, how is it going to move 70 billion litres from the proposed Traveston Crossing Dam to Brisbane? But that is still not the whole story on water; it is not even close.

What about the 65 million litres of class A treated water that has been dumped into the Brisbane River every day since March—eight months ago—because of the Beattie government's incompetence in providing infrastructure? The government has known that the water would be available for the last two years. It is so clean that it is probably the only part of the Brisbane River where one can see the bottom. All of this recycled water from the one responsible arm of government in Queensland—our councils—could feed the power stations and industry and could provide for the needs of local farmers, and thereby the water in our dams could be kept for drinking.

There is more than one crisis in Queensland. There is a water crisis all right but there is also a crisis in the provision of government services, and it is not something that started yesterday; it started the day this government was first elected. The time is well and truly here when those opposite need to put some pipes in the ground, not from the Traveston Crossing site from the existing facilities to carry recycled water south—from Noosa in the north to Brisbane and from Brisbane to a completed western pipeline.

The stupidity that surrounds the performance of this government on water can be solved today if the government had the will to deliver the services to those who elected it. If this sad Labor government wanted to provide more good, clean drinking water it would abandon its plans for the Traveston Crossing Dam and raise the height of the existing Borumba Dam. And do you know what? Work could start on that today as well.

Nuclear Energy

Ms DARLING (Sandgate—ALP) (12.43 pm): I rise to express my deep concern at the lack of evidence to support safe and environmentally sensitive disposal of uranium waste. The uranium mining, processing and nuclear energy review draft report contains little assurance and, in fact, makes me question the Howard government's true valuation of nuclear energy.

The federal coalition has displayed its dodgy environmental credentials before, but never have I seen such a charlatan dressed up as a saviour. The Australian people need assurances. We cannot begin to travel a path to nuclear power without all the answers. How can 40 years of research tell us that nuclear waste will be safe if buried deep underground for 600 years? Polluting the soil to clean the air is such a stupid idea that I can only conclude that the Prime Minister's motives are either political or financial.

Touting the benefits of nuclear energy is not futuristic policy; it is short-sighted and self-serving. The federal government is encouraging the people of Australia to embrace an energy source that will cost 50 per cent more than current power options to reverse the effects of an environmental phenomenon it said was not real. Apparently, federal coalition members have now seen the movie and they are all believers in global warming. But I suspect they worship mammon, not mother earth.

Let me quote some discussion points on waste disposal from Ziggy's review. The report states—

Deep underground disposal in stable geological structures is seen as the most appropriate solution, but one which currently has the support of less than half of the citizens of the European Union.

But apparently nuclear powered governments overseas are finding ways to turn local opinion. Let me quote some more from this wonderful report. It states—

It is widely accepted that a host community should be compensated for accepting a facility which benefits an entire country.

Now this is sounding more like the federal government's tactics when trying to win the hearts and pockets of the Australian people. Let us read some more from this wonderful report. It states—

While a number of countries with significant nuclear industries are moving to build national High Level Waste repositories, this may be difficult in countries lacking suitable geology.

So the Northern Hemisphere countries are looking for stable nuclear dumping sites, preferably on the other side of the world. And I would wager that these wealthy countries would pay good money to the naive country willing to take the waste. But what is in it for us? Let me read another quote that will complete this ugly picture. The report states—

As national governments will have to accept the ultimate responsibility for international repositories, funding arrangements must ensure there is adequate compensation for accepting this liability.

Now we are starting to see a possible motive for the federal coalition's sudden concern for global warming. I call on the Howard government to come clean and explain what value it puts on the life, health and safety of the people of Australia. We will not prostitute ourselves to the nuclear powered countries of the world. We are not for sale.

In discussing what is claimed to be the best method of disposing of nuclear waste, the report commissioned by the Prime Minister states—

The combination of natural barriers and engineered barrier systems provides a long lasting passively safe system ensuring that significant radioactivity will not return to the surface environment, with no burden of care on future generations.

'No burden of care on future generations'! We are now in a crisis situation. The earth will not cope with our thirst for power. We cannot afford to keep making decisions on the 'best known science of the day' and leave future generations to clean up the mess. Mr Howard should put the money into some realistic evidence based research. Better still, he should put the money into renewable energy options for use domestically and to export to the world. Come to Queensland and talk to our world-class environmental scientists. Come and talk to our energy minister about smart alternatives. It is now time for the voice of the people to be heard. Members opposite should prove their loyalty to the people of Queensland and stand up for our health and safety.

I urge the young people of this country to let the Prime Minister know—loud and clear—what they think of being left with cleaning up the mistakes of politicians who refuse to break the cycle of disastrous environmental decision making. And I urge the traditional custodians of this land to let the Prime Minister know—loud and clear—how they feel about the disposal of radioactive materials within the heart of the country, down in the stomach of the mother that sustains us.

Queensland Health

Ms LEE LONG (Tablelands—ONP) (12.48 pm): Problems continue to plague our public hospital system in Queensland. We have heard many times about how various plans and strategies are in place to fix things. We have been told that there are record health budgets. And we have heard over and over again how things are changing for the better. Yet at the grassroots level nurses are still overworked, doctors are in short supply, specialists are difficult to find and even harder to access, there are not enough beds and people are still going untreated for longer than the recommended waiting times.

One of the worse examples of how overstressed the entire system is is when ambulances are forced to ramp up outside emergency departments at major hospitals, including Cairns. Not only is it a clear sign that emergency departments are failing to give people the basic care they need when they need it; ramping up is a terrible waste of scarce ambulance resources. We have been forced to pay an unfair ambulance tax on electricity accounts specifically to give this government the resources to provide the world's best ambulance service. What it seems we are getting more and more often is not the world's best ambulance system but the world's best mobile hospital waiting rooms. Problems multiply rapidly because these major Queensland hospitals cannot cope with the health needs of our increasing population. Ambulance officers get stuck ramping up with their patients on board and are unavailable to respond to other emergencies in their respective districts. Even fire crews are sometimes called on to administer oxygen and as a result are taken away from their main tasks. It is a lethal cocktail of problems.

The logjam needs to be broken and that needs to happen urgently. Five-year plans, future projections and so on are not making much, if any, difference at the grassroots level. What is worse, however, is that there appears to be very little being done to address long-term issues such as the acute shortage of Queensland Health professionals. The shortfall runs into hundreds and hundreds of doctors and allied health professionals each year in Queensland alone, yet this government is providing scholarships for a mere 50 doctors per year. I am certain that hundreds could be placed throughout Queensland for their training. As a state we are answering only a small percentage of the need. At a time of enormous budget surpluses it is an incomprehensible betrayal.

One of the short-term solutions of hiring overseas trained doctors in our public hospital system provides some temporary answers for communities desperate for local medical care. However, quite apart from the issue of medical standards there is another problem that is becoming more apparent and that is the language barrier. A doctor who is incomprehensible to a patient cannot explain what is going on, cannot provide treatment advice and cannot even properly discuss symptoms to make an accurate diagnosis of an illness or ailment and often does not even understand the Queensland health system. We do have a desperate need for doctors, nurses and allied health professionals but it is vital that those that we do get are able to function properly.

Questions also need to be raised about what guidelines Queensland Health staff are forced to operate under. Several recent incidents have cast serious doubt over some decisions. In one example a 99-year-old man who lives alone was taken to a hospital after having collapsed. He was examined and told to go home. He was not even put under one night's observation. He was not even given a reason for his collapse. The hospital was adamant that there were no beds available. However, after intervention by the medical superintendent lo and behold suddenly a bed was available and he was found to have a fever. I do not think that any kind of medical qualification is necessary to decide that a 99-year-old living alone who has been found collapsed on the floor would benefit from at least one night's observation.

In another case, an elderly lady was discharged from hospital and left no choice but to walk more than 20 kilometres to her home in another town with no public transport available. She was found by a passer-by who noticed her distressed condition, clutching her chest and struggling to make it up a hill in the searing, mid-afternoon sun. These kinds of events cry out for an urgent roll-out of the promised extra funding not in four or five years or even longer but immediately.

Algester Electorate, Infrastructure Boom

Ms STRUTHERS (Algester—ALP) (12.52 pm): I have boasted many times in this House that the Algester electorate is an economic and transport hub of south-east Queensland. Suburbs like Acacia Ridge and the growing commercial and industrial areas around Stapleton are producing a wealth of economic activity, and that simply means jobs, jobs, jobs.

I have great news for members in this House and the people in my local electorate: unemployment in Queensland is now at a record low of 4.3 per cent—in fact, the lowest ever on record since employment data was collected in its current form in 1978. The economic activity in my local area is generating many thousands of these jobs. Queenslanders now have the best chance in many years of getting jobs and building a decent quality of life. Under the coalition government that the Leader of the Opposition served in eight years ago, unemployment hovered dangerously around 10 per cent.

Labor has driven unemployment down to record lows and we have the lowest ever unemployment levels despite record population growth. The numbers of voters in my electorate is now up to about 32,907. The average in most electorates would be about 28,000. Algester is a very high growth area. The new suburbs of Parkinson and Forest Lake are all growing rapidly and are great communities with many good facilities for families. One of the problems is that this population growth means more demand on water, transport and social infrastructure.

The Premier, Peter Beattie, came to office in 1998 promising jobs, jobs, jobs. He has delivered record levels of unemployment in Queensland. He has delivered jobs, jobs, jobs. We will now have more roads, more water, more pipes and more rail services. Under this Beattie government we have an

unprecedented level of funding to infrastructure—levels that have never been seen in Queensland. The South-East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program provides a 10-year commitment to infrastructure to accommodate the many hundreds of thousands of people who are choosing to live in Queensland.

The projects in and around my local area that will benefit local people include the Centenary Interchange on the Ipswich Motorway. Residents in Forest Lake who have been speaking to me over many years about the congestion in peak times at that interchange are very relieved to hear that this project is getting underway. Another project is the Western Corridor Recycled Water Scheme and the announcement last week by the Deputy Premier and others enabling water for agriculture and industrial use to be piped from Oxley, Wacol and areas around my electorate into Ipswich treatment plants. There is also the duplication of the Gateway Bridge. Many people in my local area and many heavy vehicles using my local area need to have a good run through the Logan Motorway across to the Gateway Bridge and this duplication is very welcome. Many people are saying to me though that they want to see e-toll come in much more quickly in order to ease the times for that journey.

We have the new electricity substation on Learoyd Road at Acacia Ridge. Many people have been asking me, 'What is that space-like little station on Learoyd Road?' It is going to mean a much stronger electricity supply locally and a much more reliable electricity supply. Residents in Parkinson and other areas have complained to me over recent years about brownouts and problems with computers and equipment in their homes. This substation in Learoyd Road will improve electricity supply locally.

The passenger rail study has been kicked off; looking at a passenger rail through from Salisbury to Greenbank. Currently the Acacia Ridge to New South Wales border rail supports freight services only. It is another welcome infrastructure project that may come into fruition servicing my local area. The initial findings of the passenger rail study show that the corridor is technically suitable for commuter operations but more work needs to be done on potential patronage. It is great to see that public transport patronage is up. People are worried about petrol prices and are using public transport. I would hope that the feasibility of this passenger rail will be deemed possible and will be constructed into the future.

There is a lot happening in my local area. The new Trade and Technician Skills Institute at Acacia Ridge is a great new initiative meaning thousands of apprenticeships and traineeships will be offered in key skill shortage areas. All the best to Steve Ghost and his team. They have done a great job in setting up that new world-class centre. We are seeing the construction of a $30 million elective surgery centre at QEII Hospital—again, good news for local people who have been forced to wait longer than necessary on waiting lists. It is all good news for my local area.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 pm to 2.30 pm.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Ministerial Accountability

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (2.30 pm), by leave: Earlier this morning the Leader of the Opposition sank to a new low. He launched a cowardly attack on a number of former members who are no longer in a position to be able to defend themselves within this parliament. His accusations were false and misleading. If he made them outside this chamber I hazard a guess there would be a number of legal proceedings initiated.

Bizarrely, because some former members only listed a few items on their personal register of members' interests, the Leader of the Opposition infers that they are guilty of fudging or some form of improper behaviour or corruption. What an absurd and offensive suggestion! Is he suggesting that his own colleagues who have an interest in only one property have fudged their entries as well? I am sure that the member for Burnett, the member for Cunningham, the member for Toowoomba South, the member for Southern Downs and the former member for Robina would be just as offended as everyone else by the Leader of the Opposition's comments.

Let me say to the Leader of the Opposition: we are not millionaire graziers, we are not all wealthy landed gentry who believe they have born-to-rule rights. The reality is that there are some people who are humble Queenslanders who have been elected to this place, and I am happy to be their leader. As for the millionaires and the property owners over here—the landed gentry who think they have a divine right to rule—I say to the Leader of the Opposition that not everyone is as wealthy as he is and not everyone is as wealthy as the Leader of the Liberal Party, who is worth something like $50 million. Not everyone is in the financial category of the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I say to the Leader of the Opposition that if he is so brave he should go outside the House and repeat his claims. Do not be a coward, go outside and repeat them.

Mr Seeney: I did, at the press conference.

Mr BEATTIE: No, he did not. I have endeavoured to contact all the members and past members whom Mr Seeney slandered today. The member for Greenslopes, Gary Fenlon, says his entry in the pecuniary interests register is impeccable and based on advice that he received from his accountant, his lawyer, the Clerk of the Parliament and the Integrity Commissioner. The member for Murrumba has already corrected the Leader of the Opposition on the public record this morning. The former member for Inala has also rejected the accusations, stating that his entry was always 100 per cent correct and fully complied with the requirements of the pecuniary interests register. I understand that the former member for Chatsworth has already challenged the Leader of the Opposition to make his outrageous claims outside the House. Now is his day to do it. As I understand it, it is the registered—

Mr Seeney: I did, at the press conference.

Mr BEATTIE: What we hear is that the Leader of the Opposition backed off at a million miles an hour because he does not have the guts to stand up and repeat outside this parliament what he said in here.

Mr Seeney: I did so.

Mr BEATTIE: As I understand it, the register published in May 2004 showed Mr Mackenroth had a 50 per cent share in his Carina house and cheque accounts with the ANZ Bank. I understand that he bought a unit at the Sunshine Coast that was not included in the last published register on August 2005 because he had already retired. However, I have confirmed that Mr Mackenroth notified the Clerk of this purchase in line with the appropriate guidelines, and the details of that investment were publicly available. Mr Mackenroth has authorised their release and the Clerk has just confirmed it. I hope the Leader of the Opposition takes up Mr Mackenroth's challenge to repeat his accusations outside the chamber.

Mr Seeney: What about the accusations you made before?

Mr BEATTIE: I doubt he will have the guts, but I hope he does so.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr O'Brien): Order! The Leader of the Opposition will cease interjecting.

Mr BEATTIE: The Leader of the Opposition should remember that not everyone—and I want to repeat this—is as well off as him or the Liberal Party leader with their extensive interests in real estate, shares and other investments, nor does everyone inherit family money or find themselves in the fortunate position of accumulating wealth over generations. The Leader of the Opposition should also know that many members divest themselves of interests before they enter parliament to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, which is what I did. I sold my share portfolio at a loss and I invested it in managed funds. I did so because I do not believe in conflicts of interest.

The Leader of the Opposition needs to get out of the gutter. Our government has some of the most stringent and open accountability processes in the country. I made it clear that I expect the highest possible standards from my government and I expect the highest possible standards from those who are part of my caucus. I was as shocked as anyone by the behaviour of Gordon Nuttall. The matter is now before the CMC and will be dealt with in due course.

Talking about general matters—and I will refer to general matters involving Gordon Nuttall—I have made it clear to the party secretary that I want a process begun for his expulsion. I will ensure and insist that he is expelled from the Labor Party. The reason for that is very simple. It has nothing to do with the specific matters that may be raised by the CMC—and I remind members that I referred the matter to the CMC; no-one else did that, not the Leader of the Opposition, I did it. I will move for his expulsion because he did not comply with the register; he did not comply with the rules of this parliament. While I am leader anyone who does not comply with those rules will be expelled.

Moving back to the issue, I asked cabinet and caucus members not to deal with Mr Nuttall. As I have indicated, I have spoken to the party secretary. The question was asked, 'What did I do when I returned?' I raised this matter in cabinet, as I said publicly, and the Leader of the Opposition knows that. I raised the issue with every member of cabinet in that cabinet room. Everybody understands that I will be doing it on an annual basis. I will be writing to Government members to follow up the cabinet decision. My position was confirmed by cabinet. Secondly, I will be tabling in this House on an annual basis the gift register, which will be extended to shadow ministers as well as ministers.

I want to say a couple of other quick things about this. In terms of appropriate behaviour, what is important is that we set high standards here. High standards mean that if anyone misbehaves, they are dealt with appropriately by the leader and by the parliament or the CMC or anyone else. What is also important, though, is that we do not set out to try to denigrate innocent individuals by some sort of attempt to smear people simply on the basis that they are not as wealthy as the Leader of the

Opposition. That is what happened today. I think it is disgraceful that the Leader of the Opposition came in here with not one skerrick of evidence against any of these individuals and sought to somehow besmirch their name because of the fact that they were humble Queenslanders and not that well off. What sort of an attack is that? The reality is that if the Leader of the Opposition had some information, why did he not table it? He had nothing new. If it were not for the *Courier-Mail* he would have nothing to say. If it were not for the *Courier-Mail* and the television networks he would have nothing to say. It was a disgraceful ploy. What has happened here today is an abuse of parliamentary privilege by the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Schwarten: Gutless.

Mr BEATTIE:—who has not only been gutless—and I take that interjection—but who wants to simply damage people's reputation by way of innuendo and inference. If the Leader of the Opposition has something to say he should send it to the CMC. He should do what I did: have the courage to actually send it off to the CMC. He has nothing to say about this. Empty vessels make the most noise. The Leader of the Opposition has sunk to a very low level today. He has nothing in relation to any information on any of these individuals and yet he came in here and besmirched them. What about the members on the Leader of the Opposition's side of the House whom I named who have modest returns. What did he say about them?

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr O'Brien): Order! I have asked the Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting. If he interjects again I will have to warn him.

Mr BEATTIE: I come back to the point. I want to make it clear. I have no criticism of the member for Burnett, the member for Cunningham, the member for Toowoomba South, the member for Southern Downs or the former member for Robina for the returns they made. I simply highlight for the House that they are on par with the members referred to by the Leader of the Opposition.

I think it is disgraceful. I think that the Leader of the Opposition owes every single one of them an apology. If he can draw to my attention any serious information of any improper behaviour in relation to any of my members then I will be referring that member to the CMC and I will not need the Leader of the Opposition to do so. I think his behaviour is reprehensible. It is a cowardly attack. He should have the courage to apologise to every one of those members.

SUPERANNUATION (STATE PUBLIC SECTOR) AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure) (2.40 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990 and another act. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure) (2.40 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Superannuation State Public Sector Scheme, better known as QSuper, is the superannuation fund covering the Queensland public sector. QSuper is currently classified as an exempt public sector scheme under Commonwealth superannuation legislation, but complies with the spirit of the legislation through a heads of government agreement.

QSuper's exempt status was appropriate when the current Commonwealth regulatory environment commenced in 1994. At that time QSuper was essentially a defined benefit style scheme where the state carried the investment risk. However, QSuper has evolved into very much a market linked fund, with a large proportion of the assets subject to member investment choice and hence investment market movements. The government therefore considers that it is appropriate for this major fund to commence preparations for a move into Commonwealth government oversight.

Additionally, former Public Service employees have requested QSuper to accept contributions from their new employers, but QSuper's current status makes that difficult where the new employers are from outside the public sector. The QSuper board, which includes union representation, is desirous of the changes, but there is no intention of opening QSuper to the general public.

This bill provides a framework for QSuper to come within Commonwealth regulation, but various discussions and processes will be needed with Commonwealth Treasury and the regulators. The proposed changes assure members that their fund will be subject to the level of scrutiny applying to the superannuation industry in general. This change in regulatory oversight will be delivered whilst maintaining current services to members which support QSuper's commitment to low fees, real service, better knowledge and solid returns.

The changes proposed in the bill mainly relate to the operation of the QSuper board, to ensure compliance with Commonwealth regulatory requirements. Specifically, the proposed amendments involve the board's structure and some provisions to ensure the board has the required control over QSuper's investments. To support regulation, changes are also proposed to QSuper's administrator, the Government Superannuation Office. Assets and some staff of the Government Superannuation Office will be transferred to the board to ensure it can discharge its regulatory obligations.

This bill also creates a new statutory position to ensure the continuation of other additional superannuation services to government such as the administration of the Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Fund. In addition, provisions in the bill will allow members who have left the Public Service to have contributions made to QSuper by their new non-public sector employer. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Dr Flegg, adjourned.

STATUTE LAW (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

First Reading

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Public Works, Housing and Information and Communication Technology) (2.43 pm.): I present a bill for an act to make various amendments to Queensland statute law. I present the explanatory notes, and 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 Information and Communication Technology) (2.43 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 50 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 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, the commissioner, 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. I seek leave to have the remainder of my second reading speech incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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 through a sentence.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stevens, adjourned.

AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY (QUEENSLAND) BILL

First Reading

Hon. RJ WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Minister for Education and Training and Minister for the Arts) (2.47 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide statutory recognition of the Australian Catholic University and to facilitate its operation in Queensland. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. RJ WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Minister for Education and Training and Minister for the Arts) (2.47 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Australian Catholic University was established in 1991 following the amalgamation of several Catholic tertiary education institutions in eastern Australia. The university has campuses in Ballarat, Banyo in Brisbane, Canberra, Melbourne and Sydney. In 2003 the university opened its new Brisbane campus at Banyo and this campus is now home to some 2,500 students and 200 staff. The Banyo campus has an excellent reputation for its academic programs including arts, business, education, nursing, psychology and theology.

The Australian Catholic University is recognised through legislation of the New South Wales and Victorian parliaments. It is also recognised by the Commonwealth as a recipient of public funding under the Commonwealth Higher Education Support Act 2003. In Queensland, the Australian Catholic University is recognised as an approved interstate university under the State Higher Education (General Provisions) Act 2003. However, unlike our other major Queensland based institutions, the Australian Catholic University does not have its own Queensland stand-alone legislation.

For some time the Australian Catholic University has argued that Queensland legislation is important for several reasons. Principally, the university contends a separate state act is imperative for institutional status and comparability. It would also put the university on a more equal footing with the eight Queensland institutions which enjoy their own dedicated state acts. Universities are operating in an increasingly competitive environment, both domestically and abroad. Not only are they competing for financial resources and students; they need to consider their participation in the commercialisation of intellectual property and the broadening of their research and discipline profiles. It is essential that the Australian Catholic University, as a well-established and highly-respected institution within Queensland and nationally, is viewed and perceived equally with all other Queensland universities through its presence on the state statute books. I seek leave to incorporate the remainder of my second reading speech in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

In terms of its own internal operations, the passage of this bill will assist in putting the Banyo Campus on the same legislative footing as the University's operations in New South Wales and Victoria.

The higher education sector in Australia is also being subject to almost continual reform stemming largely from constant policy shifts from the Commonwealth Government. Without a legislative footprint in Queensland the University believes it is potentially 'at risk' of an attempted statutory takeover by the Commonwealth Government.

The bill I am presenting before the House addresses these concerns. It clarifies that the governing body of the Australian Catholic University is solely responsible for the institution and the provision of educational services at its Queensland base.

The bill contains similar provisions to those contained in other Queensland university Acts. For example the bill will enable the governing body of the University to pool trust funds obtained from bequests and the like for investment purposes.

It also outlines some important powers on the University senate with respect to its Queensland operations. In particular, it prescribes a core function of the University in Queensland as granting higher education awards.

The University will be prohibited from using an exemption under the State Anti-Discrimination Act to exclude potential applicants to the institution on religious grounds. This will ensure the student population of the University will continue to be representative of the broader community.

Finally, the bill also respects the independence of the University by making it clear that the State Government is not liable, financially or in any other sense, for the workings of the institution.

For many years, the Australian Catholic University has provided exceptional undergraduate and post-graduate professional education programs to many thousands of Queenslanders across a range of discipline areas.

As Minister for Education, I am particularly aware of the important role the Banyo Campus plays in preparing young teachers for employment in catholic schools across Queensland and in upgrading the professional skills of practising and experienced teachers in these locales.

Moreover, the University continues to work closely with the public schooling system in a range of curriculum and other cooperative activities in supporting the work of students and teachers in our schools.

The bill before the House recognises the importance of the University to the south-east corner and the broader Queensland community, and affirms the institution in its critical work.

I commend this bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Dr Flegg, adjourned.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Hon. RJ WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Minister for Education and Training and Minister for the Arts) (2.50 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Act 2000 and other acts. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. RJ WELFORD (Everton—ALP) (Minister for Education and Training and Minister for the Arts) (2.50 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Queensland Skills Plan, a $1 billion plan introduced by our government earlier this year, provides for historic reforms to Queensland's vocational education and training system to alleviate skills shortages and to secure our position as the national leader in vocational education and training. The primary intention of the bill is to enable the implementation of actions outlined in the Queensland Skills Plan white paper, specifically new industry engagement arrangements and to streamline the completion process for apprentices and trainees to support competency based training. The bill will also remove the legislated role of industry training advisory bodies from January 2007. This is in line with feedback received during the consultation process for the Queensland Skills Plan.

One of the key themes was that existing industry advisory arrangements did not meet the needs of many Queensland employers. Stakeholders agreed that industry advisory and engagement arrangements needed to be revitalised, particularly to ensure that regional and remote location employers could have their say. New strategies are now being put in place to ensure the needs of industry are identified at local, regional and state levels. This will allow industry training priorities to be established as well as suitable training products and delivery methods to be developed and implemented to meet the needs of industry. New, customised and innovative skills strategies being developed include centres of excellence, skills formation strategies and industry skills alliances as well as industry-government skilling partnerships.

Centres of excellence represent a partnership between industry and government to foster coordination and leadership from within industry and strengthen the role of employers in overcoming skills shortages. They foster the notion that industry must increasingly own its skills formation, attraction and retention processes. Centres of excellence aim to achieve a sustainable, skilled workforce when and where those skills are required. Three new centres of excellence will be established for the energy, manufacturing and engineering and the building and construction sectors. They will be established by July next year and will play a key role for both industry and government in driving vocational education and training, skills development and the labour market. The new centres will complement existing centres of excellence in the aviation and mining industries.

Skills formation strategies are also part of our wide-reaching systemic changes and improvements and underpin all of the new industry engagement approaches. The strategies encourage businesses, registered training organisations and government at all levels to work collaboratively on finding skilling solutions. This includes better planning, new training approaches, revised training products, new qualifications, better career planning and marketing campaigns. Fourteen skills formation strategies are currently operational, with a further 23 to come onstream over the next three years. I seek leave to incorporate the remainder of my second reading speech in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

Strategies are developed in partnership with industry, government, unions and regional and community leaders. They identify how factors that affect skills supply—such as industrial relations, employment conditions, remuneration and the overall 'attractiveness' of the industry—can be managed and addressed if skill shortages are to be overcome.

Some industry sectors have been identified as needing an ongoing and structured approach to skills formation issues. The development of Skills Alliances for tourism and hospitality, sport and recreation, automotive and community services, health and the creative industries will build state-wide and local partnerships to provide skills and training leadership in their respective industries.

Skills Alliances are autonomous industry entities from which the government will purchase strategic skills information and advice. They will deliver a suite of services to Government that are focused on addressing skill shortages and future skills demand.

Some sectors such as the rural industry and transport already have strong existing forums and mechanisms to foster workforce development and skills needs through a whole of Government approach. In these sectors, business is already engaging with government on the issues impacting on their industry. In these sectors, Industry-Government Skilling Partnerships have been established to provide critical advice on future skilling priorities by building on existing industry relationships through the Department of Primary Industries and the Department of Transport.

Industry sectors that do not come under these new partnership arrangements will not be overlooked. Our government will continue to liaise directly with industry peak bodies and organisations where direct engagement is desirable or needed.

The Queensland Skills Plan also outlines a range of actions to improve current apprenticeship arrangements. These will make the apprenticeship system more relevant to industry and today's workers, and get skilled workers into trade occupations sooner.

The bill will streamline the process for completion of apprenticeships and traineeships and the implementation of competency based training arrangements. There will also be greater clarity in relation to the roles and responsibilities of each party in the process.

Competency based training allows for trade qualification completion once the apprentice is fully competent—irrespective of the time served. Queensland has led the nation in the implementation of a competency based training approach.

Our government will continue to work with all Queensland industries to encourage more employers to implement competency based apprenticeship and traineeship arrangements. We will further improve this through collaboration between employers, apprentices and trainers, to address any concerns about training quality and assessment.

The Skills for Jobs and Growth Green Paper recognised the need to develop new options to enable apprentices to complete early. Rewarding apprentices who are competent instead of maintaining a time served approach ensures quality tradespersons who can meet the needs of industry. The employer's role in determining competence will be maintained as all parties to the Training Contract and the registered training organisation must agree.

The bill introduces a mechanism to deal with those circumstances where a party to the Training Contract does not sign the completion agreement—despite all relevant practical and theoretical competencies being achieved. In these situations, the registered training organisation will notify the Training and Employment Recognition Council for a decision on whether to determine the apprenticeship or trainee as competent. The Council will make a determination ensuring all parties are afforded the opportunity to put their case forward.

This process effectively negates the potential for apprentices and trainees to be held back from completing their apprenticeship or traineeship when they have achieved competency in their occupation. This will assist in the timely provision of fully qualified tradespeople into the labour market.

Importantly, in situations where parties to the Training Contract fail to agree that a competency has been achieved, the proposed amendments also provide a mechanism to resolve that disagreement.

A new Skills Assessment Service will be established to work with industry and training providers to improve the consistency, validity and employer confidence in assessment practices. Part of this service will include dispute resolution mechanisms to help resolve concerns over the competency of apprentices.

I wish to make clear, that competency based training arrangements will not impact adversely on training quality and that the employers role in the determination of competence will not be diminished. Competency based training is consistent with the Council of Australian Government's national approach to apprenticeships, training and skills recognition as agreed in February this year.

Although competency based training has been a key feature of Queensland's apprenticeship system for a number of years, it is still not common practice across all industries. This is despite more than 30 per cent of Queensland apprentices, across a range of trades, currently finishing their apprenticeship before the nominal term.

The Queensland Government is committed to maintaining the quality, consistency and integrity of Queensland's apprenticeship qualifications, and making the apprenticeship system work better for apprentices and employers.

Similarly, this government is committed to implementing all actions of the Queensland Skills Plan to ensure the development of Queensland's flexible and responsive training system.

I commend this bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Copeland, adjourned.

SECURITY PROVIDERS AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Hon. MM KEECH (Albert—ALP) (Minister for Tourism, Fair Trading, Wine Industry Development and Women) (2.54 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Security Providers Act 1993, and for other purposes. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. MM KEECH (Albert—ALP) (Minister for Tourism, Fair Trading, Wine Industry Development and Women) (2.54 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The key objective of the Security Providers Amendment Bill 2006 is to tighten regulation of the security industry to ensure only those persons of reputable character operate in the industry. The new regime will:

- expand licensing categories to capture currently unregulated providers of security services, including those who operate in industries where security work can be mixed with other duties;
- strengthen character and probity tests to weed undesirable elements out of the industry;
- require licensees to continue their professional development through ongoing training;
- increase the penalties for operating without a licence or for engaging unlicensed personnel; and
- implement other important changes to the way security providers operate and are monitored to ensure protection of the community and property.

The bill implements a recent call by the Council of Australian Governments for states and territories to harmonise private security licensing regimes and to complement COAG's counter-terrorism initiatives. COAG has recognised that a national security industry has a key role to play in counter-terrorism activities at a time when security is paramount. The industry has the potential to fulfil a role in protecting critical infrastructure and, in some cases, provide a first response to a terrorist incident. A nationally consistent approach to licensing, probity and character checks will provide a 'nowhere to hide' framework to prevent rogue elements exploiting inconsistencies across state boundaries to enter the industry. I seek leave to incorporate the remainder of my second reading speech in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

BACKGROUND

The bill will amend the Security Providers Act 1993 which creates a licensing regime for security firms, security officers, crowd controllers and private investigators.

The range of activities regulated by the Act includes people who are employed to keep order around public places including nightclubs and hotels; provide services such as mobile and dog patrols; act as armed and unarmed guards and respond to alarms. Additionally, the Act regulates private investigators who investigate missing persons, conduct covert surveillance operations and factual investigations on behalf of their clients.

The Act seeks to ensure:

- the community is protected from unacceptable behaviour of security providers;
- only persons of an 'acceptable character' enter the industry and operate as security providers;
- operators possess basic levels of competency in the delivery of their services to members of the public; and
- industry participants behave according to community expectations.

CONSULTATION

This bill has been prepared after consultation commencing in 2002 with the National Competition Policy review of the Act and the distribution of a Consultation Paper in April 2005. The most recent Consultation Paper was prepared with the input of representatives of the security industry, trainers, retailers, consumer and community organisations, academia and relevant Government departments. I thank them for their contribution.

At total of 112 submissions were received with the majority of responses focused on the growth and diversification of the industry and the need for the legislation to keep pace with this change.

The strong public feedback helped to develop the policy proposals for a Public Benefit Test which attracted a further 47 submissions from the community and industry. Stakeholders noted the reforms will assist in providing the community with a safer and more competent industry.

More specific and detailed consultation with industry groups and firms has also been undertaken. The vast majority support the general policy principles of expanding licence categories, tightening probity requirements and instituting industry training. Public consultation has also been conducted on the draft bill to ensure that the proposed changes will work in practice.

KEY PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

At present the Act requires crowd controllers, security officers, private investigators and security firms to hold a licence in order to operate.

The bill proposes to expand the current licensing categories to capture security equipment installers, electronic surveillance operators, dog handlers, in-house security guards, and security advisors as well as broadening the definition of security officer so as to capture a broader range of persons and firms who work in security along with other duties. Security officers will now be defined to include anyone who patrols, protects, watches or guards any property by either physical or electronic means. This will address a trend in the security industry whereby security personnel and security firms have avoided coverage under the Act because of uncertainty about definitions as they apply to persons and firms who mixed security with other duties or because of the industry around which their security work is conducted.

Firms and personnel in these sectors will need to be licensed, allowing the Department to check the background of operators, mandate training and monitor their appropriateness to remain in the industry.

'In-house' security officers, or employees who patrol or watch their employer's property, are not currently required to be licensed. It is proposed to include these people if security is a primary duty associated with their position. An exemption will continue for employees of the State.

This new licence category will affect employees who work as loss prevention officers for retail outlets, it will also affect soft-security at licensed premises and any other security staff who are employed directly rather than through a contractor.

Additional security activities to be licensed include the installation, maintenance or repair of security equipment. This will cover, for example, security equipment such as residential and commercial security alarm systems, safes, vaults and security audio / visual systems.

Personnel working in alarm response centres who monitor residential and commercial alarms and those monitoring closed circuit television security systems will require a licence under the changes.

Persons who provide advice to minimise security risks and provide management strategies to prevent or overcome security hazards will need a licence. This may include advice about the installation of electronic surveillance equipment such as closed circuit television and motion detector systems.

The changes will also clarify that people performing the activities of a security officer with the use of a guard dog will need to be licensed.

Probity checks

Probity checking of prospective licensees and those intending to renew their licences will be tightened and the factors used to determine whether a person is suitable to remain in the industry will be increased.

The Department will be able to use investigative information from the Queensland Police Service, unrecorded convictions and other background information to weed out of the industry members of outlaw motorcycle gangs and other undesirable persons.

The Act will be strengthened to ensure only appropriate people work in the industry. It is proposed that findings of guilt where a conviction is not recorded (that is, unrecorded convictions) are considered when assessing a new licence application and the renewal of an existing licence. The consideration of unrecorded convictions will be limited to offences serious enough to be currently prescribed under the Act as disqualifying offences, for example, theft, assault, burglary and drug offences.

Consideration of unrecorded convictions will not be open ended, and will be limited to these findings of guilt within the previous five years.

They will not automatically result in a person's exclusion as the Chief Executive must consider the nature of the offence and its relevance to the person's performance of the functions of a security provider under the licence.

Allowing unrecorded convictions to be considered is consistent with probity and character tests in other legislation involving persons occupying positions of trust.

Investigative information from the Queensland Police Service will also be considered in licence applications. This will be any relevant information about an investigation concerning the possible commission of disqualifying offences. The amendments will allow the Chief Executive of my Department to consider this information when assessing the risk to public safety or the holding of a licence being contrary to the public interest.

The Chief Executive's decision is reviewable, and aggrieved applicants will be entitled to receive reasons for the decision.

Security providers are trusted by the community to protect property and ensure public safety. Therefore, amendments will be made to enable the Chief Executive of my Department to also consider public interest when assessing a person's appropriateness to be licensed under the Act.

Increased penalties for operating unlicensed

These proposals to expand the licensing categories and scrutinise applicants more thoroughly, will be complemented by increased penalties for operating without a licence or engaging personnel without a licence.

The penalty for operating without a licence will increase from the current 100 penalty units to:

- 500 penalty units for a first offence;
- 700 penalty units or six months imprisonment for a second offence; and
- 1000 penalty units or 18 months imprisonment for a third or later offence.

These increased penalties provide an appropriately strong deterrent for those seeking to operate outside the regulatory system.

Other proposals

Once in the industry, a range of proposals are aimed at ensuring appropriate behaviour. These include the introduction of a mandatory code of practice and on-going industry-based training to force security personnel to learn up-to-date techniques for maintaining order and avoiding escalation of disputes.

The training proposals will supplement the existing qualifications required before a licence is granted. This training is of a professional development nature to ensure a licensee's skills are kept up to date with behaviour and situation management.

The training regime will be industry-based, practical training, which is strongly supported by security industry stakeholders as a means for them to monitor standards of behaviour and training across the industry.

To assist the right people to enter the industry, the bill proposes a restricted licence for trainees. Applicants under this scheme will need to first pass strict criminal history and character probity checks. If their application is successful, these restricted licensees must then work under the direct supervision of a fully licensed security provider and also complete an approved training course within a limited period of time. This will assist firms in rural and remote areas to meet local demand.

Temporary Permits

The bill will also introduce a new temporary permit for bodyguards, crowd controllers, security officers and security firms, currently licensed in another Australian State or Territory, to carry out authorised functions for a particular event.

For example, security officers licensed in New South Wales will be able to perform security officer functions at specific events such as a Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting held in Queensland. These events place an unusual high demand on the Queensland industry and the temporary permit will allow for the demand to be met on a short term basis (for example, the length of the event).

Applications for temporary permits will be processed and tested against the same suitability criteria as normal applications. This means that the applicant will be assessed against the same criminal history and other checks.

SUMMARY

I am proud to introduce the Security Providers Amendment Bill 2006.

The bill will boost security industry standards and ensure that this Government is providing a safe and secure community for all Queenslanders.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Copeland, adjourned.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Hon. MM KEECH (Albert—ALP) (Minister for Tourism, Fair Trading, Wine Industry Development and Women) (2.56 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act 1981, the Classification of Computer Games and Images Act 1995 and the Classification of Publications Act 1991. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. MM KEECH (Albert—ALP) (Minister for Tourism, Fair Trading, Wine Industry Development and Women) (2.57 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Associations Incorporation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006 amends the Associations Incorporation Act 1981. The key objectives of the bill are to address two main issues of concern to Queensland's incorporated associations—mandatory insurance cover and auditing requirements. This bill is the first of two phases of amendments identified through a recent review of the act by my department which included significant consultation. Other amendments in the bill will have the potential to reduce disputes between members of an association, improve compliance with the act and address other simple anomalies. Minor unrelated amendments are also to be made to two classification acts administered by my department. The Associations Incorporation Act commenced in 1982 and provides a simple and inexpensive mechanism for non-profit groups to incorporate. I seek leave to incorporate the remainder of my second reading speech in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Since 1991, the number of associations incorporated under the Act has risen dramatically and there are now approximately 20,000 registered associations across Queensland. These associations include social and sporting clubs, artistic societies, groups with religious, patriotic and political interests, professional associations, charitable organisations and youth, voluntary and community groups. They range from small, locally based organisations comprised entirely of volunteers, to licensed clubs staffed by professional managers with an annual turnover in the millions of dollars.

While incorporation under the Act is not compulsory, those organisations which elect to incorporate obtain a number of benefits by virtue of the association becoming a separate legal entity. The association has all the powers of an individual and is legally able to do things in its own name such as own property, enter a lease or sue or be sued. Additionally, the personal liability of an association's members and management committee is limited because of its incorporated status.

I am committed to ensuring that legislation administered by my Department is contemporary and relevant. This review of the Associations Incorporation Act commenced in 2003 and has included the release of a consultation paper in February 2005 which attracted 280 responses.

The review found that while incorporation under the Act has been popular, there are concerns with certain aspects of the Act's operation. This amendment bill responds in particular, to concerns about insurance and auditing requirements and will help reduce costs and administrative burdens for many organisations. These issues have been identified as a high priority. Other concerns identified in the review such as eligibility for incorporation, types of associations, dispute resolution and conflicts of interest raise complex issues and will be addressed in stage two amendments after further examination and consultation.

Some associations have found the current provisions requiring mandatory insurance cover extremely difficult to maintain due to the cost of premiums and the availability of appropriate insurance cover.

The bill proposes to remove the mandatory public liability insurance requirement and replace it with a series of steps to be taken by a management committee in considering the need for the association to take out such insurance. However the mandatory insurance requirement will still apply to associations which own or lease real property and associations that are trustees of land under the Land Act 1994.

The new obligations imposed on the management committee will ensure appropriate consideration is given to the need for public liability insurance. The amendments will provide for committee accountability to the association by mandating that the committee must report its decision about public liability insurance to members at the first annual general meeting of the association and at each subsequent annual general meeting. The management committee must also advise other parties that might be affected by the association's activities, whether or not it has public liability insurance.

These obligations significantly exceed the approach in other states and territories, which have no legislative requirements for public liability insurance, and take no legislative steps to encourage associations to consider whether they need to take out public liability insurance.

The other significant benefit in the bill for associations relates to auditing requirements. Currently, the Act requires all associations, regardless of size to submit professionally audited statements. However, as with mandatory insurance, a "one size fits all" approach is no longer considered appropriate.

The bill introduces a 'tiered reporting' system, which has three levels based on total revenue or assets.

- Level 1 associations, with at least total revenue or current assets of more than $100,000, will continue to be fully audited as per current requirements.
- Level 2 associations are those which do not fall into either Level 1 or Level 3. They will not be required to provide fully audited statements but must instead have a registered accountant confirm that the books of the association have been kept in a manner consistent with good accounting practice.
- Level 3 associations are those with total revenue of $20,000 or less and current assets of $20,000 or less. These associations will only be required to lodge a statement by the association's president or treasurer, that they have kept accurate books of account.

The lesser requirements for Level 2 and Level 3 associations is expected to benefit some 80% of Queensland associations.

Consultation indicated very strong support for a 'tiered reporting' system with 85% of stakeholders agreeing to such a system.

The bill does, however, contain exemptions for associations that are required to produce audited accounts under other legislation such as the Gaming Machine Act 1991 or pursuant to funding or grants agreements with the government. Those associations will continue to be subject to full auditing requirements.

The bill also contains a number of other amendments to the Associations Incorporation Act to clarify existing provisions and to correct simple anomalies.

The Act is to be amended to give the Office of Fair Trading a power to require the production of documents (such as financial records, contracts, minutes of meetings, membership register, etc) in order to make an assessment as to whether an association is complying with its objectives.

This will be particularly useful when investigating allegations an association is providing financial gain to its members.

This power will also assist the Office of Fair Trading to oversee the financial affairs of associations, especially in cases where concerns are raised an association is being mismanaged.

Failure to comply with the reporting requirements in the Act is proposed to constitute grounds for cancellation of the incorporation of the association. This will provide a further incentive for associations to comply with their obligations. The service requirements for notices relating to cancellation have also been simplified.

The Act is to be clarified to enable the Chief Executive of my Department to refuse an application for incorporation where satisfied that the association's proposed rules do not comply with the requirements of the Act. Further, if a rule of an association is inconsistent with the Act, it will be made clear the Act prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

A number of other amendments have the potential to reduce disputes and ensure transparency between members of an association, or between members of an association and the management committee. These amendments are:

- a new provision granting members access to minutes of any general meeting and financial documents;
- a requirement that an association includes its registered name on all documentation endorsed or issued by the association;
- a requirement that if an association's rules or other documentation lodged with the Office of Fair Trading are in a language other than English, a certified English translation must also be provided. This is similar to requirements in the Commonwealth Corporations Act 2001; and
- revised requirements for the quorum needed to hold a general meeting, to better accommodate smaller associations.

Other miscellaneous amendments will clarify the voting rights of an association secretary and that the rules of an association may allow technology such as teleconferencing to be used to facilitate holding and voting at general meetings.

Additional clarification will include that:

- a three quarters majority will be required for a resolution to incorporate and adopt proposed rules;
- casual vacancies on the management committee will be allowed in situations where an elected member of the committee resigns or dies; and
- appeals in respect of disputed decisions under the Act may be made to the District Court.

The requirement for associations to have a registered office has been removed.

The bill introduces a new requirement preventing the use of information obtained from the Departmental register of associations for direct marketing purposes, and enables the Chief Executive to withhold information from the register in certain circumstances, such as where the health or safety of a member may be at risk.

The bill also allows the Chief Executive to delegate the power to grant or refuse an application to use an unsuitable name or to exempt an association from using the word 'incorporated' in its title. This will significantly simplify the operation of the Act.

The bill also contains unrelated amendments to the Classification of Computer Games and Images Act 1995 to address an incorrect reference to a repealed schedule within the Commonwealth Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995. Amendments to the Commonwealth Act have created a separate National Classification Code which replaces the previous schedule. The Queensland Act will now refer to the Code.

A proposed amendment to the Classification of Publications Act 1991 results from a recent decision of the District Court which highlights the Act does not currently allow evidentiary certificates to be used where a publication was not classified at the time of the offence. The practical effect of this decision is that oral evidence will be required in these cases. The proposed amendment will allow a certificate to be used in evidence which states that a publication would, if classified on a certain date, have held a stated classification.

The bill is considered to be reasonable and appropriate and will address the priority issues for associations of mandatory insurance, financial auditing and reporting. It will reduce the financial burden on associations and reduce red tape.

As I have indicated there are issues about eligibility for incorporation, types of associations, dispute resolution and conflicts of interest which are complex and require further policy development. Those issues will be considered in stage 2 amendments which will now be progressed.

I am proud to introduce the Associations Incorporation Act and other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. This bill demonstrates this Government's commitment to associations and the broader community which benefits from the continued operation of strong and viable associations.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Seeney, adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Hon. AP FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport) (2.58 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1993, and for other purposes. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. AP FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport) (2.58 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Local Government and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006 amends the Local Government Act 1993 and the Electoral Act 1992. The next local government elections are due in March 2008 and this bill will ensure those and future elections meet community expectations of accountability and transparency.

The amendments proposed in the bill were developed in response to several significant drivers, principally the Crime and Misconduct Commission's report of the inquiry into the Gold Coast City Council's 2004 elections tabled in parliament earlier this year. The government decided to implement 17 of the 19 CMC recommendations in full or in part. The bill I introduce today includes amendments that give effect to that decision. The bill is a clear statement of the Queensland government's commitment to the outcomes of the CMC inquiry and to avoiding a repeat of the deception many voters felt over the 2004 Gold Coast election. The government announced its response to the inquiry in August, shortly before the recent election. This bill is the culmination of very serious consideration and considerably complex drafting requirements.

The amendments aim to improve the conduct of local government elections and the quality of information disclosed both by candidates and elected councillors. The changes will increase community confidence that the behaviour of councillors and candidates meets standards expected of community leaders.

This bill will increase public trust in the democratic process for local governments. Elections must be fair and honest, and it is crucial that the community has trust in accepting the role of local governments and the power that they exercise.

Groups of candidates linked by fundraising will have to declare their alliances when they nominate whether they consider themselves a group. The definition of 'group' in the Local Government Act will be amended to include candidates who undertake fundraising activities together. Candidates will be required to record the name and membership of groups on their nomination forms. This provision will make certain that alliances between local government candidates, such as those formed during the campaign ahead of the 2004 local government elections for Gold Coast City Council, are fully disclosed and outlaw joint activities by candidates who do not comply with this regime.

One of the key objectives of this bill is to ensure that, as far as practicable, the same conditions and rules apply to state and local government elections. This means greater consistency between the Electoral Act 1992 and the Local Government Act 1993. Right now, the electoral provisions in the Local Government Act do generally mirror those in the Electoral Act. However, there are a number of differences, including the penalties for election offences and a number of disclosure requirements. The bill remedies these differences, substantially increasing penalties for electoral offences under the Local Government Act. For example, the penalty for giving false or misleading information has been increased from six months to seven years imprisonment. I seek leave to incorporate the remainder of the speech in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Another example of alignment between the Acts is a new requirement under the Local Government Act for lodgement of how-to-vote cards. The bill includes provisions to stop how-to-vote cards being distributed with misleading information. Cards must be presented to the Returning Officer seven days before polling day and the Returning Officer must reject how-to-vote cards that do not comply.

In addition to the amendments affecting elections, there are amendments relating to the conduct of councillors and councils.

Councils will be required to provide a statement of reasons for a decision taken contrary to the advice of council officers in particularly significant matters. This will strengthen and increase transparency of council decision-making processes. The aim is not to erode councils' decision-making powers, but rather to ensure that councils identify the intended benefit to the community as a result of a decision. This should help avoid misunderstandings, promote the acceptance of adverse decisions, and reduce the likelihood of ill-informed complaints and appeals. This provision is not dissimilar to the parliamentary processes that apply at State level whereby the Government can be asked the reasons for a particular decision.

The bill requires councillors to note that considering matters involving people who have given them gifts may be a conflict of interest. Councils will have to minute any declaration by a councillor that they have a conflict of interest, the nature of the conflict, how they dealt with it, if they voted and how they voted.

This amendment will work in conjunction with the Local Government Act's current requirements regarding the declaration of a material personal interest—that is, the requirement that councillors absent themselves from discussions and voting on a matter in which they have a direct pecuniary interest.

The new provision will give councillors greater certainty about how to deal with matters that may constitute a conflict of interest, which may not entail a material personal interest. The conflict of interest obligations in the bill increase transparency and accountability, ensure councillors identify and declare conflicts of interest and, by recording them, provide for increased public scrutiny.

The bill also makes it an offence for a councillor to direct, or attempt to direct, local government staff about the way the employee's duties are to be performed in relation to particular categories. The categories for which a penalty applies if a councillor directs staff in performing their duties are granting a licence, permit or approval, granting a concession, rebate or waiver for an amount owed to a council, entering into a contract, disposing of land or non-current assets and allocating resources for carrying out local government programs or projects. With a penalty in place, there is now a strong deterrent to discourage councillors from directing employees in the performance of their work.

This bill gives the public greater access to information about councillors' interests. Any citizen will be able to see the details of a councillor's gifts, sponsored hospitality, membership of political and community associations and other interests on the Council's website. Where councils do not have a website, a person will be able to access the material free of charge in the council office.

Recommendations regarding some procedural matters relating to the maintenance of registers of interest will be addressed through amendments to the Local Government Regulation 2005. These include the timeframes in which a councillor must notify the council CEO of an interest, the timeframes in which a CEO must amend the register to reflect a changed interest and alignment of the definition of sponsored hospitality with that in the State Members Code of Ethical Standards. The Government will move to give effect to these amendments to the subordinate legislation as soon as the bill I am introducing today gains passage, should that be the will of the House.

The Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation's review of the election process following the 2004 elections has also been a key driver for this bill. The Department's review of the electoral system following each quadrennial local government election ensures that the LGA continues to reflect best practice, and is responsive to the practicalities of conducting local government elections.

The 2004 review of electoral provisions has to some extent been overshadowed by the CMC Inquiry and its outcomes. However, the convergence of these two processes has provided a unique opportunity to introduce a comprehensive suite of electoral reforms.

The departmental review of the 2004 elections delivered a number of key enhancements and innovations, with particular focus on continuing to bring local government into alignment with State electoral practice—including in relation to matters noted by the CMC such as electoral penalties and registration of how-to-vote cards. The review gave the opportunity to canvass public opinion on key electoral reforms, including caretaker conventions and candidate codes of conduct.

This bill introduces caretaker requirements for local government elections. Caretaker arrangements have long been in place at both State and Federal levels of government, aimed at ensuring that incumbency cannot be exploited at the expense of the integrity of the election process. A caretaker period will apply to councils during the period from the close of nominations until the end of the election period—a maximum of 42 days. During the caretaker period councils will be prohibited from publishing or distributing electoral material other than materials relating to the conduct of an election. Councils will also be prohibited from making major policy decisions during the caretaker period, including in relation to contracts of a financial value of $150,000 or one per cent of rate revenue or the appointment, remuneration or dismissal of a CEO.

Councils will be able to apply to the Minister if exceptional circumstances require that a major policy decision needs to be taken during the caretaker period. This amendment offers local governments the same protection that the State Government enjoys whereby the Governor can intervene should a matter need to be addressed urgently during a State election campaign. I do not foresee this provision being used except as a last resort, and I anticipate that councils will be able to manage their activities within the electoral cycle.

Candidates will have the option to be bound by a code of conduct prescribing candidate behaviour, similar to the code that has applied to State candidates since 2003. Like the State equivalent, the code of conduct for local government candidates will establish the standard for ethical and lawful candidate behaviour.

Candidates who do sign up to the code will provide a clear signal to the electorate of their commitment to ethical and lawful behaviour. Councils will keep a register of those candidates who agree to be bound by the code of conduct and these registers will be available to the public. Our democracy will judge candidates who do not agree to the code of conduct.

A small number of other local government issues are also to be addressed by this bill.

The bill includes an amendment to the Local Government Act allowing the appointment of financial controllers in particular cases. The Local Government (Community Government Areas) Act 2004 already provides for the appointment of financial controllers. This provision has been used to appoint financial controllers to assist Aboriginal councils experiencing financial management difficulties.

Presently, under the Local Government Act, the State Government has only one tool of intervention for dealing with councils that have demonstrated problems with management of their finances—dismissal. The proposed amendment offers a response that allows the State Government to support councils experiencing difficulties with managing council finances in a constructive manner in circumstances which require intervention but fall short of warranting dismissal.

The bill also provides that a councillor is disqualified on conviction for a breach of section 250, which prohibits councillors from releasing confidential council information. The bill also makes it clear that it is the release of confidential information that constitutes an offence, rather than requiring a council to demonstrate that harm has been caused by the release of information as is currently the case.

The bill includes amendments to the Local Government Act to support the Size, Shape and Sustainability program, which is a key joint initiative between the department and the Local Government Association of Queensland. The Size, Shape and Sustainability initiative—otherwise known as SSS—is underpinning reform of the Queensland local government system. The Queensland Government, through the SSS initiative, funds councils to explore structural change as a means of improving efficiency and effectiveness. It is anticipated SSS will lead to enhanced cooperation and shared services between councils across Queensland, as well as structural reform by way of significant boundary changes or amalgamation of local governments.

The SSS review process established by the Local Government Association and the department corresponds closely with requirements under the Local Government Act for major reviewable local government matters, particularly the community engagement that must be undertaken ahead of a recommendation being made to the Minister for Local Government. However, the SSS process could result in the community being consulted twice in succession on the same issue if current legislative arrangements applied to major reviewable local government matters arising from a SSS review.

The bill creates a special category of reference for major reviewable matters arising from a SSS review. The bill provides for the Electoral Commissioner to certify that community engagement undertaken as part of the SSS review satisfies legislative requirements that would otherwise apply to major reviewable local government matters. The intent of the Local Government Act is retained due to the independence of the SSS process in determining recommendations, the significant community engagement that occurs and it is the Electoral Commission that must undertake a referendum and report the results.

The SSS process is a significant commitment by local government to lead the examination of the long term sustainability of councils and engage with their communities on this challenging issue. Wherever possible, it is the intention to implement the recommendations of the SSS reviews in time for the 2008 local government elections. The State Government is supporting this by providing funding for reviews under the $25 million Regional Collaboration and Capacity Building Program.

However, in some cases it may be necessary to use the current powers of the Local Government Act to defer elections to ensure the outcomes of a SSS review can be implemented. This will only occur where a SSS review is significantly progressed but unable to be implemented by March 2008. Deferring an election will provide certainty to the relevant local governments and their constituents participating in the SSS review that the work they are undertaking will be implemented in a practical and timely manner. I will be writing to all local governments in Queensland on this matter in the near future.

Mr Speaker, in conclusion, I want to note that the amendments in this bill are just one part of the Queensland Government's commitment to strengthening the requirements for local government elections in this State. The Department will support the introduction of legislative amendments through its training program leading up to the 2008 elections, as well as by updating key documents.

In the lead up to the 2008 election, we will conduct education and training about the role, obligations, requirements and expectations of elected councillors and the behaviours required in codes of conduct. A TAFE course is also under development that will focus on the role of councillors for intending candidates. Training for Returning Officers will also be enhanced.

Key documents will also be updated ahead of the 2008 elections. We will also update the "Candidates Handbook", the "Returning Officers' Manual", the "Disclosure of election gifts handbook" and the "Scrutineers Guide".

The new code of conduct for intending candidates that I mentioned earlier will also be developed well ahead of the 2008 elections.

Mr Speaker, I remind the House that it only took one group in one council at the 2004 elections to place public trust in jeopardy. All councils should not be tarred with the same brush. I congratulate the large majority of councils on their professionalism, the range and quality of services they provide and their responsiveness to the needs of their communities. The changes generated by this bill will ensure council elections and elected representatives continue to meet the community's high expectations for openness and accountability.

Mr Speaker, I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Seeney, adjourned.

SPORTS DRUG TESTING AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Hon. AP FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport) (3.02 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Sports Drug Testing Act 2003. I present the explanatory notes, and I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Hon. AP FRASER (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport) (3.02 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill will amend the Sports Drug Testing Act 2003 in order to retain parity between Queensland's antidoping legislation and the Commonwealth's. It will continue to provide a clear head of power for the state to establish contracts with the Commonwealth for provision of drug testing and educational services to sports in Queensland. It will ensure the Queensland government continues to send a strong and lucid message regarding its stance against doping in sport.

Queensland has a proud tradition—and a reputation that other states envy—as a region that has produced, and continues to produce, some of our best known and most successful athletes. The achievements of those champions have the power to motivate Queenslanders to take part in healthier, active lifestyles. They inspire new generations to strive for excellence, and they build our profile around the globe as a formidable centre for sporting superiority.

However, there will, unfortunately, always be those few athletes who are willing to undermine our proud sporting spirit by cheating. At the same time, there are others who will sometimes unknowingly breach the rules by taking banned substances. We responded to this in 1999 when Queensland became the first state to negotiate a contract with the Australian Sports Drug Agency for drug testing of state level athletes. That was reinforced in 2003, when Queensland enacted the Sports Drug Testing Act 2003. I seek leave to incorporate the rest of my speech in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

But since then there have been international developments towards harmonising anti doping practices around the world. In October 2005, Australia adopted the International Convention Against Doping In Sport, established by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. This requires the Federal Government to determine the most appropriate method of implementing the World Anti-Doping Code in Australia.

In March 2006, the Federal Government enacted the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Act 2006. This transferred the functions of the Australian Sports Drug Agency to the newly established Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority. The new Commonwealth Act incorporates terminology and broader functions and powers aligned to the International Convention Against Doping In Sport and the World Anti-Doping Code.

Specifically, the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Act sets up the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority and specifies there will be a National Anti-Doping Scheme, which will be administered by the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority. It also establishes the Australian Sports Drug Medical Advisory Committee.

Consequently, amendments to the Queensland Act are now needed to maintain consistency with the Commonwealth legislation. These amendments formed part of the Government's actions for the first 100 days after the State election. The amendments will remove inconsistencies created by the changed terminology and scope of the Commonwealth legislation. They will also facilitate Commonwealth/State agreements to maintain targeted anti-doping services in Queensland.

These agreements are central to the Government's Drug-Free Sport Program and enable the State—in partnership with sporting organisations—to co fund the provision of drug testing and educational services to the sports prioritised by Queensland. The Commonwealth legislation allows the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority to test Queensland athletes. But without the agreements to be facilitated by this bill, there is no guarantee the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority's priorities and resources will deliver the level of services needed by Queensland or that those services will target the sports prioritised by Queensland. Currently there are twenty state sporting organisations working with the Government to contract anti-doping services from the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority.

The agreements also enable Queensland to ensure appropriate services are delivered to support Queensland Academy of Sport programs.

The Commonwealth legislation does not require parental consent for a child under 18 to undergo a drug test. This bill, which aims to align with the new Commonwealth law, sets out the way in which consent can be provided. This is a matter which the Government will pursue the Commonwealth to reinstate the requirement for permission to be provided.

The Government believes this bill represents the best step for Queensland to continue to protect the health and safety of our athletes and our magnificent sporting reputation.

Mr Speaker, I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Seeney, adjourned.

MAJOR SPORTS FACILITIES AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 31 October (see p. 282).

Mr SEENEY (Callide—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.03 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the consideration of the Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill. The opposition will not be opposing the passage of this bill through the House. It is probably opportune that, as we debate this bill which relates to Brisbane's major sports facilities, I place on record my appreciation of what a wonderful facility the Woolloongabba cricket ground has become. Like so many Queenslanders over the last week or so, I have had occasion to spend some time there. It is the first time that I have been to the stadium since it

was completed. There is now a full stadium all the way round the ground. It is a tremendous facility. It is a tremendous experience to go there, as I and so many Queenslanders did, to experience the first test between Australia and England. That ground is a credit to all Queenslanders, and it is something that Queenslanders can enjoy for many years to come. It is a tremendous facility, as is the Suncorp facility. I think the Suncorp facility—the football stadium at Suncorp—is widely recognised as a tremendous facility.

As a kid I used to go to the Woolloongabba cricket ground. I used to go there and stand on the hill underneath the trees. Some of the other members might remember the trees that were on the hill. It has gone from that sort of ground to the tremendous stadium that it is now. It certainly does have something of a different atmosphere now to what it did in those days. To some extent, the atmosphere has changed. I would not say that it is worse, but it has certainly changed. It allows so many more Queenslanders to have that great experience. It is not only the game that is played in the stadium; it is the function rooms and the facilities that lend themselves to so many other uses. I attended a number of functions there during the test.

As I have done before, and it is probably opportune that I do it again, I wanted to make some comment about the security measures that were in place at the Woolloongabba cricket ground. I do not want my comments to be misinterpreted. It is a fine balance to achieve, I think. We all recognise how difficult it is for the people responsible for security to achieve the fine balance that is required to ensure that everybody who does go to the Gabba to see the cricket enjoys their experience and enjoys the day. That includes family groups, children and a whole range of people. Everyone has the same right to go there and enjoy that experience.

However, over recent years the activities of groups like the barmy army and the Australian equivalent, the cricket fanatics, have been a source of entertainment and amusement to all of us who go there. Even though staid old codgers like me would never participate in those types of activities, they do provide entertainment and they add to the atmosphere, colour and the general enjoyment of the whole day. I think there is some validity in the argument that has been put forward that the activities of those groups have been curtailed to a point where it has probably lessened the experience of going to the cricket. I think that the authorities that are responsible for the implementation of those security measures need to reconsider the security measures. They need to have a look at the types of security measures that they put in place and allow people to have some fun. They need to allow the fun to be put back into a day at the cricket at the Gabba. I think that that is something that comes out of the first test. It was certainly evident the day I was there. The quietness of the group was not all to do with the fact that England was scoring so badly; it was to do with the fact that the fun had been taken out of going to cricket at the Gabba a little bit. In saying that, I say again that there has to be consideration for everybody at the cricket, and it is a fine balance to be achieved. The pendulum has probably swung a little bit too far with the security measures.

Getting down to the specifics of the bill, the bill does a couple of things. It bans the practice of ticket scalping. The bill certainly has our support with regard to one of the objectives of the bill, which is to prevent people from making unreasonable amounts of money from the desire that people have to attend and participate in these major sporting events.

The bill bans the practice of ticket scalping by creating the offence of reselling tickets for major events at more than 10 per cent above the original ticket price while protecting the rights of charitable and community groups to auction tickets to raise money for charity and community purposes. It is commendable that the bill does not impose a ban outright on reselling tickets. I have heard some people call for that. I think that would have been a too extreme reaction to the need to ensure that undue amounts of money are not made from the reselling of tickets—a need which we support. The reselling of tickets provides valuable fundraising opportunities for charity and community groups, such as junior sports groups. If those groups are able to benefit their cause by doing so, then they should be allowed to do that. I am pleased that this bill allows that to happen.

Other incidents of ticket reselling probably occur less often, such as when people buy tickets with the intention of attending an event and then find that for some reason they cannot attend. I believe those people should have the right to sell their tickets. I am fairly confident—and I hope the minister will provide us with the assurance that this can happen—that selling such tickets is well and truly allowable under this bill, so long as people do not sell the ticket for more than 10 per cent above its value. I think that is pretty reasonable. There are always more people who want to go to watch these major sporting events than there are tickets available. It is a great shame, if there are spare seats and tickets available for sale, if somebody misses out simply because they cannot get a ticket.

We all know that plans can change. I have been in that situation. Regrettably, I had some very valuable tickets for a function and I was not able to attend. It was not hard to sell them. I do not consider myself to be a scalper and I would not like to think that I would fall foul of this legislation in any way, shape or form.

Mr Hinchliffe: You haven't got the cockney accent.

Mr SEENEY: That is right. It was not hard to sell the tickets. I gave them to one of my son's friends who went up to Caxton Street with them. He told me that he could have sold a dozen had I had them, but I did not. I think the bill recognises that such events can happen—and I am pretty sure they do. But when considering this bill we need to place those circumstances on the record just so that the situation is clear. People who might like to make mischief about what this bill is trying to achieve can be silenced very quickly by pointing out the assurances that the minister can give people in the parliament. I think it would be good if we could do that today.

The bill also deals with the issue of so-called ambush advertising, or unauthorised advertising. This was brought to our attention by the appearance of the Holden blimp over a major sporting event in Brisbane. That raised the issue of the potential for that sort of advertising to become much more widely practised. At the time when it became an issue, it was obvious to me that the government had to do something about it. It could not allow a free-for-all in the skies over a major sporting event. If that occurred, we would end up with almost a traffic jam of hot-air balloons, blimps, planes towing banners—the whole range of options that are available. We could not allow that sort of activity to go unchecked and uncontrolled for a number of reasons, such as the safety of the people involved.

Obviously, if there are a large number of such devices, it becomes a traffic management issue in uncontrolled airspace, for want of a better word. Members could imagine that there would be a degree of jockeying of positions on a first-in basis. This situation is a bit like where people stand to give out how-to-vote cards on polling day. Even though that practice has not been controlled, it is still a first-in, best-dressed situation. Just as enthusiastic booth workers struggle to put up corflutes in the places that offer the best advantage, we can imagine that people would be struggling to get the best positions for their advertising device. There is also the aesthetic impact of these types of advertising devices on the people who go to watch the sporting event. I believe there was certainly the potential for this sort of advertising to spoil the sporting event.

But the most important reason is a commercial one. We have to appreciate that it costs an enormous amount of money to stage major sporting events, such as the first test that we just enjoyed at the Gabba cricket ground. If we are able to raise those large amounts of money that are necessary to stage such events, then the sponsors who pay for the sponsorship rights to put their logo on the fence or on a banner in the stadium itself—or whatever advertising opportunity they buy—have to be able to get value for money, otherwise they are not going to continue to sponsor such events. If those major sponsors do not continue to sponsor events, then me and all the other Queenslanders who enjoy going to those major events are going to affected, because a lack of sponsorship will reduce the number of opportunities to stage major events.

We have to protect the commercial integrity of staging major events, because the commercial integrity of staging such major events is tied very closely to giving commercial advertisers value for money for the advertising that they buy within the precinct itself, or in areas closely associated with the precinct. That is the most important reason. If we devalue that product, then the commercial viability of the whole sporting event suffers. The event itself will suffer. Consequently, there will be fewer events held. I do not think that anybody wants to see that. We certainly support the moves that the government is making to control this type of ambush advertising, or unauthorised advertising, because in a very real way it could potentially threaten the viability of those major sporting events.

There are a few little quirks and questions regarding how the legislation is going to be implemented. It is not hard to imagine how the administration of such a law could be taken to overzealous levels. I know when this matter was first floated in a public debate, the issue was raised with me of names on T-shirts and logos on eskies, cricket bats or footballs. I hope that, even if those issues are not dealt with in the bill, common sense will prevail. We all appreciate the intent of this bill. The administration of the bill should be carried out in line with that intent. Perhaps the minister might like to make some comment about that issue in his summing-up. It would be very valuable if the minister did that because it would provide an opportunity to put to rest any fears that might be raised by people who would like to make mischief with the legislation.

Having made those few comments, I look forward to enjoying and watching many more major sporting events at the great facilities that we have in Brisbane. There is very much a bipartisan support for having events such as the first cricket test that was held in Brisbane continue. I just hope that we always get the same result that we got last week. I certainly will not be opposing the passage of the bill through the House.

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—Lib) (3.19 pm): I rise to speak briefly to the Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill 2006. The Premier introduced this bill in an attempt to deal with ticket scalping and those blimps that display unauthorised advertising. The bill will allow the Governor in Council to declare particular events being staged at any MSFA facilities as being subject to aerial advertising restrictions. These restrictions have to be published in the *Government Gazette* at least 28 days before the restrictions take effect so that all of those evil competitors know for sure that they are not allowed to play in the sky.

The issue with giving 28 days notice of aerial advertising bans is that it allows advertisers enough time to take advantage of the loopholes that this bill has. The restrictions on aerial advertising will not apply to logos or symbols permanently displayed on buildings which may be visible from the facility, and the restrictions do not apply to advertisements displayed on aircraft which pass over venues as part of scheduled commercial flights. If I were a pretty savvy skywriter or pilot that pulls advertising banners behind my plane, such as those I see on the Gold Coast beaches almost every weekend in summer, would I not just schedule my flights in advance around the venue?

Also, the bill maintains that aerial advertising cannot be within sight of a declared event. Does that mean within sight of the venue from the air or from the facility and from inside and outside the facility? I can remember seeing the blimp's shadow going across the MCG on AFL grand final day on the telly. I had no idea what the shadow was at first, but when I realised it was blimp I did not jump up and think parliament should be restricting competition—it is competition that has always made our commercial arena more interesting and fair and conducive to new advertising techniques. What I thought was that that might be a little dangerous and harder for the players to follow the ball, running in and out of a moving shadow.

I am not too sure how effective these restrictions are going to be. The most successful commercial operators and advertisers are successful because they find ways to advertise to their markets in creative and exciting ways. I do not think these restrictions are going to stop ambush advertising, and I even doubt whether they will stop aerial advertising. I know that I am nitpicking on what I perceive to be, in essence, an anticompetitive bill, but I admit that I am still very angry that the Beattie government would reject legislation banning the public display of illegal drug utensils but prioritise banning blimps.

The bill also aims to address what seems to be a growing phenomenon—ticket scalping. Currently event organisers and ticket agents impose conditions of sale on tickets, usually including that the purchaser cannot resell tickets at an inflated price. Breaches of this condition can incur cancellation of the ticket. The explanatory notes rightly point out that this has its disadvantages for the purchaser of an onsold inflated ticket as they may be refused entry to the event, but I do think that anyone who is willing to buy a scalped ticket is aware of these risks. What is worthy of protecting though is when these purchasers are the victims of fraudulent activity where tickets may not exist or do not meet the expectation due to false advertising. That is worth protecting against.

So the bill creates a deterrent to reselling and purchasing scalped tickets—20 penalty points for reselling and five penalty points for purchasing at a price 10 per cent above the original ticket price. Again in reality we have to ask: is this going to reduce ticket scalping? Ticket scalpers of the past who used to set up shop out the front of the stadium itself are long gone. Onselling now occurs in the digital world, through eBay and away from the facility itself. People prepurchase tickets and give themselves time to flog off their tickets at work, uni and even at school. How the empowering of police to issue infringement notices to offenders prior to and during the events held at MFSA facilities is going to address these issues is beyond me.

Laws that are not or cannot be enforced are worse than no laws at all. There is no greater illustration of this, seeing as how I have already alluded to this today, than the current bans against the public display and sale of cannabis utensils or bongs. One would not know that this is against the law in Cavil Avenue this week, with schoolies specials on the items being heavily promoted. But, despite making this activity unlawful, the Beattie government has obviously not had its police monitoring and enforcing these laws. I repeat: laws that are not or cannot be enforced are worse than no laws at all.

I can appreciate the 10 per cent margin provided in the bill to allow for the proper reselling of tickets, and I understand that this legislation could strengthen the existing conditions placed on tickets by event organisers and ticket agents by allowing them to point to legislation displayed on the wall—like bar tenders can do with the Liquor Act—but the enforcement reach of this may defy the objective of this bill to address the phenomenon of ticket scalping.

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory—NPA) (3.23 pm): The Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill 2006 is the minister's first piece of legislation since assuming the role of the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport. I congratulate him on his elevation to that high office and I wish him well.

I believe that this is a very important piece of legislation which protects the rights of people. In this modern day and age that we live in, especially in the corporate world of big business, when we talk about aerial advertising and property rights as such, it is very important that we get the mix right. When it comes to TV rights of events such as the test match at the Gabba which just concluded—and congratulations to Australia and to the Gabba trust on hosting such a fine event—the point is that we have to make certain that we do have the mix right. I think the government has it right in relation to this legislation.

The member for Surfers Paradise clearly identified the issue of ticket scalpers. I thank the minister for bringing this to the attention of the House and introducing this law. That element of society is taking advantage of those less privileged people who cannot afford to pay exorbitant prices to go to

events such as the test match at the Gabba or a State of Origin game at Lang Park. I think this is good legislation where we put fairness and equity back into what everyday Queenslanders should be able to have access to, whether they buy a ticket through Ticketek or over the internet or whatever. However it is done, it should be done in a fair way so that nobody is penalised.

I went to the Gabba on Friday afternoon and saw the last couple of sessions. I thought that that was a fantastic event. I know criticism has been levelled at the government and at the police for the level of security at the game. A lot of people go to the cricket. I was there and I saw young fellas having a bit of fun. I have no problem with that, but I do have a problem with people who want to go there and cause chaos and problems for the people around them. I think the Barmy Army is absolutely fantastic. They keep the atmosphere going. They put a bit of life into the subject. It is even better still when the Aussies are giving them a tune up. I hope that continues for a while because they are not backward in rubbing it into us. But at the same time we have to make these sporting events safe so that our families can go and enjoy them. I do not think security was overboard. At the end of the day I think it was a good outcome.

There is one other aspect of this legislation that I want to reflect on this afternoon—that is, the business of getting people to and from these venues. The Gabba is no exception and Lang Park is no exception. I am pleased that the minister for local government is in the House this afternoon. I hope that the minister for transport might also listen to what I am about to say. We have to take a long hard look at how the parking issues at the Gabba and Lang Park, or Suncorp Stadium, can be addressed. Businesses around Suncorp Stadium are affected during major events and it is an impost on them. I know that Suncorp Stadium is right in the middle of the minister's electorate. I think that is something we have to look at. A lot of legislation comes into this House over a period of time and we think it is right on the day but that is one aspect we still have not got right.

That is an issue that corporate government should look at. It is the government's responsibility to upgrade these venues—and they are quality venues. I congratulate the government on the Gabba cricket ground. It is fantastic since the completion of the upgrade, and Queenslanders can be proud of it. I have heard commentators say that it is one of the better cricket grounds in the world. That statement is also applicable to Suncorp Stadium as far as football is concerned. If anyone has been to major events at the Olympic stadium in Sydney, they will have witnessed the fact that they can unload that ground in 20 minutes—trains, buses, the whole bit; people are gone. But when it comes to our grounds here in Brisbane we have a real scourge in relation to public transport. There is the issue of Milton Railway Station, public parking and the conveyancing of people to and from the grounds in buses—which is done for free and that is good, but we have a lot of homework to do.

This issue has to be addressed. Light rail is something that we have to consider, especially around the Gabba, but I think it can be utilised in other areas of the city. In 2006, in the sophisticated world that we live in, Brisbane is certainly in a position to take advantage of modern transport types like light rail and monorail such as the one in Sydney. European and North American countries are able to take advantage of light rail and interface it with buses, ferries or heavy rail. I know that we are currently engaged in very in-depth planning here in Brisbane in relation to these types of events. We need to take into account not only events like this but also people getting to and from work on a daily basis. We can boast about our sporting venues such as the cricket ground at Woolloongabba and also Suncorp Stadium—Lang Park as many of us refer to it; I know that we should not—but we have to ensure that people can get to and from the events. These are venues that we can be proud of but we have to ensure that people have easy access to and from events. Whether it is the Brisbane City Council or whether it is the Queensland state government in conjunction with those two representative bodies, we have to address the issue and make improvements not only in the interests of businesspeople in close proximity to these venues but also the patrons who want to go to and from these events.

We can have the best here in Brisbane because we are in our infancy as far as planning goes. I say to the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport and to the transport minister: we have to get it right. We have an opportunity to get it right by working together to come up with a solution. I support the legislation and have pride in doing so.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (3.31 pm): I rise to support in particular the antiscalping segment of this Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill. There are those people who set out to purchase tickets at their initial release with the intent of selling them later on at an inflated price. That is often to the disadvantage of the mums and dads in the community who would possibly be able to scrape together the original selling price if it was something they desperately wanted to go to or take their family to but certainly the inflated price is beyond their reach.

I commend the minister for the provision in the bill that still allows not-for-profit organisations to hold their fundraisers. We have all been to charity auctions where we are encouraged to pay well above the face value of whatever the item is. I have been to some auctions where the auctioneer challenges the bidders to double the price of a $20 meat voucher: 'Pay $40, it is for a really good cause.' That is the whole point of the auction. We know why we are there; we know what we are there raising funds for. The

bidders in those charity auctions and the like do so with their eyes open; they are well informed and they know that the additional money that is paid above the face value of whatever the item is is going to a charity. I commend the minister for that.

I also commend the minister on the 10 per cent latitude from the original ticket price. It recognises that something will increase in value. It is also recognition of the fact that there are circumstances where people buy tickets in good faith and then subsequently their circumstances change and for a variety of reasons, usually health or family reasons, they cannot attend the event. There is certainly no impediment to them on-selling the tickets, albeit that they cannot sell them for an inflated price.

The question that I have for the minister on this legislation is in relation to the advertising segment of the bill. My initial reaction was that we were being a bit draconian in stopping people from advertising over venues. In years gone by it was seen to be entrepreneurial to organise to fly over a packed venue with a sign. The more entrepreneurial were the ones that dragged a sign behind a plane across their competitor's sponsored activity. We have lost the joy in all of that now and we are going to stop them.

Mr Beattie: No-one is going to have any fun anymore. That's it, it's ended.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Yes, it is finished—none of this dropping your competition in the noses of the people who have come to watch your sponsored event. Initially my reaction was that we were overdoing it, but I can understand the fact that the major sports facilities' sponsorship is six and seven figures nowadays and that it is an investment by the major sponsor in terms of their corporate badging, their investment in sport but more the marketing of their product.

Could the minister clarify on the record whether people whose businesses visually adjoin the major sports facilities will be obligated to cover up what is their normal advertising. Reading the explanatory notes, it could be construed in an emotional environment that people who have advertising on their buildings or have advertising banners in the vicinity of the major sports facilities could feel vulnerable in terms of the fines, and the quantum of the fines is significant.

As I said, I think we have lost a lot of our sense of humour and our uniqueness that makes us Aussies. However, in terms of the value of sponsorship now, it is understandable. I look forward to the minister's response.

Mr REEVES (Mansfield—ALP) (3.35 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise in support of this Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill. Continuing on from what the member for Gladstone has said, sport these days is big business. Most of the funds that come in from sport these days come from two major sources: attendance and sponsorship. The reality is that no major sporting event today would work without sponsorship. Prior to entering this place I had a bit to do with the sporting industry. It was quite apparent that local clubs were reliant on sponsorship. Anything that we as a government and as a parliament can do to ensure that the sponsorship dollar will continue to support sporting events and sporting organisations is a good thing. To—for want of a better word—ban the blimp if it has not been approved will in the long term achieve good outcomes for this city and this state when it comes to conducting major sporting events.

The Brisbane Cricket Ground—the Gabba—has just achieved a record crowd and I must compliment all those involved in Major Sports Facilities Authority, in particular a friend of mine who is the manager of the Gabba and ANZ Stadium, Chris Cochrane. He and his team did a marvellous job of putting on a great event at the Gabba. He even became a bit of a media star over the last week and a half and I think he did a pretty good job of that. I congratulate Chris and his team on the excellent work that they did during the cricket. It was a great experience.

I attended one day of the cricket. There were a couple of little hiccups early on the Thursday morning in relation to transport but that was mainly because there were more people coming from the city than usual. That was obviously as a result of more overseas and interstate travellers. The transport system overall coped particularly well.

I travelled home from the Gabba on the bus and I happened to sit next to a person who used to work for the ICC. He has travelled the world. He lived in Brisbane for five years but is now back living in England. He has worked for Zimbabwe cricket and the ICC. I did not prompt him and I did not tell him what I did until after this conversation, but he could not believe our great south-east busway. He had travelled up from Loganholme with some friends of his that he was staying with and he reckons that he has never been on such a world-class transport system. I agreed with him wholeheartedly. It was a great pleasure to listen to this person who, as I said, has travelled the world and thought our bus system was terrific.

I commend the other provisions of this amendment bill that address the issue of ticket scalpers and the placing of a 10 per cent cap on the price of tickets that are onsold. I commend the minister for this legislation. I cannot say that in the past I have not actually tried to buy a scalper's ticket—I declare it—but it was not illegal then—at least not in Queensland. When we were going down to Sydney to watch the St George-Melbourne grand final we realised that we were in row 999. So we took up a better offer as we were walking through the gate. We ended up having good seats, although the result was not superb for any St George supporter.

I commend the minister for these changes. We are now attracting world-class events because we have world-class stadiums in the form of the Gabba and Suncorp Stadium. No-one could doubt that this city has now got a world-class stadium for rectangular sport and oval sport that is the envy of many others. We have a lot to be proud of considering the transport systems we now have in place with nearly 80 per cent of the people catching transport to Suncorp Stadium—and I am sure that the number travelling to the Gabba over the weekend increased dramatically—and, in the future, the world-class management in the Major Sports Facilities Authority. I look forward in years to come to attending a number of events. Not only are they a direct result of the changes we are making here; more importantly, they have come about because of the great stadiums, the great facilities and the great management. I look forward to attending many more sporting events at those great sporting facilities. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. PD BEATTIE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (3.42 pm), in reply: I start by thanking all honourable members for their contributions to today's debate. I thank the opposition for their support for this bill. I knew we had to agree on something somewhere along the line. In particular, I would like to record my thanks to the honourable Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport, Andrew Fraser, who has been instrumental in the development of this bill and will handle the bill in the debate on the clauses.

I support the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the magnificent venues such as the Gabba and Suncorp Stadium and the management of the Major Sports Facilities Authority. For the record, I might just say to all those critics who attacked my government along the way for building Suncorp and who attacked my government for also completing the Gabba that I think they now realise that they were wrong because Queensland is entitled to the best sporting facilities in the world. That is what we have. We are attracting sporting events and out of that comes an enormous amount of economic activity. I say to those people who whinge about everything that sooner or later they have to support those who are building these sorts of facilities. The same goes for the new library I opened last week and the art gallery that I will be opening on Friday: they are great pieces of infrastructure but they are also culturally and intellectually enriching for the state. That is what we have been trying to do. I accept the sentiments of the Leader of the Opposition and I acknowledge that.

These amendments will strengthen Queensland's position as the premier destination for sporting, entertainment and cultural events. The amendments will protect fans, supporters, promoters, sporting bodies and sponsors alike by tightening controls over the conduct of major events at our major sporting facilities. Importantly, as I said earlier, these amendments will help to preserve the community fabric that centres on families attending major events and seeing their heroes in action.

One of the things I am really pleased about is the increased number of women who are supporting major sporting events. Take Australian football, for example. I know, Madam Acting Speaker, that you are an AFL fan. You can tell the intelligent fans. Australian football has the highest percentage of female support. Cricket is in the high thirties and AFL is in the forties. The real challenge is for Rugby League and Rugby Union, which I love, to lift the number of women who support it. I am sure there are some female members of this House who could give them some guidance.

Mr Reeves interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: So women use public transport?

Mr Reeves: If they come there will be even more.

Mr BEATTIE: Fair enough, and the member for Mansfield will be there to show them the way. Importantly, these amendments will help preserve the community fabric and the families. The ticket-scalping measures will protect the public from the actions of unscrupulous scalpers who merely seek to make a profit and who really could not care less about the event. They are only interested in greed. In this electronic age scalpers have been able to exploit web sites like eBay to profit from onselling tickets at grossly inflated prices. I would like to acknowledge eBay's cooperation with the government on this bill. They had discussions with the minister for sport and I think he has allayed any concerns they may have had about the legislation. I am pleased to advise that they have agreed to put appropriate measures in place to alert their customers to the new offences. I thank them for that. I think the amendments have been circulated.

Again, I acknowledge the views of the Leader of the Opposition in wanting to preserve some of the theatre associated with test cricket. However, it is important that families can attend these events feeling safe and with some surety that their enjoyment will not be disrupted. In relation to the issues that the Leader of the Opposition has raised, the government is balancing the requirements for public safety at events, including appropriate antiterrorism measures, with the need to ensure that our facilities remain attractive venues for staging events. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, who has left the chamber, that it is important to not simply act on—and I say this with the greatest courtesy—the television coverage of the arrest. Often what happens—and I talk to police from time to time, and I was talking to the Deputy Premier and the police minister a little bit earlier about this—is that there is a long period of inappropriate behaviour before the people are actually thrown out of the venue. The police, I have to say, have been incredibly tolerant.

Why should a family going to the cricket have to be subject to behaviour such as beer being thrown over them or inappropriate loutish behaviour, obscene language or whatever? We should be able to be civilised when we go to a sporting venue. If we are going to increase the percentage of women and families who go to view cricket particularly beyond the high thirties and into the forties and fifties, then we should act like civilised people. There is nothing wrong with a bit of fun. I have welcomed the balmy army here on a number of occasions. I think there are about 10,000 of them wondering around. The minister for tourism has confirmed that because most of them are friends of hers. The important thing is that if we do welcome the balmy army—and they are generally well behaved—we need to make sure that everyone else behaves appropriately. I think the police behaved appropriately. I want to say to the police publicly: well done. I do not think we want to go to sporting events to be slobbered on.

The penalties for ticket scalping will only apply if a person attempts to sell a ticket for more than 10 per cent of the purchase price. This is designed to allow people who genuinely need to do so to recoup the cost of the ticket. I think that is reasonable, although 10 per cent is not a bad return. I would not mind that on any investments. I am sure that the Leader of the Liberal Party, who has extensive investments, would love a 10 per cent return.

I also thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support regarding the aerial advertising provisions. Further, I would ask that he convey his support to his federal colleagues so that we can achieve a nationally consistent approach to this matter and therefore overcome the need for state parliaments to deal with this matter individually. The government will be monitoring the implementation of the legislation to ensure that any anomalies which are identified can be addressed.

In relation to comments made about exemptions for scheduled flights by the member for Surfers Paradise, who is in the chamber, it should be noted that the bill specifies that this must be a scheduled commercial flight—in other words, a flight operated by an airline. Therefore, the situation to which the member referred will not arise.

I thank the member for Gladstone for her support for the bill. The bill provides that advertising on buildings adjacent to major sports facilities that are in place on more than a temporary basis are exempt from the restrictions. So the point that the member for Gladstone raised is covered. The XXXX sign is a case in point. The MSFA has some discretion in relation to these matters anyway. I do not think that is a problem as the MSFA would be able to pursue the matter.

The aerial advertising provisions will provide surety to event organisers and sponsors when they stage events in Queensland. In turn, this will make Queensland an even more attractive location in which to hold events. That is something that will ultimately benefit the event-loving public.

Recent weeks have seen international acts such as U2, Kylie and Billy Joel perform at our facilities. As well, there was the first test match of the Ashes series played at the Gabba. I would like to see Queensland build on this momentum. If the attendance figures from the recent Rugby League test matches in Sydney are anything to go by, Queensland venues have a bright future.

By the way, I agree with the speculation I heard that the Tri-Nations final next year should be held at Suncorp. The Australia versus England match on 18 November—it was held on my birthday; I was away overseas—was well attended. The final was not anywhere near as well attended. I think that it makes sense that they should go where the fans are. I say to those organisers in both Rugby League and Rugby Union that it is worth remembering that when they allocate matches in the future. While they have to build crowds in other places, including Melbourne, it does not do any harm to ensure that they look after their base constituency.

What they should do, if I can give them some unsolicited advice, is build on the solid foundations they have got and then expand their support base. That is what the AFL did. AFL has one of the most successful track records in this nation of expanding its sport. While I have come to appreciate it, love it and support it, having grown up with Rugby League and Rugby Union I would like these sports to equally expand.

I want to congratulate Rugby League on the Tri-Nations series. Rugby League did a fantastic job. The final was certainly a gripping game. We could not ask for a better final between Australia and New Zealand. Congratulations to the New Zealanders. While I was obviously passionately supporting Australia and I was delighted to see Darren Lockyer pull off that brilliant try at the end, set up by Thurston, I think the New Zealanders should be very proud of their performance.

Let me come back to the final points. It is worth making the point that sporting events lead to economic activity. That is one of the reasons we have to have the best sporting facilities in the world and that is what my government has built. That is one of the reasons we are bidding for the world athletic championships in 2011. That was one of the reasons I was in Monaco a couple of weeks ago.

Finally, for the information of members I point out that the minister for sport, Andrew Fraser, and I have dual roles here because sporting facilities are technically my responsibility through the MFSA. By and large, the minister for sport looks after them for me. I want to acknowledge the contribution that he has made here. He has negotiated most of the provisions of this bill and is largely the driving force behind it. I want to thank him publicly for it. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1 (Short title)—

Mr FRASER (3.52 pm): I move the following amendment and table the explanatory notes for the amendments—

Tabled paper: Explanatory notes to amendments to be moved during consideration in detail.

1 Clause 1 (Short title)—

At page 4, line 5, after '*Act*'—

insert—

'*(No. 2)*'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3 (Insertion of new pts 4A and 4B)—

Mr FRASER (3.53 pm): I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 3 (Insertion of new pts 4A and 4B)—

At page 5, after line 10—

insert—

'***public sale forum*** means a newspaper, auction house, internet website or other venue or medium that, in the ordinary course of business or commerce, is generally made available to members of the public to sell to, or purchase from, other members of the public, all, or broad categories of, property and services.'.

3 Clause 3 (Insertion of new pts 4A and 4B)—

At page 6, after line 2—

insert—

'(5) A person does not contravene subsection (1) or (2) merely because the person provides, or assists someone else to provide, a public sale forum that is used in contravention of subsection (1) or (2).'.

These amendments seek to clarify the operation of the aiding and abetting elements of the Criminal Code to the application of the bill.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))—

Mr FRASER (3.54 pm): I move the following amendments—

4 Clause 7 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))—

At page 9, after line 20—

insert—

'***national or international***, sport event, includes, for example—

(a) a sport event that is organised at a national or international level or by a national or international body; and

(b) a sport event between a team representing 1 State or country and a team representing another State or country; and

Example—

the rugby league 'State of Origin' series

(c) a sport event between a team representing a State, or a part of a State, and a team representing another country, or a part of another country.

Examples—

- a game of cricket between a team representing Queensland and a team representing England
- the rugby union 'Super 14' competition'.

5 Clause 7 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))—

At page 9, after line 26—

insert—

'***public sale forum***, for part 4A, see section 30B.'.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

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

Motion agreed to.

Long Title

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

Motion agreed to.

STATE DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 2 November (see p. 536)

Miss SIMPSON (Maroochydore—NPA) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.56 pm): I am pleased to rise to speak in the debate on the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006 which amends the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 and provides for state planning and development through a coordinated system of public works organisation, as well as environmental coordination of those public projects.

It is well recognised and acknowledged that members on this side of the House are strong advocates for better economic and social infrastructure and are strong supporters for the better administration of development in Queensland. Our advocacy and support is unequivocal. The coalition parties are the genuine pro responsible development and free enterprise parties in Queensland. Our record in government of getting timely and critical infrastructure established is obvious the length and breath of the state.

However, being pro responsible development does not mean the coalition parties support legislative mechanisms which remove transparency or put at risk inbuilt accountability and probity measures which in turn prevent corruption within a public entity. We certainly do not support measures that undermine good environmental and social outcomes resulting from good decision making.

What we see is that there is a great risk in this bill. It provides unfettered powers to the Coordinator-General. At this juncture I must point out that I am not saying that the current Coordinator-General is corrupt. However, what we are saying is that Queenslanders may not be so fortunate in the future considering this bill provides for an unelected member of the government to have more power than the minister or the parliament.

There is no reason that infrastructure, critical or otherwise—including the government's proposed water grid—cannot be processed through the existing provisions of the Coordinator-General's powers. The existing powers are extensive, but they are subject to strict control. There is every reason to insist that in each case a compulsion or an authority is used by the Coordinator-General that it is subject to parliamentary scrutiny and therefore subject to parliamentary authority.

It is the parliament that is supreme in our system of government. The parliament is not an obstacle to progress and should not be seen as being obstructive. The State Development and Public Works Organisation Act is a very important piece of legislation. It is always worth remembering the act's history. Since 1938 Queensland has been fortunate in having generic statutes which have promoted public works and sensible development throughout the state. In line with the evolving role of the Coordinator-General, the act was amended in 1971 to provide for a means of environmental coordination of development, the establishment of state development areas and enhanced powers to facilitate development of the mineral and energy resources of the state.

The 1971 amendments laid the foundation for the Coordinator-General's role in the facilitation of major private sector development projects in Queensland. The Office of the Coordinator-General and the functions available through the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 will remain integral to the economic, social and environmental development of this state. Since 1981 the act has been amended some 20 times, but the amendments being debated today provide the Coordinator-General with unprecedented power. Major infrastructure projects have, by and large, been provided by public sector agencies. However, the coalition parties appreciate and are supportive of the important role that the private sector plays, and will increasingly play, in the physical and social development of the state.

Running a state on behalf of the people of Queensland, which is the essence of responsible government, is similar to running a company on behalf of its shareholders. Queensland is a giant enterprise with many facets, some of them not so obvious to the broader community. However, the government has stewardship of the books, not ownership of them. That ownership belongs to the people of Queensland. Major projects create jobs and numerous flow-on benefits such as valuable export revenue as any economic development strategy reveals, and an integral part of an economic development strategy is a need to promote infrastructure development. Infrastructure supports the delivery of essential goods and services to all businesses, industries and households across the state. It includes transport systems, water storage and distribution systems, production and transmission facilities for electricity and gas, information technology and telecommunications. Providing adequate and cost-effective infrastructure is essential to meet the government's commitment to increase the standard of living and quality of life for Queenslanders.

For the past eight years the coalition has been urging the ALP government to pursue the provision of adequate infrastructure. The coalition was quite prepared to provide the government with our own economic development strategy which was about ensuring Queensland was the best place to do business in Australia because we had the necessary infrastructure—energy, water, roads, rail and ports—and had developed a coordinated and rigorous policy framework which aimed to ensure that energy, water, transport and telecommunications networks were in place to support further growth and development across the state; to continue significant microeconomic reform to reduce prices of major imports such as gas and electricity for Queensland business and industry by introducing competitive markets into infrastructure service provision; and to gain an increased focus on innovative ways of meeting users' needs, including introducing private sector involvement in infrastructure and service delivery through public-private partnerships.

Even though the coalition constantly urged the government to get to work and develop essential infrastructure, in the main the coalition was howled down by various government ministers and members who claimed we were out of date. We were viciously criticised for wanting to build dams, roads and bridges and we were even accused of scaremongering when we raised serious concerns about the ability of electricity suppliers to provide a secure electricity supply.

Whilst the Labor government remained inactive, infrastructure development stalled. But the government still managed to enter into backroom deals with some groups, including some environment groups, which is particularly interesting considering that this bill provides for voluntary environmental agreements. What this means with regard to government owned companies doing business with the government is something that we are very keen to hear the Deputy Premier explain, because there certainly are not any explanations in this legislation, the second reading speech or the explanatory notes.

Supposedly this bill's provisions mirror those contained within the Nature Conservation Act. I say 'supposedly' because in briefings we have been advised of the detail of the policies applying to these voluntary agreement acts and provisions that are yet to follow but we have not seen it. The Nature Conservation Act provides for conservation agreements which are quite specific in their intent—that is, a definition, a person's rights, management principles, prohibitions and restrictions. A conservation agreement under that act is also subject to revocation by the Governor in Council. However, under this amendment bill the power is entirely in the hands of the Coordinator-General once the minister has approved his request to enter into a voluntary environmental agreement. I will state that again: this amending bill puts the power entirely in the hands of the Coordinator-General once the minister has approved his request to enter into a voluntary environmental agreement.

Whilst on the subject, let us look at some other provisions of the Nature Conservation Act and, in particular, how those provisions relate to the state or the relevant landholder. For example, under the Nature Conservation Act a conservation agreement may be entered into which may contain terms—

(a) requiring the State to provide financial or other assistance; or

(b) requiring the State to provide technical advice; or

(c) requiring the State to carry out specified activities ...

In this instance, under the Nature Conservation Act the operative words are 'the state'. However, a comparison within the amendment bill reveals that a voluntary environmental agreement may contain terms—

(a) requiring the applicant to provide financial or other assistance; or

(b) requiring the applicant to provide financial assurance to the State; or

(c) requiring the applicant to provide technical advice or carry out stated activities ...

It certainly provides a shift in responsibility from the state to the applicant. As I have said, there are many unanswered questions as to how this is going to be applied—whether in some circumstances it is the surreptitious movement of costs and debts from the state's balance sheets, and once again we are expected to accept this lack of clarity and transparency of the money trail because the government has put this legislation through in this format.

We have already seen a classic example of funding trails which are obtuse with regard to the development of Suncorp Stadium and somehow we are being expected in this legislation to trust the government if, through its development process, it shifts the cost sideways—whether that is a private sector involvement or a government owned entity, and there is certainly a track record with government owned entities and parking the real costs of projects under government owned companies.

Another concern for the public is the fact that the applicant has no access to judicial review, only a costly exercise through the Supreme Court—a costly exercise because it is done without the benefit of statute law provision and would have to be a civil claim. I will talk more about this removal of the appeal rights in a moment. One has to question why the government wants to depart from sound legislative principles.

Section 4(3)(b) of the Legislative Standards Act 1992 provides that legislation should be consistent with principles of natural justice. Natural justice principles are derived from the common law and include the right to be heard, an absence of bias and procedural fairness. In relation to the Beattie Labor government's undermining of natural justice principles, the explanatory notes state—

The new section 76P(1) provides that the Coordinator-General's decision is conclusive and not subject to any objection or appeal under the SDPWO—

that is, the State Development and Public Works Organisation—

Act; or the relevant law.

In relation to section 76P(1), the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee found—

The effect of this provision is to deprive affected persons of access to any of the usual statutory appeal processes.

Similarly, in relation to decisions about critical infrastructure projects, progression notes, notices to decide and step-in notices, essential parts of the Judicial Review Act 1991 will not apply. The committee outlined further that—

Part 5 of the Judicial Review Act essentially declares that the Supreme Court retains its original common law jurisdiction in relation to the prerogative writs of mandamus, prohibition or certiorari, but that the writs in question are no longer to actually be issued by the court (s.41(1)). An equivalent remedy must be provided in the form of an order (s.41(2)). Part 5 extensively regulates the processes for obtaining redress in reliance on the Supreme Court's 'original' (inherent) jurisdiction.

It continues—

In essence, s.76W declares inapplicable all of part 5 except for s.41(1) (which provides that the three prerogative writs shall no longer be issued).

The committee noted that the provision of section 76P and 76W, both inserted by clause 7 in this bill before the House, removed the normal statutory appeal rights and severely curtailed, or even completely removed, rights to judicial review, the first in relation to prescribed projects and the second in relation to such projects that are also declared to be critical infrastructure projects. No member in this House could honestly state that these provisions are fair, particularly where natural justice is spurned and procedural fairness is rejected.

I note that other outside bodies have also criticised this extraordinary removal of appeal rights. The Local Government Association, which was not consulted in the lead-up to this legislation being formulated and tabled, said that no appeal rights or judicial review rights, except for critical infrastructure projects in relation to decisions made by the Coordinator-General, is unprecedented and inconsistent with fundamental legislative principles.

Coalition members understand the need for speed in the delivery of infrastructure, particularly for the much-needed infrastructure such as water storage and distribution, energy, road and rail, which this ALP government has failed to deliver for the past eight years. However, as this Labor government grew fat and lazy and basked in the glory of the hard work of previous governments' sound economic and developmental achievements, what was happening under its collective noses? Queensland's growth was running at an average of two per cent per annum since 1995, but this Labor government chose to engage in spin instead of delivering substance. I have to commend the state government for its superb media management. It makes a virtue out of trying to fix the problems it has created, such as the south-east Queensland water crisis. No doubt the government will try to sell this extraordinary piece of legislation as essential to overcoming the infrastructure logjam, which is what there is after an infrastructure drought.

The important issues—such as building the southern regional pipeline, the western pipeline, the desalination plant and other measures—are now urgent, and there are critical time frames for resolving them. On that we agree. Brisbane could run out of water within the next couple of years if the pipelines are not in place to deliver fresh water. Dams that have been contentious will not, in fact, be online for years to address the immediate water crisis, but additional storage capacity is still necessary. Thus, there is the Coalition's own south-east Queensland water strategy, which we released months before the government, and there is our ongoing commitment to seeing water infrastructure put on the public agenda over a number of years.

The state Coalition agrees that there is an urgency for these pipeline projects to proceed and for proper water infrastructure to be put in place in a timely way along with other state infrastructure. However, what we do not agree with is the scope of this legislation as it delivers almost unfettered powers into the hands of a high-level bureaucrat with virtually no right of appeal or checks or balances upon that. We have supported the important role of the Coordinator-General, as outlined in previous legislation. However, we do not believe that this legislation is, in fact, necessary to deliver the timely infrastructure when it can just cancel out the rights of individuals and overcome good decision making.

Despite the minister's staff and the briefings referring to this legislation as a 'softer' approach than the existing provisions, it really is a grab for power. There is nothing 'softer' about the huge extension of the scope of the Coordinator-General's powers, where he does not have to subject his decisions to the accountability of parliament or, in many cases, even legal review. Once again, we have to ask: why is this legislation necessary when the power is already there in existing legislation to do the job of building the infrastructure?

We have not yet heard of one specific project mentioned, or the detail of where the bureaucratic logjam is, that requires this bill. In one briefing, logjams were vaguely blamed on the government departments. In another briefing the government said it was local governments that were to blame. I think it is time that the government came clean about what specific projects this legislation is supposed to address.

Instead, I would identify that the real answer lies at the higher level. The failure to do anything earlier in regard to infrastructure for our growing state was not a problem with the legislation; it was a leadership failure. It was a failure by the Beattie government to live beyond the 24-hour media cycle and plan for growth, which has been fairly constant for the last 30 years. We have seen something like a 2.1 per cent growth just in the last couple of decades. At times in the eighties and nineties there was up to three per cent growth. Currently it is running at about 2.1 per cent growth. Growth was predictable. It is leadership that has failed from this government that has been in place for eight years.

Before the government tables the proposed legislation, the current legislation was sufficient in order to ensure that the government got Suncorp Stadium built. The government had enough legislative power to get its new arts centre built. It had enough legislative power to get the library built. Why did the government not have enough power to put in place the water infrastructure and the other critical economic and absolutely necessary infrastructure for the basics of life? The government had the power under the legislation; it just did not have the intestinal fortitude. The government did not have the right decision making. That is why today, whilst some of these lovely iconic buildings are being opened, we are saying, 'Where's the water infrastructure?'

In speaking to this legislation, I have noted a number of the coalition's concerns. However, to summarise, the ramifications and concerns we have with this bill are, firstly, a lack of demonstrated need with government representatives unable to identify logjams within the decision-making process other than tardiness within government departments. This is clearly a reflection of poor management and should not be corrected by legislation. Secondly, there has been a lack of consultation. There was no consultation undertaken with industry or the community. As a consequence, the Local Government Association of Queensland, which is the representative of most of the development decision makers, were not informed about the bill's provisions until the association's public outcry. Thirdly, the lack of judicial review. The bill departs from provisions under the Legislative Standards Act 1992, which provides that legislation should be consistent with principles of natural justice. Natural justice principles are derived from the common law and include the right to be heard, an absence of bias and procedural fairness.

Another point is voluntary environment agreements. This raises the question as to how it will enable the government to push through what it wants to do with Traveston Dam. We know that there are major environmental concerns with voluntary environmental agreements. Does this mean that the government enters into agreements with itself through a government-owned company? Does it technically mean that a government agency cannot be challenged under judicial review?

The other issue that has to be addressed, too, is the potential cost to ratepayers and the general public. The Local Government Association of Queensland described the bill as 'using a sledgehammer to crack a nut' and is concerned that the Coordinator-General could direct councils to do certain works, irrespective of the cost to ratepayers and whether the community supports the works or not. Then there is the lack of good governance. This bill jeopardises good governance, particularly at a time when the state governments around the nation are under the spotlight due to corruption and accountability issues.

It was interesting that the Deputy Premier alluded to the COAG meeting as being one of the reasons for this legislation before the House. I would welcome her explanation as to where the detail within the COAG agreement is reflected in this legislation. Certainly some of the documentation that has been tabled does not back that up. I would welcome detail of what exactly she has signed off on. In the meantime, I will table a document that I understand relates to what COAG recommended. I do not see anywhere that it would recommend this extraordinary grab for power that is in this particular legislation.

Tabled paper: Copy of document titled 'Infrastructure Regulation'.

I once again reaffirm the state coalition's belief in the need for timely infrastructure. It is also our belief that the power is there in the legislation to deliver timely and good infrastructure. What has not been in Queensland under this Labor government has been a commitment for leadership to ensure that the right decisions are taken in a timely way.

This should not be an excuse to give these extraordinary powers to a high-level bureaucrat and remove them from the scrutiny of the parliament. Now more than ever there is a need for scrutiny to ensure that the process of providing the infrastructure that is necessary for the economic, social and environmental sustainability of this state is open to public scrutiny. That will deliver better governments and better decision making. It will also ensure that the debacles that have occurred with this state government and its track record on infrastructure cannot repeated.

The coalition is opposed to a number of provisions of this legislation. I note that the proposed government amendments—they were not available before I commenced my contribution; I saw them about five minutes into my contribution—will address some of the concerns of the Local Government Association. Unfortunately, although we were given a briefing of the intentions of some of those amendments at 8.30 this morning, I did not see the drafted amendments prior to the debate of this legislation. We will certainly scrutinise those amendments but continue to raise the issue that this government has not addressed the overarching concerns that we have about the necessity for this legislation.

The power is there now to deliver timely and good infrastructure for Queensland. This legislation is simply a power grab to make up for the poor decision making of a government that no longer wants to be accountable to the parliament or to the people.

Mr FENLON (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.20 pm): After hearing the paranoid ranting of the opposition, I rise to inject some sense into this debate. That contribution from the opposition that we have just heard shows why the opposition is a laughing-stock in the business community in this state. Across all the boardrooms in this state, the opposition is a laughing-stock. People simply shake their heads and say, 'How sad.' It is no wonder, because we have an opposition that is clearly out of touch with reality and is not listening to business.

This legislation shows that this government is listening to business. It makes sure that the future infrastructure needs of business in Queensland will be catered for. When businesses come to Queensland to undertake development and to seek the appropriate infrastructure by which to undertake that development, they need to know with a degree of certainty that that infrastructure will be in place. Businesses have to have a degree of certainty when doing their calculations of their rates of return and the time construction will take before the project is brought to fruition. Businesses have to talk to their banks, their financiers and their shareholders. They have to have some degree of certainty.

As the minister said in her second reading speech, it is a sad reality that projects get bogged down. Business is concerned that projects get bogged down, sometimes in bureaucratic processes. This legislation recognises that reality. In 2006, we need to make sure that we have a modern regulatory framework that will allow business to get on with business and to allow government and the private sector to get on with putting in place the necessary infrastructure to allow business to take place.

In terms of the history of this very noble and august institution, the Office of the Coordinator General, this legislation is a logical step. As the minister noted in her second reading speech, the origins of this legislation go back to 1938 and the Forgan Smith Labor government. Certainly, this legislation originated during the Great Depression. We no longer live in the Great Depression. Today, we require very different approaches. Therefore, since 1938 this legislation has evolved to cater for many different circumstances in Queensland.

We have seen the Coordinator-General step in to support some very significant infrastructure—for example, the South East Freeway. At the time that expressway was constructed, it could not have been done any other way. Certainly, a great job was done at the time. It is sad that in recent times we have seen faults occur in that great construction. That project was an undertaking of the Coordinator-General at that time, and for very good reason. Essentially, the Coordinator-General had to step in and perform its function because of the failure of the market to perform. The Office of the Coordinator-General did not necessarily undertake such projects on its own; at various times it did so in partnership. But the office has done that job well over many years and has done so under some very significant and eminent leadership, such as that of Sir John Kemp, Sir Charles Barton and Sir Sydney Schubert.

Back in the mid-1970s I was very proud to work in the Coordinator-General's department. They were very exciting times as the Whitlam government was in power and various programs were undertaken and coordinated in regional Queensland. Today, through this legislation, the Office of the Coordinator-General will be able to further that great work to ensure that our infrastructure is in place in a timely, effective and efficient manner.

In a broad sense, this bill is about preventing unreasonable delays in the assessment and decision stage of the necessary approvals. It can require the decision maker to make a decision or to assume the role of decision maker in relation to a prescribed decision or process. It also allows the

Coordinator-General to impose conditions on, or seek, a voluntary environmental agreement. So this bill is about achieving balance. Developers in the marketplace cannot have everything their way. There has to be a mechanism by which to ensure that a balance can be achieved and that environmental issues, which are often a sticking point, can be dealt with expeditiously and appropriately without unnecessary delays. That is a fundamental aspect of this legislation.

Under this legislation, more than one deputy director-general can be appointed as a means to ensure that the Coordinator-General has the appropriate administrative and operational assistance and resources to meet the increased workload related to the state's immediate and long-term growth requirements. The legislation also clarifies that the process for the acquisition of land in a state development area is consistent with the acquisition process of section 125 of the SDPWO Act.

The rationale for this bill is to facilitate the development of vital infrastructure and other infrastructure, both public and private. Also, as I have mentioned previously, it is also to provide measures to ensure that proper account is taken of environmental factors. More specifically, this bill increases confidence and minimises unreasonable delays in the progress of, or decision making for, certain prescribed projects.

Why is this legislation important at this point? It is simply that Queensland is the growth state and the Smart State. What is happening in Queensland is making heads turn on a world scale. The Smart State is a reality. The Smart State is supported by this House. We have been elected on the principles of the Smart State. People in my electorate certainly understand those principles when they see the improvements in our schools, when they see their children receive great opportunities through universities and when they see their children get jobs that are coming out of research in universities.

They understand that the Smart State is a reality. Smart State initiatives have resulted in Queensland becoming the growth state and the state where high levels of employment are a reality. This is a very good opportunity to again remind those opposite of the way in which they scoffed at Peter Beattie when he went to the election in 1998 claiming that we would move toward a five per cent unemployment rate. How they scoffed, laughed and ridiculed us. Now we are here and we are here because of the Smart State principles and the principles embedded in this bill in terms of ensuring that the infrastructure that is needed for development can occur properly in Queensland.

The Smart State is indeed in place because we are attracting the right critical mass of research and industry to this place. Through the Coordinator-General and the department of state development, we are able to create the linkages between the appropriate areas of industry and research to attract business to this state. That is what is happening. We want to give certainty to those people who are taking the trouble to come to Queensland. It was a great pleasure for me to represent the Premier recently at a business investors meeting in Sydney. It was an information session for potential investors in Queensland. What a great story it is to sell—it is about selling refrigerators to the Equator rather than to the North Pole. Queensland's story is a great story because we are doing the right things in Queensland to give certainty to business.

We are a government that is in touch with business. We are a government that is making sure that investors know that they are getting certainty when they come to Queensland. They can go back to their boardrooms and say, 'We're talking to a government that knows what it is doing. We're talking to a government that will give us some certainty about what will occur in Queensland. We will know with certainty that infrastructure will be put in place.' This legislation does that and does that well. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr GIBSON (Gympie—NPA) (4.32 pm): I rise to speak on the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. At this point in time our democracy is drowning in distrust—distrust of politicians, distrust of former government ministers and distrust of this government. At a time when Queensland most needs to be reassured that the legislation that affects their lives is good for them, we find this government putting forward these amendments in the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which are clearly not good for Queenslanders. My concerns about these amendments focus on the removal of the right to judicial review and the voluntary environmental agreements.

This morning the Premier made the statement that he is committed to giving people a choice. What these amendments will do is to effectively remove choice from Queenslanders—the choice to disagree with a decision and to seek a judicial review. Democracy is ultimately about deliberation and debate and, in part, the function of legislation is to enable all people to be a part of this process. The function of judicial review in these accounts is to provide another perspective on questionable decisions.

Courts are not the ultimate determiner but merely another government institution that help deliberation take place through institutional dialogues with other branches of government. Judicial review has a number of facets. It can be described broadly as the function or capacity of the courts to provide remedies to people adversely affected by unlawful government action. Such a description identifies the primary elements according to the breadth of judicial review. The primary elements are: the extent of the jurisdiction of the courts to hear and determine disputes arising in relation to government

actions or inaction and the range of government action or inaction in relation to which relief can be sought if that action or inaction is unlawful. This element in itself has several aspects—the source and nature of the power being exercised, the nature of the decision maker, the nature of the decision. Other primary elements are: the available remedies and the circumstances in which the remedies might be refused on discretionary grounds and the people entitled to seek relief from a court with jurisdiction to hear and determine disputes of this nature.

In short, the role of judicial review in a democracy is as a check on the majority of power. It may be in the narrow self-interest of this government's majority to disenfranchise social minorities—Queenslanders who do not have a voice here—who have no recourse through such ordinary legislative processes. Today we have heard of their concern for developers and businesses, but what of the ordinary Queenslander? What of those people who will be affected by this legislation? I argue that the reason why self-interested politicians would remove the opportunity for judicial review depends solely on the perspective of their power position. The courts serve as a neutral arbiter to resolve disputes under legislation. This is something that we should continue to preserve and protect. There are numerous reasons to be suspicious that these amendments reflect the interests of the people of Queensland. In my opinion they clearly do not. One of these reasons is linked to the colloquial name being given to this bill—the Traveston Crossing bill.

It is clear that this legislation is about pushing through the Traveston Crossing Dam. I suggest that the taxpayers of Queensland would want to know why the costs of building the proposed dam keep going up but the yield projections keep moving down. There are options that in combination are capable of delivering substantial yields; however, these have not yet been thoroughly investigated, nor have any findings been made public. At a time when we need to include people in the decision-making process, we are now seeing amendments that will disenfranchise them. In this sense it begs the question why the judicial review exemptions ought to be included in this bill at all. Is there a more sinister reason why the government wants to put the review of its decisions beyond the reach of the law?

We have a government that has not been honest with the people of the Mary Valley. Despite undertakings from the Premier, documents are still not freely available, such as the geologist report on the initial dam wall site. It has never become available and its absence would suggest that the Premier committed the state to a multibillion-dollar project, with the Treasurer sanctioning it, knowing that the site would not be suitable. No; at a time when we need even greater judicial oversight of government decision making the exemption of judicial review sends a bad message to all Queenslanders.

Another area of concern is the enabling of the Coordinator-General to enter into a voluntary environmental agreement with the applicant. Let us look at the environmental impact of a major state development project that would be affected if these amendments go through. It is clear that the emission of greenhouse gases is associated with large dam projects contributing to global warming. This morning we heard a question asked of the Minister for Mines and Energy about what his department is doing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions—and I commend him on his work. We are fortunate that the question was not asked of the Deputy Premier for if it were she would have had to declare that the large shallow dam that she is proposing at Traveston Crossing will increase greenhouse gas emissions in this state.

This government has become a laughing-stock across Queensland when it is viewed as an environmental vandal with what it is proposing to do with the Traveston Crossing Dam. I bring to the attention of the House a report by the World Commission on Dams which found that dams are a major contributor to climate change. It has been found that decomposing vegetation in large shallow dams—

Mr McNamara interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hervey Bay!

Mr GIBSON: It has been found that decomposing vegetation in large shallow dams emits carbon dioxide and methane. Methane is a greenhouse gas that is 20 times more potent than carbon dioxide. Current understanding of the emissions suggests that shallow, warm, subtropical dams are more likely to be greenhouse gas emitters than any other type of dam. An estimate in the report of the World Commission on Dams suggests that gross emissions from reservoirs may account for somewhere between one per cent and 28 per cent of the global warming potential of greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr Lawlor interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Southport!

Mr Lawlor interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Southport!

Mr GIBSON: The source of the information that I have just provided to the House is a report of the World Commission on Dams released in 2000.

This government's proposed dam at Traveston Crossing will be a major contributor to greenhouse gases and it is proposing that it should be able to enter into a voluntary environmental agreement. I, along with all Queenslanders who are concerned, are not convinced of this government's credibility on

environmental planning for major infrastructure projects. One only has to look at the way this government has referred the Traveston Crossing Dam under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act to the federal government.

Earlier this morning we heard the Premier criticise the federal government with—and I loosely paraphrase—'If the Howard government has its way we will turn from being paradise one day to a radioactive dump the next.' Well, if the Beattie government has its way with this legislation we will turn from paradise one day to a greenhouse gas-emitting, environmental wasteland swamp the next. That is what it is proposing at Traveston Crossing.

In conclusion, during my maiden speech I highlighted the concerns that I had with the proposed dam at Traveston Crossing. I spoke about the importance of being involved in the community and listening to the people. It is clear from what we have heard from the government's side today that the only side of the community it has been listening to are the developers and businesspeople. It has not been listening to average Queenslanders. It has not been listening to people whose lives will be adversely affected by the removal of the right of judicial review, nor has it been listening to people who have been screaming at them about the environmental concerns that its major infrastructure projects will impose upon this state.

It is not a lack of ability under the existing powers to build water infrastructure by the Coordinator-General that has brought about this legislation. Rather, it was a lack of political will on the part of this current government. Now faced with level 5 water restrictions if it does not rain, we see presented to this House an amendment that does not provide for good government. A failure to plan does not give this government a mandate to strip basic rights from all Queenslanders. I encourage the House to not support the proposed amendments.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego—NPA) (4.43 pm): I am pleased today to rise to speak to the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will give my contribution today from a local government perspective. The major impact of this legislation will be on local government. As mentioned by the shadow minister, it is quite interesting, when one considers this is major legislation that we are dealing with, that no consultation was undertaken with local government at all. When one reads through the explanatory notes and information provided, there is no consultation with industry at all. Yet, in fact, it is industry and local government who will be providing this major infrastructure. Here we have a government that is imposing these regulations, talking to the departments, having a navel-gazing exercise and not being able to work their way through this major legislation with the people who will be most affected. It is really quite extraordinary.

There have been some amendments put in place since as a panic solution to resolving some of the issues. Some of the issues were grey. This is a serious situation. We are in a parliament where the government has provided legislation that could have become law. I will read to the House the sorts of comments that are coming, for instance, from local government—

The amendments are totally over-the-top. They will give enormous and unprecedented powers to a senior public servant without any normal checks and balances the Westminster parliamentary system provides.

That is a simple thing that we should be able to do. It was not there.

The proposed powers are unprecedented in Australia. No other state jurisdiction goes so far.

We have a problem. Whose fault is it that we are running out of water? I will come to that later. We have an issue that has to be resolved. We have no problem with making things better. I will deal with some of the reasons why a lot of these developments are held up. Further comments from local government state—

Giving these 'no legal redress' powers to the Coordinator-General as the bill proposes breaches fundamental legislative principles. It is a minister or governor-in-council who should exercise these powers not a public servant whose decisions are not challengeable in a court of law.

Again there was no consultation.

At a time when state governments around Australia are in strife for corruption and accountability problems—

and we have seen that in this very chamber this morning. How many more ministers are going to be named for picking up corrupt money?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Warrego, you are skating on thin ice in relation to the Speaker's ruling this morning. I ask you to come back to the bill.

Mr HOBBS: I am sorry, I did forget about that ruling this morning. I apologise.

A government member: It was such a long time ago.

Mr HOBBS: It was a long time ago.

A government member: Memory like a goldfish.

Mr HOBBS: That's right, yes.

At a time when state governments around Australia are in strife for corruption and accountability problems these proposed changes fly in the face of good governance.

This is what the Local Government Association says—

Every spiff in Queensland will be lining up at the co-ordinator-general's door to get a special favour done. It is bad public policy.

This is what one of the major organisations in Queensland has said about the government's legislation. I know that the government has changed it in recent times. It had to; it was so ridiculous. It goes on—

I cannot fathom why other ministers and their departments rolled over on the issue. Surely the executive and the parliaments are supreme.

That is true. Aren't the parliaments supreme? Shouldn't the ministers have the authority? Why is the government handing it over to a public servant? This is quite extraordinary.

The amendment bill fundamentally changes the power balance between councils and the state government, overturning 20 years of bipartisan political support for the autonomy of Queensland councils in budgetary and infrastructure matters.

Recently a protocol was signed between local and state government. In fact, it is the second protocol that has been signed now. Members can bet their boots that as soon as a new one is signed it is broken within a few weeks. It happened again. It keeps on being broken. Why does the government even deal with local government? Why does it give a fanfare, get the media in, sign up the documents and then break it straight away? There is no sincerity. Local government is a third tier of government. Those opposite have no understanding of the issues that are involved and the breach of trust that occurs every time no consultation is undertaken when major legislation is brought before the House. Further comments are—

Councils cannot support the bill in its current form. Politicians not public servants must be making the decisions. There also needs to be a genuine state interest test prior to government intervention and such powers should only apply to large infrastructure projects in genuine emergency situations, normally, say, for projects of more than $50 million.

Those are just some of the comments from local governments across Queensland and they are the people I represent in this chamber. That is a genuine precis of the government's bill. It was not much of a tick, that is for sure. The government has put this together in a panic mode like a chook running around with its head cut off. It is trying to run around and fix up a problem to ensure that we do not run out of water.

We do not want to run out of water; we all support that. There are panic plans here. The government has not acted on infrastructure in the past. It has sat on its hands. It has not done the things that it should have done. How many years has the government had to construct the western corridor pipeline? I ticked that off for a feasibility study way back when I was minister. So many times ministers have gone up there—Minister Barton, for instance—to talk to people and they say, 'I do not think we can do that. No, they won't do it.' The government should have known that those simple things are going to be needed. Water is going to be required and for other purposes, whether it is for the Lockyer or for power stations. That pipeline should have been built by now. There is no reason why it should not have been built by now. It has been in the pipeline, so to speak, for years and years.

Of course, I must not forget to take the opportunity to point out that we already had a dam site at Wolffdene and this government sold it. It sold the only significant dam site in south-east Queensland. It has been sold off and now that site is full of houses. How smart was that—the Smart State? It sold off the dam site. It should have been built by now as well and it would have had water in it considering the rain that the coast has had in the past 12 months. The government can say that it can build dams but if it does not rain they will not fill up. That is the truth. However, the reality is that we have to have them around there.

A while ago the member for Greenslopes talked about the fact that across boardrooms big business are not listening to us in the coalition and that business wants certainty. Yes, they do want certainty, but they also want good legislation. They do not want bad legislation. There is no place anywhere for bad legislation and there is no excuse for bad legislation. All the government has to do is talk to people and they will tell it that. It needs to consult with people. All it has done is consult with the departments, and they are most of the problem. This is what has happened over the years.

Government members should cast their minds back to Minister Elder. He got State Development going because the departments had slowed things down. Things could not get done. He called it the 'department of grunt'. It eventually became the 'department of whimper'; it could not do anything because the environment department slowed everything down. Hell's teeth, we cannot even move a mangrove without having to go through a whole range of discussions.

I will never forget one instance I had experience with—and this is one good example of what happens—where a man-made channel was put in. Over the years some mangroves grew up in this man-made channel. The channel was used to drain these areas because of mosquitos and so forth. When an application was made to deepen this channel so that it could then be used again for its original purpose, it could not be done because the mangroves were there. They then had to take out one side of the drain, let the mangroves grow over the next 10 years and then take the other side out. For God's sake, how stupid is that? In the meantime people are getting Ross River fever because of the damn mozzies. The wetlands were not doing what they were supposed to do. The farmlands were not draining. It was a crazy set-up, and this is what has happened within the department.

The departments are clogging up various developments. Now the government is trying to bring in legislation to crack a nut. This is what has happened. It has had to try to do this. It is bringing in legislation that is just not working. Another example can be seen in the wild rivers legislation currently before the House. It was put in place and would have totally stifled everything. In fact, it did stifle a lot of things.

Mr Pearce: Including mangroves.

Mr HOBBS: Probably that, too. They definitely could not even touch the mangroves.

Mr McNamara: You're not really a greenie, are you?

Mr HOBBS: I am probably more of a greenie than the member opposite believes. The reality is that we understand it far better than members opposite do. We now have a bill before the House that overturns all that stupid stuff that was originally in the wild rivers legislation. That is an example of the departmental people, a lack of consultation and no understanding of the issue. If the government had got it right in the first place it would not have to bring amending legislation into the House to change it. This has happened again. This bill that we are debating before the House today in its original form would have had to have been changed very soon if these amendments that have just been circulated had not been added as well. It was faulty legislation. It was not right.

Let us move on. There is an issue in relation to the Acquisition of Land Act in a state development area. I think there is a need to make some changes in relation to this particular act. It might not necessarily be appropriate under this legislation. I have an issue in my area in relation to a major project and that is the powerline that is being constructed by Powerlink from Spring Gully to Braemar. One of the major issues is that the people are saying that Powerlink is not listening to them. Presently the act states that any compensation that is paid is worked out on the basis of a valuation before and after the event. That may be the case, but people would prefer to have something similar to when a Telstra tower is put on their property. Telstra will actually pay them every year as an ongoing lease. If a powerline is going through someone's property and there are 50 of these towers, why can they not be paid a long-term lease? Why can they not be given the option of taking the compensation for the placing of the infrastructure through the farm or entering into a long-term lease arrangement as compensation? That needs to be considered.

There are a number of issues in relation to the Integrated Planning Act such as judicial review. The shadow minister and the member for Gympie gave a very good summary of the lack of judicial review or any review. At the end of the day people can go to the Supreme Court, but how is an individual going to do that and win? Talking about tree clearing, I know of one case where one landholder fought the government. In the end it cost the government about $5 million and cost him at least $1 million to fight it. The landholder won in the end; he was right all the time, but the government kept going back because it had the money to do it. Every time an individual goes in there and tries to say, 'I think you're doing the wrong thing,' the government is just going to trample them. So there is no assurance that the government will not use its resources to try to trample the individual.

The explanatory notes talk about consistency with fundamental legislative principles and the departure that the government is taking from that and then it lists the reasons for the departure. The government is not being serious about these reasons for the departure. It cannot have a departure. The explanatory notes, for instance, state—

> The inclusion of a provision that effectively removes the right to review or appeal of a decision made under this part and removes the right to judicial review under the Judicial Review Act 1991 for those prescribed projects which are classed as critical infrastructure.

If a mistake is made and it impacts on someone who is building major infrastructure—and we are talking about millions of dollars here—it could ruin them and their company. This could happen if some little bureaucrat says that this is what we should do. There is no right of appeal. That is not right, not fair and not reasonable in anyone's language. People should have the right of appeal particularly relating to matters of such significance. Those opposite are taking that away. I think they should fix the departments first.

The explanatory notes talk about the departure from fundamental legislative principles. I mentioned before people who may have commenced activities or expended moneys and may be unable to proceed due to a decision made by the Coordinator-General. The legislation should not adversely affect rights and liberties or impose obligations retrospectively. This legislation does that as well.

In some instances we have to have retrospective legislation. We all know that. At the end of the day, this provision is not dissimilar to call-in powers. We have seen examples in this House where call-in powers have been abused—for example, in Montville. That occurred before the last election. It was quite clearly a situation where the government used its legislative powers to ride roughshod over a company that was doing the right thing.

Those opposite have legalised lying so they may as well legalise corruption. That is what they are doing. There are a number of issues in this legislation. The amendments will result in some significant changes. These changes will be much better. The way I read it—and I have only had a quick chance to read through these provisions—is that the government is legislating a $50 million limit. The minister can make a decision to call in much smaller projects. I suppose there are some improvements there.

At the end of the day we have some serious problems with this legislation. We do not think the government is really serious about it. I think it is panicking. Had it been really serious about doing some real work on this legislation beforehand then we would not be debating this legislation in the manner in which we are today.

Mr MOORHEAD (Waterford—ALP) (5.02 pm): I rise to speak in support of the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill will ensure that the government can continue to provide the essential infrastructure to deal with growth in our state, particularly in the south-east corner, and to deal with the worst drought this state has seen in recent times. This bill will ensure that, through the Coordinator-General, the state government can have a planned and strategic approach to infrastructure construction and ensure that government processes, across levels of government, can contribute to the construction of infrastructure. Importantly, this bill will ensure that projects that cross local government borders are not frustrated by the issues of coordination, planning and construction that can exist when local governments are asked to deliver projects of regional significance.

This bill is another example of the government delivering on its election commitment to deliver these reforms in the first 100 days after the election. As a new member to this place, it is great to see that the legislative agenda is being pushed to quickly deliver for Queenslanders the commitments made during an election. But this bill is only part of delivering on the significant infrastructure needs of our state. Much of the work needed is already underway due to the great work undertaken by the Beattie government in its previous term.

The bill will allow the minister to declare a prescribed project in order to progress works or development that, in the minister's opinion, have significant economic or environmental interests for the state or region. Although some have said this is about the state government controlling the construction of toilet blocks, this bill is about the roads, pipelines and other infrastructure projects of regional significance. This power is an important but not an excessive one. It is one that is necessary to ensure that projects that have an interest beyond one community are built in a timely fashion.

Once a prescribed project is approved by the minister, the Coordinator-General will then be able to ensure that decisions are made by a decision maker within either the statutory time frames set by legislation or a time frame required by the Coordinator-General to ensure the timely progression of a prescribed project. The Coordinator-General will be able to require a decision maker to make a decision on the project within 20 working days or within the time prescribed within the legislation where a decision maker has failed to make a decision within what the Coordinator-General considers to be a reasonable period.

Where the minister approves and where either a notice to decide is not complied with or the Coordinator-General considers that it would be beneficial to manage a decision from a whole-of-government basis, the Coordinator-General can take over the role of decision maker. With the greatest of respect to our local government colleagues, local governments often do not have the resources or budgets to build such critical infrastructure. Often getting two or more local governments to agree on anything is a difficult feat. This is of particular importance to the Waterford electorate, which extends across the border between the Logan City Council and the Gold Coast City Council and borders with the Beaudesert shire.

The Waterford electorate sits on the fringe of the urban footprint under the South East Queensland Regional Plan. As growth continues in our area and to the south in the northern Beaudesert area pressure will continue on infrastructure in our area, particularly road and water infrastructure. This bill will ensure that the state government can remove road blocks to infrastructure construction that may be faced in our community. In these circumstances, it is entirely appropriate that the Coordinator-General be able to issue notices to decide or step into the decision-making role when required.

This power will ensure that the Coordinator-General will be able to continue working to implement this government's South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan. This infrastructure plan is something that makes me proud to be a member of this Labor government. This plan will deliver critical projects to south-east Queensland. Included in this plan is the Western Corridor Recycled Water Scheme—a project to replace the potable water used by Swanbank and Tarong power stations with recycled water. Releasing this potable water for human consumption will make a significant contribution to meeting the demands for water for south-east Queensland.

This plan will also see improvements to the Gold Coast rail line. Putting an extra line on the Gold Coast line from Kuraby to the Kingston Railway Station in my electorate will mean that rail services can meet increased demand caused by, among other things, increasing petrol prices.

Another key infrastructure project that constituents in the Waterford electorate look forward to is the construction of the Pacific Motorway transit project. I congratulate the Minister for Transport and Main Roads on this project. If only his federal counterpart would contribute a fair share to the project as well. This project will ensure that the Pacific Motorway will continue to provide an efficient route for Logan and Gold Coast residents to and from Brisbane. In particular, this project will see the upgrade of the Loganlea Road interchange with the Pacific Motorway—a much wanted improvement for the people of Waterford. This bill will ensure that the infrastructure of region wide or statewide significance can be coordinated on a region wide or statewide basis. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (5.07 pm): I rise to speak to the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. I thank the minister for allowing her officers the opportunity to give those of us on this side of the House a briefing. I was not able to attend the original briefing. They made time this morning for another briefing. I left before that briefing was finished. That was partly my fault. I went with a lot of concerns about the actions of the Coordinator-General in terms of the community. It was not the forum to really discuss that with the officers. It was inappropriate. I acknowledge that I have some concerns about the human face interaction with the Coordinator-General, which I will be raising in a moment. They are good words on paper but they have to be put in terms of their impact on people in the community. Those impacts are significant and at times tragic.

It is stated that the genesis of this legislation was proponents of major industries complaining that regulatory agencies—local governments and some state departments—take too long to make decisions. The general thrust of conversation since then has been that it is predominantly the fault of local councils. The activities of the Coordinator-General in my electorate are significant. We have a major project base there. A number of projects fell into the category of major projects before this legislation. Those projects went through the normal approval process.

However, I found it novel that the explanatory notes list those people and organisations that have been consulted. In industry and community no-one was consulted but interdepartmentally a number of departments—Crown law, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Transport, Office of Urban Management—are listed. No local councils and no members of the community who might be affected by it were consulted. There is no input from those people who will be on the receiving end of the powers contained in this legislation. However, industry was consulted because the proponents complained to the minister before the election and that started the ball rolling of getting this legislation in train. So they have had an input, but the community and the councils have had a very poor run in terms of consultation as far as the government is concerned.

The LGAQ articulated quite a number of concerns with the minister's office and I believe that in part the amendments that have been circulated will address some of those concerns. I do make the point before I make my next few comments that some of what I am about to say may be addressed in the amendments that the minister has circulated and, if that is the case, I commend her for that. The concerns that the LGAQ articulated included that there had been no identification of any particular project approval problems which cannot be addressed with the existing powers available to the state government. It is pertinent to reflect on the fact that IPA was put in place as a planning instrument for the state, yet this legislation is a mechanism to circumvent IPA. In IPA there is a ministerial call-in power and it was explained to me that this is a softer option to the call-in power. However, it no less circumvents the normal approval process that was put in place with IPA.

It is my understanding that councils in my electorate—and I will not be specific—have found that the greatest problem they have in following the IPA with regard to major projects is that their first obligation when they get a project application is to circulate it to the relevant government departments. Those departments have—and I stand to be corrected—about 20 days to provide their comments. One of the first things that those departments do as a matter of course is to send in the application for an extension letter. The council gets it all of the time. It may be easy to sheet home the responsibility of protracted processes to local government, but they are merely following the process that they are required to follow under IPA. If there is a problem with IPA in that there is a loophole to allow departments to extend the application and assessment process, we need to fix that problem. We do not need to further impede the rights and liberties of people and councils which represent the community in a different way but no less than we do here in this chamber.

It could be stated that this legislation assists the big end of town to circumvent IPA but the smaller developers and the small end of town cannot. That was a comment put to me by somebody who is directly involved in the approval process and the relationships between councils and government and vice versa. There was a lot of concern expressed to me about the fact that the Coordinator-General is effectively being given the call-in powers and not the minister. At least in the majority of the other instances where these call-in powers or overriding powers have been legislatively provided for, the call-in power is held by the minister—the elected person—and the community at least has an opportunity to have a comeback at the elected minister, the member for wherever. This removes that identification—this accountability—and places significant power in the Coordinator-General's role.

There was concern expressed about no definition of a prescribed project. However, that may be answered in the amendments. Returning to the point in relation to the Coordinator-General rather than the minister having the call-in power, public accountability is diminished significantly with a public servant deciding what is to be called in, and, as an adjunct to that power, appeal rights in the main have been totally removed. Judicial review has been removed. In the briefing this morning the minister's officer rightly said that councils could go to the Supreme Court, but most councils are very nervous about that. There is a significant cost involved. There is risk and the ratepayers get very jaded if perhaps the councils take matters to the Supreme Court and are overridden.

Another concern articulated is that the Coordinator-General can require agencies, including councils, to do tasks with no recompense for costs incurred. I believe that an amendment is proposed that will obligate proponents to pay infrastructure charges to councils providing they are reasonable and lawful. However, my question is: is it possible that, in the overriding powers that are being given to the Coordinator-General, the directions the Coordinator-General gives to councils could incur costs? If so, will councils be able to turn back to the Coordinator-General and request recompense for the additional work that the Coordinator-General is requiring, not the proponent, or is the state government proposing to make the proponent shoulder all of the costs irrespective of whether they were authors of those costs or not? Again, I reiterate one of the LGAQ's concerns. There have been no specific instances given that identify the types of problems that are being corrected with this legislation. I believe that there are grounds for significant concern on the part of the community and councils in relation to the structure of power, the relationship between councils and state government and indeed the disempowerment of councils in relation to their negotiations with proponents of major industries.

There are a lot of good people working in major industries, but there are some who will take any authority that they are given to the nth degree. I will give an historical example. There was a proponent who built a small project in Gladstone. They have moved on. The project has been sold to people who are much more community minded and much more fair-minded. I was mayor at the time. The project was going to have significant impacts on our road infrastructure. Product was going to be carted through the Boyne Valley on timber jinkers before the road was bitumenised. The negotiations had occurred in Brisbane between the state government and this proponent before it even saw the light of the day. The two councils in my electorate were not involved because the product was sourced outside of the electorate.

The agreement was made with the proponents to build the project in the state development area with no contribution for infrastructure in relation to road damage. If there was any heavy rain and the road was cut, they had to go through Biloela. However, as soon as the road was trafficable the jinkers would come back through the Boyne Valley because it was quite a significant distance shorter. The damage to the road was significant straight after wet weather, but there was no road infrastructure contribution required of that company. The proponent met with the council after the deal had been done with the state government and I raised, as was appropriate, with the proponents these concerns that council had. The proponent—as I said, he is no longer operating in the district; they have sold the business—literally folded his arms and said, 'I don't have to talk about it with you. We've done the deal with the state government.'

Therefore, there needs to be that recognition that there will be some proponents who will be averse to negotiating with all of the parties that will be impacted by a project and will use, or endeavour to use, these overriding powers to their advantage. Fortunately, the majority of major infrastructure investors in my electorate are not like that. They are very reasonable. The most recent one, which has been rebadged, was brilliant in terms of its community consultation. It was good to deal with, and I am sure that the state government would acknowledge that as well. The major players in my electorate have all been good. But if there is a way to reduce the process, to simplify it and to leave people out who should naturally be consulted, I believe that human nature endeavours to circumvent that process.

Another concern that was articulated was that, because local government is the lead agency for most development proposals, local government gets the blame when things take time under IPA. I have raised in part before that government departments are concurrence agencies—for example, the Main Roads, EPA and DNRM—and some have a habit of holding things up with requests for extensions of time. Whilst this may impact on state departments, the major negative implications will be that local government is not doing its job. I want to reiterate that the councils in my electorate work tirelessly to see benefits for their communities. I would not like to see any legislation that impugns the reputation of the local authorities in my electorate. The local authorities work tirelessly.

The power in this legislation is far reaching in that the Coordinator-General can rescind decisions already made, override objector appeals and make decisions with or without conditions. There is a lot of power enveloped in this legislation, and it is power without accountability.

Earlier in my contribution I said that I wanted to put a human face to this legislation, because whenever individual and community rights are trampled people will be negatively affected, and we should always remember that. I know that major projects provide work, investment and income to state governments as well as to individuals in terms of pay packets. The major projects in my electorate also have national significance. I would not like the minister to think that I have said anything that would undermine the importance of those projects. However, process is important as well. We have had a significant amount of involvement with the Coordinator-General in my electorate in terms of the acquisition of land and service corridors. Indeed, I believe that the amendments are going to require that, if a project is over $50 million, the Coordinator-General's powers will automatically be able to come into play. If it is under $50 million, the minister or the Coordinator-General must then go through a consultation process.

As an example of the way things happen on the ground, recently there was a corridor project that the Coordinator-General became involved with in my electorate. The consultation by the staff of the Coordinator-General's with the local councils was to ring the council up the day prior and advise the councils that there would be an advertisement about the proposed corridor, its route and impacts in the paper the next day. That was the consultation. That is the concern that councils have.

It is possible to misrepresent issues very easily. The minister is subject to the advice that she gets. The minister asks, 'Have the councils been consulted?' The officer says, 'Yes, Minister, we've talked to them.' Unless the minister thinks to ask when that was, how often that was and how long that was before the project became so far in train that it was irreversible—unless the minister has the time to think of those questions—it could be that the consultation was the day before and councils effectively had no input.

I turn to the issue of the human face. The Coordinator-General has purchased a number of properties in my electorate. I am not criticising whoever the Coordinator-General is because they do not do the actual negotiation. A lot of the time—and I use those words advisedly because I do not hear from all of the people who have been hurt through this process—people have been offered a pittance in comparison to the replacement value of a like property in the electorate. They have very little recourse. If they argue the value, the compulsory acquisition occurs and it goes to the Land Court. However, there is a lot of pain before that. A lot of physical and emotional adjustment has to happen.

A couple has come to me in the last couple of weeks, and the matter has gone to the relevant minister's office. They moved to my electorate and purchased a property north of Targinie. They are not in the Targinie buyout. They were in the process of building a house and had a knock on the door. It was a representative of the Coordinator-General's department to say that their property was required for a corridor. No-one argues the necessity of a corridor, but the amount of money that was initially put on the table—it was not a compulsory accusation because governments now like negotiated purchases—was not going to resettle them. The wife came in very agitated—she was more than agitated. The husband could not come in because he was so upset. As it turned out, they were a couple who had been bought out at Traveston. They were not given enough money to resettle in that district so they had to shift up to my electorate because the land values were lower. The wife said to me at the time, 'John's not coping. He cannot face another process with the Coordinator-General's department like he's been through.' I sent the material down to the relevant minister's office to see if there can be a more compassionate process for this family, which had already been through this once at Traveston. As it turns out, I do not believe the land down at Traveston was needed.

I had word yesterday that the family has left. The wife and the four children have been put into sheltered care, and the husband is receiving psychiatric treatment because the work of the department of the Coordinator-General lacked compassion. That is the human face of this legislation. Members see it in their electorate office, and I see it a lot in my electorate office. It is imperative that there is proper accountability and proper recourse by people to be able to argue for the value of their property—at least the replacement value of like for like—and we do not have that in Queensland.

There is an insufficient ability for landowners to represent their concerns, and there is an insufficient ability for landowners who are affected by negotiated purchases or compulsory acquisitions by the Coordinator-General for me to have confidence in these extended powers. I have seen too often in recent times—in the last 12 months or so—how representatives of the Coordinator-General's department, in exercising what are already significant powers, have devastating effects on the family. To give the Coordinator-General more rights to trample judicial review and appeal rights is not acceptable until that department shows that it can treat people with dignity and respect.

Mrs MENKENS (Burdekin—NPA) (5.26 pm): I rise to speak to the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, and I support the comments made by the shadow minister and other members on this side of the House. The government's reason for introducing this bill is to streamline and facilitate the assessment and decision-making processes for significant projects. It will give the Coordinator-General unprecedented powers to impose conditions to override and direct those responsible for some of our state's most significant and pressing projects. That is it pure and simple. It will enact far-reaching legislation and ignore natural principles of justice in order to speed up its own flawed systems and avoid its own bureaucracy and processing works vital to all of our futures. Is there any doubt that this is due entirely to this government's procrastination and inability to anticipate the current water crisis? It is ironic that because of the head-in-the-sand attitude of the Premier and the responsible ministers they now see fit to introduce a new layer of bureaucracy and oversight to correct the huge problems caused by this government's abject failure to manage this state's future.

There is no doubt that once this government finally acknowledged the imminent water crisis it should act to immediately address the problem. That the government ignored and denied Queensland was facing such a disaster until the 11th hour is a fact it cannot deny. Extraordinary efforts must now be made to avoid the Premier's oft repeated Armageddon situation. Interestingly, I believe the Premier may

have outspun even himself with this analogy. 'Armageddon' is commonly taken to refer to the ending of the world. However, in this case I believe that the Premier may have been subconsciously referring to the downfall of his government and the end of his own ambitions.

I would first like to deal with the several articles of faith broken and trivialised in the framing of this bill. The hypocrisy shown by the leaders and minister of this government in this bill is breathtaking. As I have detailed in this House before, the Premier is on record promising to deliver open and accountable government to the residents of Queensland. However, in only the third setting of this new parliament we are debating yet another bill that is clearly and demonstrably in breach of fundamental legislative principles and was framed without even attempting to consult with stakeholders and other concerned parties.

Yet again the Beattie government is demonstrating that it is more than willing to ignore principles of justice and government and trample over people's rights in its haste to cover up its inadequacies. The explanatory notes detail three instances where the bill clearly breaches these principles. I draw the attention of the minister to the definition of such principles as underlying a parliamentary democracy based on the rule of law. The notes detail not one but two instances of the removal of the rights to appeal a decision made under the provisions of this bill. What use are the laws of this state if this government is prepared to change the laws of this state to suit its own purposes as and when it sees fit? Just how secure can Queenslanders—our constituents—feel when they know that this government is willing to use any means possible to force its agenda, despite significant and lawful objections? How democratic can this government claim to be when it legislates to remove people's rights without even paying lip-service to the need and requirement to consult beforehand?

As the explanatory notes explain, section 4(3)(b) of the Legislative Standards Act is concerned with natural justice principles, which include the right to be heard, an absence of bias and procedural fairness. The explanatory notes also detail the reasons for this bill's departure from those principles, with the somewhat circular explanation that the Coordinator-General requires these new powers so that he or she may exercise these powers under the proposed amendments.

The legislation also seems to introduce a new notion of infallibility in the Coordinator-General's deliberations and decisions. It makes one wonder whether, on first introduction, one would be required to shake hands with or genuflect in front of this omnipotent being. At a time and in a political climate when we expect this government to adhere rigidly to conventions of probity, it will once again use its majority in the House to override objections to its heavy-handed approach and pass legislation that will further erode the rights of every Queenslander to be fairly heard and judged.

I will now address the major concerns that we have with the bill itself and the ramification of its introduction. Firstly, as I mentioned earlier, this bill is in response to the government's own lethargy in proceeding vital public infrastructure. It is in response to poor management by government departments and the inability of government ministers to recognise and address emerging problems in their portfolios. There is no need to enact yet more legislation. The powers and laws are already available to facilitate the commissioning and building of new public works without having to resort to measures such as those contained in this legislation. However, these powers presuppose that we have a government that has a clear view of the future needs of this state.

But past comments by members of this government, such as that no new dams will ever be built in Queensland, are not indicative of a government that is willing or able to listen to common sense. They indicate that members opposite prefer to govern by ideology rather than practicality. Such comments indicate that the members opposite are more interested in appeasing and pandering to minority interest groups and party factions than being responsible and representing those who really elected them.

I have already mentioned the appalling lack of public consultation with this bill. I find it really incredible that even the Local Government Association of Queensland was not involved or consulted prior to the introduction of this bill. The Local Government Association of Queensland has raised several serious concerns about provisions that are contained in this bill that could have been addressed more properly if discussions had taken place. The LGAQ was rightfully concerned, especially about the possibility that it could be forced by the Coordinator-General to carry out infrastructure works irrespective of cost, a council's ability to pay, or community support or need. However, I note from the amendments circulated that some of the concerns of the LGAQ may have been addressed. I certainly look forward to the debate on the amendments to see exactly how many of these concerns have been truly addressed.

In the explanatory notes another significant departure from principles is prefaced with the excerpt from section 4(3)(g) of the Legislative Standards Act, which states clearly that legislation should not impose obligations retrospectively. How can the minister defend a provision that could affect a proponent who may have commenced activities or expended moneys and may be unable to proceed due to a decision made by the Coordinator-General? It is wrong to penalise or cause anyone to suffer loss because the government has changed the rules. What kind of security does this give to companies

that are involved in major projects? How many would be willing to tender for such projects when they know that at any time, for reasons beyond their control, they could lose control and suffer significant loss because a government department has failed to process a permit on time?

None of this would be necessary if ministers practised proper control and oversight of their departments to ensure that they were efficient and if the government planned far enough ahead that there was no need to rush decisions on major works. The planning times for dams, roads and hospitals should not be measured in months. To position Queensland for the future, we should be planning now for 10, 20 and 30 years ahead, not playing catch-up after over eight years of neglect. If ministers ran their departments properly and with due diligence, there should be no need to find ways to bypass bureaucratic process, let alone legislate to do it. If the government had kept its eye on the ball, instead of its head in the clouds, it would have had forward plans in place to address water shortages, inadequate road systems or too few hospital beds.

To use examples from my own Burdekin electorate, the Water for Bowen Project and the Urannah Dam would already be underway or finished; a base load power station would be on line in north Queensland, preferably in the Collinsville area; and Townsville's port access road would be more than a faint dream to residents who are forced to endure a massive increase in heavy traffic as the port, which is the central structure in the whole north Queensland development area, continues to expand. Drought would not be the excuse it now is for the water crisis in the south-east, because a good government would have planned for this eventuality. The government seems bewildered that, despite record population growth, especially in the south-east, the demand for infrastructure and services has correspondingly increased.

Imagine that instead of building a larger electricity supply system the government said that power stations were blokey and, as an alternative to meeting demand, it would instead restrict supply to manage the system. Imagine if we were told that we really did not need more power; we needed only to turn on the lights between four and seven on each alternate day and start receiving power-saving rebates for batteries. It would be completely unacceptable. Yet this is the same style of management that the government is applying to our water storage and reticulation: 'Do not increase capacity; restrict supply.'

This is the reason the government needs to introduce such heavy-handed and draconian measures as contained in this bill. They have finally realised just how far it has let our infrastructure deteriorate. It realises that more than eight years of inattention means double the work just to fix existing problems, let alone build into the system capacity for growth. The problem is not the processes of government and decision making; it is the inability and unwillingness of those in charge to acknowledge problems where they exist and their incapacity to deal with them as they arise. It is a failure of those chosen to govern to act on time and in good measure compounded by an abrogation of their responsibilities to the people of this state. It is not the act that we should be seeking to change; it is those responsible for the mess that we find ourselves in because of their lack of foresight and vision.

This bill lacks a demonstrated need. It lacks consultation, due attention and recognition of judicial review and good governance. It is another demonstration of this government applying a bandaid to a cut and then claiming to have set a broken limb. I will not be supporting this bill.

Mr DICKSON (Kawana—Lib) (5.39 pm): I rise to speak on the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. I come from local government and I can see a few major issues that this government is going to face if it pushes forward with this bill. One issue is that of removing appeal rights from everyday citizens. I see that as a major problem and I see that as probably helping the big end of town. I have faced many developers in my day who have always come forward and said, 'We would love to have appeal rights taken away so that we can move forward with our developments.' That is what I see occurring if we move forward with this bill today. I think it is going to cause pain for a lot of people in Queensland. If this legislation goes ahead and the Coordinator-General gets it wrong one day, which will happen—it does not matter what level of government or what business you are in you will get it wrong some time—who will pay? Will it be the state government, the local government, the financier or the developer? As sure as God made little apples, it will be the mums and dads who pay at the end of the day. That is where the money is derived from.

I think this bill is about having faith in this government. It is about giving this government a big stick and hoping that it will be fair and show good faith. It concerns me that the latest amendments have only just been put on our desks. That tells me something. When documents turn up at the end of business, that means that they are not prepared properly. It means that a lot of thought has gone into it but they have not quite got it right. My advice to this government is to take this legislation back and make sure that it gets it right before it brings the legislation forward. That is something we all should do. I know that things sometimes work out at the last minute but when changes are made at the last minute there is a tendency to get it wrong. I think that has been spoken about a few times today.

This bill removes the rights of everyday Queenslanders to appeal. If somebody comes forward with some type of development and they want to run over the top of people, as this government may do one day—it might buy land or take land off some people without giving them appeal rights—they can do

so without those people having any right of appeal. I know this government would not want to be seen to be doing that, but things occur in life out of necessity. I think this government is trying to push forward on a piece of land around the Traveston Dam site. It is going to force a few people off their land. I am concerned that this law will be used against those people. I do not want to think that that would ever happen. I am sure this government would have more morals than that, but I would hate to see this legislation used for that purpose.

Under this legislation people will only be able to apply to the Supreme Court. It is quite expensive to go to the Supreme Court. Some people can afford to go there but not the average mum and dad, not the people who live in those houses at Traveston. They will not be able to afford to defend themselves. I am sure that this government would never go after the defenceless. It would prove itself way above that. I hear today that this government has spoken about public consultation and about going through the process. I can see the process being overridden today if this legislation is passed.

I do not believe this legislation is a good document. For the sake of local government I do not think it is going to be too happy with it either. The government may push it through today, but it will create a lot of problems for itself later down the track. There are many people out there who work in local government and they would like to see the government doing what I consider to be the right thing, which is taking this legislation back and making it a better document. There are some very good points in this legislation, but I believe that it is still flawed and it is flawed because of its timing. It has rushed this legislation through, and when things are rushed through you are going to get it wrong.

The number of Queenslanders who can be dislocated by this bill is immense, and this will come back to bite us all. I am saying this for the sake of everybody in parliament today. We do not sit here and listen to everything that is said, but I have been there and have experienced these things. I say to the government: do not get it wrong because it is not worth the trouble. It may be a matter of just six to eight weeks before the government could bring this legislation back. The government should spend a bit of time on it and think about what it is doing because the people of Queensland will be grateful to the government for that.

This government already has calling in powers. It can use those any time it likes on a major development it does not want to see go through or if it has problems with it or if local government expresses that it has a problem. Why put this legislation through in a hurry? The government can use its existing powers.

I have come to this state government from local government and I have seen a lot of positives and a lot of negatives. This state government has done a lot of good things and I have seen it do some things that are probably irrational or illogical on occasion. Other members will have seen that as well. There are some people in this House who have not made really good decisions.

In Kawana, this government decided it was going to build a hospital at Sippy Downs. I pulled out a lot of documents from the newspaper. That decision was somehow overridden. I do not know why the hospital is not going to be built there any more, but it was a good idea at the time. Even the Premier and the health minister thought so. But that is not happening: it was a mistake. And that is what I think this government is going to make with this bill here today: it is going to make a mistake. The people of Queensland will not appreciate that. They will not appreciate any of us. We all get tarred with the same brush when this government makes a mistake. I am asking the government to think about what it is doing because mistakes are easy to make but fixing them is really difficult.

This bill looks to me as though it is made for the mega rich. I have said that before. I do not want the people of Queensland to think that this government has put forward a bill that is just made for people who have a lot of money. Bills put forward should be acceptable to all the people of Queensland. They should be forthright bills. I do not think this is one of those. The government should take this one back to the drawing board, have a good look at it and bring it back when it has got it right. The government should not drop documents on our desk at the last moment. That is the major reason I am going to vote against this legislation today. I have not had the opportunity to read the amendments. I would like to have done that but time has not allowed me to. Labor members are aware of that as well. We are all aware of it here because they have only just turned up.

We have an honour bestowed upon us to do the right thing by the people of Queensland. I hear the rhetoric in here every day—I hear a lot of slurs as well—about how we all want to do good. I will commit that I am going to try to do good and that is what I am telling government members here today. They should give it a go—look at what they are voting for, look at the implications for the everyday Queenslander and think about it when they go to vote because I think they will be voting the wrong way if they vote in favour of this legislation. They will get it wrong and I can absolutely guarantee them of that.

Mr KNUTH (Charters Towers—NPA) (5.46 pm): The State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006 under discussion today is nothing more than a power grab by the state government in pretending to cater for the needs of the heavily populated south-east corner. Through this

bill the government is endeavouring to quash the vision of local governments, to quash the ability for local governments to determine the needs for their own divisions and to continue the downgrading of existing public infrastructure in rural and regional Queensland. It is a typical response from a government out of touch with reality. It is typical of a government sitting in its ivory tower completely misunderstanding the needs of the entire state.

While it preaches about how the bill facilitates the development of vital infrastructure, it forgets that through its own actions public infrastructure has been neglected and downgraded across the state to the point where Queenslanders, especially rural and regional Queenslanders, are begging for the basic infrastructure needs of water, electricity and decent roads. To make matters worse, councils who have a vision and who have put time, effort and money into determining the social, economic and environmental impacts of possible projects can kiss that money goodbye. There are no tangible factors to determine whether a project will be considered prescribed. The Deputy Premier in her second reading speech said that prescribed projects will be those considered to be of strategic and economic significance. This decision is then entirely left up to the discretion of the minister and the Coordinator-General.

It is a concern when Big Brother takes over decisions of councils in relation to what infrastructure projects should go ahead. I have always stated in this parliament that the way to solve infrastructure problems in the south-east corner is to provide infrastructure in rural and regional Queensland.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House the shocking state of the Gregory Development Road—a road that the Dalrymple shire has been pushing to get funding for from the state government but to no avail. In particular, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the section between Greenvale and Bluewater Springs Roadhouse. This section is the worst road in Queensland.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr O'Brien): Order! I suggest that the member is skating on the edge of relevance and that he should return to the provisions of the bill before the House.

Mr KNUTH: Mr Speaker, I bring to your attention our concern that six or seven directors-general went to the mining towns. They went there because they did not listen to what the local councils were saying in the first place. Had they listened, there would be no infrastructure problems within the mining towns. This government called in the 350-block residential development in Moranbah, which was designed to solve the housing crisis that we presently have in that region. I believe that giving the state government more power and denying the local councils the opportunity to relay to the state government what is needed will not only bring division but will also mean that the needs of the people will not be met. I bring that to the attention of the House.

Mr MESSENGER (Burnett—NPA) (5.50 pm): It is with pleasure that I rise to speak to the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. The bill contains 27 clauses, has 35 pages and affects six acts, including the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971, the IPA Act 1977, the Judicial Review Act 1991, the Land Act 1994, the Land Title Act 1994 and the Water Act 2000.

The minister, in her second reading speech, states—

This bill is about providing more certainty to development and investment, and in particular for critical infrastructure, but not at the expense of appropriate checks and balances.

However, as we have heard very eloquently from the shadow minister and deputy National Party leader, this legislation is a power grab and unnecessary. We already have the legislation in place to build our infrastructure; we just do not have the government or the leadership. It is a case of this government panicking and trying to play catch-up because it knows that, when it comes to providing major infrastructure to Queensland, the ALP has failed dismally. We have a government that says, 'Don't look at our track record. We're not doers, but we're going to be gonnas.'

On health, water, electricity and transport we are in crisis management all the time, and this legislation is proof of that crisis. It is also proof of the fact that fundamental rights of natural justice and the rule of law have been eroded. We only have to turn to the latest Scrutiny of Legislation Committee *Alert Digest* to grab an appreciation of that. Page 25, chapter 10, point 11 states—

The Explanatory Notes address this provision in the following terms:

> While the proposed provisions will remove the right to appeal under the SDPWO Act and to judicial review for prescribed projects as assessed by the Minister for critical infrastructure under s76E(4), the Supreme Court retains its inherent jurisdiction. As such, the proposed provisions do not exhaust the right to appeal and review of a decision. If a person or persons so wished, they could still bring action before the Supreme Court of Queensland.

In its report the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee goes on to state—

Quite clearly, the disapplication of part 3 of the *Judicial Review Act* will prevent any access to the 'statutory order of review' means of obtaining judicial review.

Right there the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee tells us that it has been caught out fibbing. The report further states—

The committee notes that proposed ss.76P and 76W (both inserted by cl.7) remove normal statutory appeal rights and severely curtail (or perhaps even completely remove) rights to judicial review, the first in relation to 'prescribed projects' and the second in relation to such projects which are also declared to be 'critical infrastructure projects'.

The committee also makes the following point—

In this regard the above provisions reflect the general philosophy underlying the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* in relation to projects of significant scope or importance.

The committee refers to Parliament the question of whether the provisions of proposed ss.76P and 76W have sufficient regard to the rights of persons deprived by these sections of appeal and review rights.

Once again, an independent and bipartisan body has found that the legislation before this place is deficient.

I also note that the Local Government Association of Queensland is very disappointed with the consultation process and the legislation. In the member for Warrego they have a great advocate and a parliamentarian who is willing to listen and to speak up for them in this place.

This legislation affects development. There can be no better example of development and investment pressure than what is occurring in the Bundaberg and Burnett regions. This legislation will affect many of my constituents. I will largely direct my remaining comments to the subjects of investment, development, critical infrastructure and the challenges that government, the private sector and communities face in managing that change.

As have many members, I have been invited to briefings from the private sector, although none have ever offered me loans of substantial amounts. Those developers would like to create many different types of developments in the Burnett, and that has left me feeling both thrilled and scared. I am thrilled that my community is growing and that there will be more opportunities for families to find work and to raise their children in one of the most sublime and beautiful regions of Queensland. Indeed, it is one of the most beautiful regions of Australia, if not the world. I am scared because the rate and nature of that growth, if not managed competently by government, has the potential to cause damage to the environment and the culture of our community, and also place dangerous pressures on vital public services and infrastructure.

Developers tell me that there are two reasons why they are heading to the Burnett. Firstly, when compared to the rest of south-east Queensland, the land is cheap. They say that the days are long gone when one could get a bargain in south-east Queensland, so they are heading north to the Burnett. Secondly, there is an assured water supply from Paradise Dam. We have to thank the member for Southern Downs and the National Party for forcing this government to build Paradise Dam. There was a lot of equivocation from the Labor Party, which just did not want to build that major infrastructure. During an election campaign, the member for Southern Downs promised to build the Paradise Dam. Again I put on the record my thanks to the member for Southern Downs for forcing the government into that action. The dam is starting to fill up. However, I have heard rumours from a number of very well-placed sources that there may be a leak in the Paradise Dam. In her summary speech, I ask the minister to dispel those rumours and guarantee the structural integrity of the dam.

As I said, many developers are lining up to build their projects in the Burnett. I have been lucky enough to be briefed on a couple of those developments. One development by Bundaberg Sugar is to be located on the north bank of the Kolan River at a place called Miara. From the plans and the briefings that I have received, I believe that up to 14,000 people will be located within an ecovillage on that northern bank. That is certainly a challenging development.

Many local government members of the Burnett Shire Council and I have received briefings on a development to be located on the southern bank of the Elliott River. That project is being conducted by the Walker Corporation, which I believe is the corporation that developed Hope Island on the Gold Coast. That corporation proposes a development that, probably in the next 10 to 15 years, will bring an extra 6,500 people to the Burnett.

Naturally, these sorts of numbers of people coming to the Burnett and Bundaberg region are going to put great pressure on the public infrastructure of our region. One example is the Bundaberg Hospital. At the moment the Bundaberg Hospital has numbers of around 100,000 people. If these developments do come to fruition, by the years 2015 to 2020 we can expect that there will easily be a doubling of the number of people within the Bundaberg-Burnett region. That is why we need to start planning right now to cater for those critical infrastructure needs of health. That is why today, once again, I will ask this government to start planning for a new hospital in Bundaberg, a hospital that can cater for a population of at least 200,000 within its coverage area. We will need a hospital as proposed by the coalition that will have at least 250 beds because at the moment the Bundaberg Base Hospital, like most other government infrastructure, is operating at its maximum. There is no fat in the system whatsoever.

I note that in relation to development the minister for state development has contributed to the Queensland government's progress report on the implementation of the government's response to the Palm Island Select Committee's recommendations. Recommendation 41, on page 28, states—

The Minister for State Development should continue to explore a range of economic development opportunities with the Palm Island community as part of a wider goal to develop a community-owned economic development plan. Development of this plan should entail consideration of:

- opportunities which are sustainable and likely to meet the environmental requirements of the Island;
- joint ventures with other entities (both public and private sector);
- enhancing existing projects;
- projects and industries of a range of sizes, particularly smaller scale and 'cottage' projects initially; and
- opportunities both on and off the island.

I recently visited Palm Island and organised to meet with senior police and police liaison officers. I was given a tour of the island and a briefing on the challenges facing the community. It was a very informative trip and I appreciate the police minister allowing me to visit and also organising the visit. I met with Senior Sergeant Paul James and was accompanied by Inspector Greg Schofield. Those gentlemen took me on a tour of the island. I gained a better appreciation of the history of the island. They showed me areas where the Islanders used to grow their vegetables and where they used to harvest trees. They also had an area where they had their own poultry farm. Indeed, they used to harvest the timber in the mills and then mill that timber. Apparently, in the mid to late sixties they had a boat building contract—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hoolihan): Order! I remind the member that he is skirting a far distance from the bill. Perhaps we could come back slightly to the bill.

Mr MESSENGER: I thank you for your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. There is a point to me explaining what I saw. As we know, there are significant social pressures to overcome social problems and the solutions are complex and not very easy to implement. But in order to secure a future full of hope for the children of Palm Island we need a project, we need development—private or government or a mixture of both—which creates economic development and jobs for Palm Island.

I am practical enough to understand that this legislation before the parliament will most probably go through on the government numbers. If any good is to come out of this legislation it might be that this legislation will enable a private business or a mixture of private and government business to be able to set up on Palm Island and provide those jobs that are needed for the children and future generations of Palm Island. I spoke of this issue with Barnaby Joyce very briefly and told him about the problems that were facing Palm Island and how we do need a private business to set up there once again. Barnaby Joyce, quick as a flash, said to me, 'Why don't you write to the Prime Minister and ask him for a tax-free period for any business that would like to set up on Palm Island?' He suggested 25 years of tax-free status for any business that sets up there. I think it is an excellent suggestion. I will be following through with that and writing to the Prime Minister asking that he consider that suggestion. I would also ask that the state development minister think about this suggestion from Senator Joyce. I think it has a lot of merit. By using this legislation and also looking at opportunities of deferring state government charges and taxes the state government may also be able to entice a private business to Palm Island and create that industry and those jobs.

In closing, I will quote the shadow minister—

The Coalition parties are the genuine pro-development and free enterprise parties in Queensland and our record in government of getting timely and critical infrastructure established is obvious the length and breadth of the State.

However, being pro-development does not mean the Coalition parties support legislative mechanisms which remove transparency or puts at risk inbuilt accountability and probity measures which prevent corruption within a public entity.

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—Lib) (6.06 pm): I rise to speak briefly to the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. As honourable members have already heard from a number of my colleagues and the shadow minister, the honourable member for Maroochydore, the coalition will not be supporting this bill as it stands for the many reasons she highlighted.

In essence, the bill aims to implement a coordination system in respect of environmental and public works, and seeks to provide a scheme for certain projects of significance declared as 'prescribed projects'. What becomes apparent immediately one peruses this bill is the fact that the government is introducing yet another layer of bureaucracy. I suppose that is not surprising when we look at its track record.

Clearly stated in the explanatory notes is the intent to provide two deputy Coordinators-General with appropriate administrative and operational assistance and resources to meet the increased workload related to growth requirements. This is merely another example of how this government continues to squander Queensland taxpayers' money. It may as well provide signed blank chequebooks in this instance.

It is not only the financial implications that I have concerns about. I take this opportunity to express my trepidation over the removal of rights of review or appeal currently available under the Judicial Review Act 1991. The Scrutiny of Legislation Committee shared its concerns in issue 10 of the Alert Digest.

We hear a lot of claims in this House about supporting people's democratic rights, yet this bill seeks to destroy fundamental opportunities which currently exist that permit community input. Basically, this means that, once appointed, the Coordinator-General has the propensity to become a law upon himself or herself under the guise of project designation to an unconfirmed criteria. Where are the limits and where is the accountability to the people of Queensland? I ask in her reply if the Deputy Premier would respond to how communities are expected to have any form of surety in this regard.

I acknowledge that there are vital infrastructure projects which need to be implemented sooner rather than later. However, let us look at why the sudden urgency, why situations have been allowed to reach crisis points. Glaringly obvious is the inaction of this Labor state government over its successive terms which has brought about this flurry of activity. Whilst the population has been exploding around it, the Beattie government has sat on its hands and failed miserably to deliver well planned infrastructure to address growing pains. Now we are faced with severe, if not critical, issues such as running out of water, overflowing hospitals and terminal waiting lists, and gridlocked insufficient transport options.

For members opposite to praise themselves and their government for letting so many systems slide into disrepair is disgraceful. Of particular interest in the explanatory notes is the section where it states its further intent to—

... minimise unreasonable delays in the progress of or decision making for certain prescribed projects considered of strategic and/or economic significance to the state'. What is clearly lacking in this bill is specific criteria as to what will constitute a prescribed project and how projects are to be determined to be of economic and/or state significance.

I note the resolution of the Local Government Association of Queensland and its advice that it will not support the bill in its current form. I agree with its specific concerns that there should be urgent discussions in relation to the development and agreement on the criteria and thresholds to apply to the identification of prescribed projects and the removal of the power for the Coordinator-General to make decisions in relation to prescribed projects.

Right now local communities in my electorate are being bombarded with projects on which they have been afforded little say as to the outcomes. Consultation processes for the most part only allowed for community input in the context that the projects were proceeding. It angers residents that they are meant to be grateful for that. It is a bit like the be seen but not heard child-rearing teachings of the 1950s. If people raise objections and oppose the projects, no matter how valid their arguments, they are dismissed as troublemakers.

I am not referring to the Tugun bypass in this category, however, which I am pleased to say is coming along famously. After 10 years of intense scrutiny and community consultation this much awaited piece of roadwork was stalled by the inability of two state Labor governments to come to an agreement. Eventually the go-ahead was given. Work on this expensive piece of infrastructure—it is over $100 million a kilometre—is a credit to the project managers and the Department of Main Roads, even if New South Wales is a major benefactor and refuses to commit to the funding of it at all.

Today was a very sad day for the people in the Currumbin Valley. We heard from the minister for local government and planning that he had no choice but to approve a completely inappropriate development of 530 homes in the Currumbin Valley. This was bitterly disappointing as this development will destroy the quality of valley life by doubling the existing population in one housing estate named the Hideaway. Used as a cruel hoax only days before the state election, the promise of a call-in was meant to fool people into believing that if they voted for the Labor candidate in Currumbin the development would not proceed.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Stuckey, adjourned.

PROCEDURE

Speaker's Statement-Conduct of Members

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, it is with a sense of disappointment that I intervene in the proceedings of the House to alert and caution honourable members from both sides of the House of the potentially grave damage to the reputation of individuals and the House generally that has unfolded today. Standing orders make it clear that once a matter is referred to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee, it should not be referred to in debate in the House.

I made a number of rulings in relation to a particular matter both in private members' statements and question time this morning. Despite my rulings honourable members on both sides of the House have transgressed standing orders to refer in more than general terms to a particular matter and make prejudicial statements in relation to that matter. I add that on at least one occasion this action was done in response to another member's reflections upon the character of past and current members and

allegations without any proffered evidence about the declarations of interests. The standing orders provide for a process in the event of evidence of nondisclosure. Where there is evidence of nondisclosure those processes should be used, not simply baseless or formless allegations or innuendo raised in the House.

Honourable members, as Speaker I will not allow this House to degenerate into a kangaroo court or its valuable privileges to shield gossipmongers. All members are to respect the standing orders, rulings of the chair and the dignity of the House generally. Conduct such as has been exhibited today will not be tolerated by me.

STATE DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p.653.

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—Lib) (6.15 pm): With a past Treasurer of the Beattie government—Terry Mackenroth—on the board of the developer, there was no way this development would be stopped. We may as well toss aside the South East Queensland Regional Plan Mr Mackenroth bestowed upon us if areas clearly defined as being designed outside the urban footprint can be carved up in this manner. Residents tell me that there are up to another dozen development applications lying dormant in the Currumbin Valley alone.

For the benefit of the people of the Currumbin electorate I ask the Deputy Premier if she would clarify in her reply whether the Tugun desalination plant is to be deemed a prescribed project and when she intends to release the criteria for determination. This project has steamed ahead in a matter of months from one being considered a reality and subject to investigative studies to a $1.2 billion major desalination plant that will pump out double the capacity first mentioned to the public in the middle of the year.

As with the Tugun bypass, costs have blown out from early estimates and are still increasing. Stunned by the rapid pace of this project, many people are raising suspicions and concerns over a range of issues including the loss of marine life, damage to the environment, effects of brine output, huge operating costs and energy requirements. No-one disputes that there is ample ongoing opportunity for the community to gain progress reports on this proposed plant, and a degree of consultation has been encouraged on a regular basis. Nor does anyone dispute the need for secure future water supplies. However, the residents of Tugun are having this massive energy chomping, industrial, water-supplying mechanism foisted upon them in the space of two years, which is a very short time frame for a project of this magnitude and permanency. This is all because of a lack of planning by authorities at both state and local levels.

Questions remain unanswered regarding the use of green energy and also the cost to ratepayers. All they have been told is that the state and the Gold Coast City Council will ultimately make the decisions and that the cost of some $6 billion worth of water infrastructure will be borne collectively by all in south-east Queensland.

I would have to say from these experiences in Currumbin that many other Queenslanders would probably be highly sceptical about fast-tracking major projects without due process and cautionary measures and without any opportunity to challenge under judicial review. That is why the coalition will not be supporting this bill.

Mr RICKUSS (Lockyer—NPA) (6.17 pm): I rise to speak in the debate on the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. My side of politics has actually outlined the reason we will not support this bill. It makes a lot of sense to me. The *Alert Digest* produced by the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee states that the effect of the provisions will be to deprive affected persons of access to the usual statutory appeal process. The powers are already there. The powers were there to build Suncorp Stadium. The powers were there to build the Goodwill Bridge. Surely it is a lack of competency on the part of the ministers that they have not been able to build this infrastructure. Some questions really need to be asked.

We have spoken about the recycled water project and the other water projects. The recycled water project has been on the books for 10 years. We have spoken about it. There have been delegations. It has gone on and on. But there has been no will on the part of the government to get this motoring. There is a lack of will on the other side.

The Coordinator-General is now starting to finally come to grips with the recycled water project. The government should have had an understanding of the project five years ago. That is when it really should have had an understanding of the project. The Local Government Association has caused some changes to this bill. Maybe it should be the one advising the minister on how to draft legislation. It seems to be the one that has actually worked out the changes. However, I want to raise one issue with the minister. There is talk of a superjail being built in my area. I wonder whether a superjail could be deemed to be a prescribed project. Would that be able to be deemed as a prescribed project? It is a 4,000-bed

jail. It is virtually the biggest jail in the Southern Hemisphere. South Africa might have a few that are bigger, but it is by far the biggest jail in Queensland. Would that be able to be a prescribed project and go against all of the planning of local governments? This is really poor legislation. I support our shadow minister, the member for Maroochydore. We cannot support this bill.

Ms LEE LONG (Tablelands—ONP) (6.20 pm): This bill is about the Beattie government's power grab—call-in powers, resumptions, limiting or removing rights of review, muzzling or ignoring the voice of the people, and the list goes on. Arguably it might be described as making it possible for vital and essential projects to go ahead as quickly as possible. But we already have processes in place for that. The standard approvals and appeals processes, while not perfect, are tried and proven and those existing processes already include call-in powers under the Integrated Planning Act 1997. The explanatory notes describe this new power as similar to those call-in powers. It begs the question: if there is not much difference, why do we need these new powers other than giving the Beattie government yet another means to have its way with Queensland and be damned with what the people may want or say?

Of course there are always going to be projects which really are vital and which should not be held up unreasonably. But, as I have said, we already have legislation on the books to cover those circumstances. The bill before us today takes those powers, which are very significant and which at present require ministerial involvement, and moves them downstream not just to the Coordinator-General but even down to deputy coordinators-general. If the government of the day believes that a project is vital enough to require this kind of action, then responsibility and decision making about it should reside at the ministerial level and not with the bureaucracy.

These powers all relate to step-in powers, similar to the existing call-in powers, and will affect projects that are prescribed projects. The definition of what is a prescribed project is very wide. Section 76E spells it out as being works that a local body or other person is directed to undertake under a particular regulation; a project in a State Development area; an infrastructure facility; a project declared to be significant under section 26 of the existing SDPWO Act that affects an environmental interest of a state or region; and anything considered by the minister to be economically or socially significant to the state or region in which it is to be undertaken. As a definition, it is quite sweeping. In combination with the powers to be made available to override the normal decision-making process, it takes a very great deal of power from a system of checks and balances and places it in the hands of government functionaries.

I now turn to those powers. The explanatory notes indicate that, under the amendments before us, the Coordinator-General, or any of a number of deputies, will be able to set time limits to take over from decision makers and even to replace already-made decisions. That ability to replace already-made decisions is another point of extra concern because clearly it has nothing to do with avoiding delays. Clearly, a decision will have already been made. It is simply a power to ensure that if a decision maker has acted promptly, if there have been no delays and if everything ran perfectly but the result was not pleasing to the grand plan, then that decision can be rolled so the Premier can get what he wants.

What we need to keep in mind is that the decision maker is often likely to be a local government, which is a group of elected people working in the best interests of their constituents. It is grassroots politics and councils that put their constituents' wishes first and they should be recognised for doing exactly what they are supposed to be doing. They should not be considered an obstacle to the desires of the Beattie cabinet. I was surprised to find in the explanatory notes an indication that one of the motivations for removing the right of appeal was to ensure vexatious litigants could not begin legal actions. We are discussing people who have already been declared vexatious litigants, and I do not believe extra legislative action is needed to provide unnecessary further controls over such people.

To suggest that access is still available to the Supreme Court is little more than a sop to fundamental legislative principles. The Supreme Court is not readily accessible, nor affordable, to many Queenslanders. This legislation has all of the hallmarks of classic Beattie government processes, and the proof is in the list of bodies and organisations which were consulted in drafting this bill. Fifteen different government departments and organisations had input. No surprise, they all supported their own process and the resulting amendments—that is, Premier and Cabinet, Crown law, Justice and Attorney-General, Natural Resources and Water, the EPA, State Development, Treasury, Main Roads and the list goes on. What is missing is any consultation, any input and any feedback from the people of Queensland. The explanatory notes spell it out. Under the 'Consultation' heading relating to industry and community, the participants are listed as nil. Not only does this bill propose stripping away fundamental rights and not only does it provide yet another means for the Beattie government to impose its warped vision on this state but it does so with complete contempt for the people of Queensland, especially considering the provisions already in place in other legislation. I will not be supporting the bill.

Hon. AM BLIGH (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure) (6.25 pm), in reply: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate this afternoon. I thank the government members for Greenslopes and Waterford for their support of the bill and for the support that members on this side of the chamber have for building critical infrastructure, for

making sure that the development that Queensland needs goes ahead at the pace that it needs to. In relation to the contributions from members of the opposition, really all I can say is here they go again. What we are about to see is another spectacular example of the Queensland opposition shooting itself in the foot. It is going to be right up there with its decision to vote against the water regulation, where it voted against the desalination plant and it voted against the western corridor recycling pipeline. It voted against all of the pipeline connectors and of course voted against both of the new water storage dams of Traveston Crossing and Wyaralong, not to mention other projects like Cedar Grove Weir. It is opposed to the eastern busway, but we are used to it opposing major projects, whether it is Suncorp Stadium or any other major facility. So it should come as no surprise—and it certainly does not to me—that the opposition is so keen to oppose provisions of this legislation which we believe are absolutely critical to ensuring that Queensland has the infrastructure that it needs to meet the needs of its people.

There were a number of main objections to the bill. Firstly, there was the pace at which it has proceeded. Let me make it absolutely clear: we make no apology whatsoever for, firstly, implementing an election commitment, because that is what this is. It is an election commitment. We have a mandate to implement this program, and we intend to do it. Secondly, we gave a commitment that this bill would be done within the first 100 days of our government being elected, and we are on track to meet that commitment. So it is an election commitment and we gave a commitment that we would do it in 100 days, and that is why it is here and we make no apology for it.

What the Queensland opposition always wants is to have its cake and to eat it. It wants to come in here and bleat and bleat and bleat. We hear it do it day after day. Every time we establish a working party or a steering group or a task force to look at things in detail it will come in here and belt us about too much process. The minute we get on with the job and implement an election commitment that we have a mandate from the people to do it wants to belt us for doing it too fast. So we cannot quite get it right. It is either too slow or too fast. Whatever it is, the opposition is opposed to it, but it does find it very difficult to hold a position for very long.

The central complaint it would seem from all of the drivel I have heard from those opposite is that at some point it offends fundamental legislative principles in relation to the operation of judicial review. Can I say particularly for the benefit of the new members of this chamber that when they see a member of the Queensland opposition put their hand on their hearts and talk about fundamental legislative principles and their lifelong attachment to them they are about to tell a whopper. They are about to tell a really big one. When they come in here and start talking about FLPs and their concern about the rights of citizens to appeal the decisions of government, they are frauds—absolute frauds.

Anyone would think that the provisions of this bill are some startling new way of trampling over the rights of citizens. Let me advise the House that the provisions that so offend the member for Maroochydore and her colleagues are modelled on the provisions of IPA. Where did IPA come from? How did it get into this House? It was brought into this House by the local government minister Di McCauley. So it was a National Party bill—a National Party bill—and the only amendments that have ever been made to those provisions of IPA were amendments made by this government in 2001 that allowed persons affected by a decision to have a right to seek a statement of reasons for that decision. So we amended IPA to give citizens greater opportunity to find out why decisions had been made, and those changes are not the only ones that have been made but are reflected in the provisions of this bill.

It is okay for the Queensland National Party to make amendments and put in place a legal framework that will, where needed, accelerate things such as residential developments, but it is not okay to provide exactly the same provisions for critical public infrastructure that might actually make a difference between people drinking water or not.

This is policy nonsense. It is the usual claptrap from people who are so concerned to be seen to be opposing things. What members have seen this afternoon is people get up one after another and read probably one of the worst press releases that the Local Government Association of Queensland has ever put out. I think even the association regrets it. It put out a press release claiming that the state government was after the public toilets. I have met with the LGAQ, and I have assured that association that its dunnies are in no danger. I am very happy to put in place some of the amendments that reflect that. I do not believe that any of these amendments are actually necessary in terms of how this bill was planned to operate and how it would have operated without them, but I am quite happy to put the LGAQ's mind at ease if it is so concerned, as I said, that we are after its dunnies because we are not.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

Ms BLIGH: I think I have largely covered the major points in relation to the debate on this bill. I say again to members that I am sure we are going to hear a lot more self-righteous pontificating during the debate on the clauses about the travesty of the arrangements in this bill in relation to judicial review. I remind members, as they are listening to this self-righteous pontification, that the architects of these

clauses are, in fact, the members opposite, and we are merely following suit for very good reason. There is only one reason why someone would use the sorts of powers that we are putting in place in this bill. That is when someone is in a situation that requires urgent action where decision makers have failed, for one reason or another—not just local governments but state government departments are also decision makers for the purposes of this bill—to make the decision in the time that they are required to do so. I remind people to think about that when they listen to some of the nonsense that they are likely to be treated to during the consideration of the clauses of the bill.

As to some of the very specific questions—in relation to the member for Gladstone, while I share her concerns about the importance of making sure that people whose land is being acquired for a public purpose are treated with courtesy, dignity and respect, I assure her that nothing in this bill affects in any way the rights of citizens whose land is being acquired for a public purpose. The only matters in this bill that go to the question of acquisition are those contained in the amendments that have been circulated that go to the question of acquiring an easement for a public purpose from a local government authority or a public utility. In terms of individual citizens, there is nothing in this legislation that would affect any of her constituents.

There was a specific question from the member for Burnett in relation to Paradise Dam. He used his opportunity to speak on this bill to assert that he had heard rumours that there was a leak in Paradise Dam. I can inform the member that this afternoon I checked with SunWater as to whether there was a leak in the dam. It advised me that there are no leaks in Paradise Dam. However, if the member for Burnett has anything that might vaguely constitute evidence of such a thing, I would be very interested to see it, and I would share his concerns should it be true.

I started by saying how important it was for us to move quickly in relation to this legislation because it was an election commitment and because we gave a commitment that we would implement this particular election commitment within 100 days of being elected, and we intend to keep that promise. However, to do so required a lot of effort from the departmental officers who are responsible for this legislation. I would like to particularly acknowledge the work of Craig Whip and his team. They have worked very, very hard during the last month to make sure that not only was the bill ready for consideration by cabinet and introduction into the parliament but also that the amendments that were required could also be accommodated.

There was one other specific question from the member for Currumbin about whether or not the Tugun desalination plant is likely to be a project that falls within the ambit of the bill. I place on the record that the amendments that are being brought forward in committee in terms of transfer of easements for a public purpose are specifically in relation to concerns by councils, such as the Gold Coast council, that they do not currently have a head of power to transfer those easements when they wish to do so for a purpose such as the desalination plant. Therefore, yes, the provisions of this bill that relate specifically to the transfer of easements would apply in the case of the Tugun desalination plant.

In relation to other provisions of the bill, it is my understanding that all of the decisions in relation to this project have now been made, and there would be no requirement to use the notice to decide or notice to step in powers in the bill. I would be happy to provide the member with more details in relation to that matter should she need that.

I thank all members for their contributions to the debate. I urge the opposition—it is probably foolhardy of me—to think twice about opposing this bill. It really is a bill that provides important powers to ensure that critical infrastructure that Queenslanders need will go ahead and will go ahead within the time frames that this parliament has set for decisions to be made. This legislation and the powers that it provides will only be enacted when decision makers, whether they are local governments or state government departments, fail to comply with the time frames that we have already set in legislation that has been passed by this House. Failure to support this bill is really a failure to support the infrastructure that Queenslanders need. I would urge the coalition to reconsider its position. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 50—Barry, Beattie, Bligh, Bombolas, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Darling, Fenlon, Fraser, Gray, Hayward, Hoolihan, Jarratt, Jones, Keech, Kiernan, Lawlor, Lucas, McNamara, Mickel, Miller, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nelson-Carr, O'Brien, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Reeves, Reilly, Roberts, Robertson, Schwarten, Scott, Shine, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Weightman, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Male, Nolan

NOES, 29—Copeland, Cripps, Cunningham, Dempsey, Elmes, Flegg, Foley, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Horan, Johnson, Knuth, Langbroek, Lee Long, Lingard, Malone, McArdle, Menkens, Messenger, Nicholls, Pratt, Seeney, Simpson, Stevens, Stuckey, Wellington. Tellers: Dickson, Rickuss

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Bill read a second time.

Debate, on motion of Ms Bligh, adjourned.

STATE DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Remaining Stages; Allocation of Time Limit Order

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (7.43 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 159, the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill and the following time limits apply to enable the bill to be passed through its remaining stages at this day's sitting—

(a) consideration in detail to be completed by 8.37 pm;

(b) the third reading to be completed by 8.39 pm; and

(c) the long title agreed to by 8.40 pm.

If the stage has not been completed by the time specified, Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to pass the bill, including clauses and schedules en bloc, and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill without further amendment or debate.

Hon. KR LINGARD (Beaudesert—NPA) (7.44 pm): Once again, the opposition has not been consulted on the urgency to pass a bill during this sitting. I think it is particularly rude for the Leader of the House to not consult with the opposition. I have never been rude to the Leader of the House. I have never gone behind his back. I expect there to be some sort of decency.

A lot of legislation has to pass through this House this week. If the Leader of the House wants to pass legislation, I believe that he should consult the opposition. But, as we find in the first hour of this parliament of a morning, the government is closing down the opposition completely—and not just the opposition; it is closing down the other backbenchers in this House. The first hour of the parliament was always considered to be a period in which ministers could make statements and opposition members could make statements. But at this stage that hour is closed down completely and the only member who is able to make a statement is the Leader of the Opposition. Similarly, with this legislation, the government is attempting to close down the opposition.

Of course, the government can do that with its majority. If it wants to continue to do that, it is able to do that. But all backbenchers must be particularly upset that their leaders are doing this. It is something that the members opposite always criticised previous leaders in previous parliaments for doing. Yet here they are doing exactly the same thing, but they are doing it without engaging in any consultation whatsoever with the opposition.

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (7.46 pm): I wish to respond by saying that the government has a mandate from the people of Queensland to pass this legislation through this parliament. In the debate on this bill eight members of the opposition have spoken and two government members have spoken. There is still an hour to go in which members can speak. That time is being taken up by the Leader of Opposition Business.

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

AYES, 51—Barry, Beattie, Bligh, Bombolas, Boyle, Choi, Croft, Darling, Fenlon, Fraser, Gray, Hayward, Hoolihan, Jarratt, Jones, Keech, Kiernan, Lawlor, Lucas, McNamara, Mickel, Miller, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nelson-Carr, O'Brien, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Reeves, Reilly, Roberts, Robertson, Schwarten, Scott, Shine, Smith, Spence, Stone, Struthers, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Weightman, Welford, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson. Tellers: Male, Nolan

NOES, 30—Copeland, Cripps, Cunningham, Dempsey, Elmes, Flegg, Foley, Gibson, Hobbs, Hopper, Horan, Johnson, Knuth, Langbroek, Lee Long, Lingard, McArdle, Malone, Menkens, Messenger, Nicholls, Pratt, Seeney, Simpson, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Wellington. Tellers: Rickuss, Dickson

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

STATE DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from p. 657.

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7 (Insertion of new pt 5A)—

Ms BLIGH (7.54 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 7 (Insertion of new pt 5A)—

At page 11, after line 21—

insert—

' '(5) This section applies subject to section 76EA.

'76EA Process applying to particular declarations

'(1) This section applies if the Minister intends to declare a project with a capital investment value of not more than $50 million to be a prescribed project.

'(2) Before making the declaration, the Minister—
(a) must give each interested person for the project a written notice that—
(i) describes the project and the area in which the project is proposed to be undertaken; and
(ii) states the grounds on which the Minister considers the project should be declared a prescribed project; and
(iii) invites the person to give the Minister a submission about the proposed declaration within the period stated in the notice; and
(b) must consider each properly made submission given to the Minister about the proposed declaration.
'(3) The stated period for subsection (2)(a)(iii) must be at least 10 business days after the interested person is given the notice.
'(4) The Minister must, within 10 business days after making a decision about declaring the project to be a prescribed project, give to each interested person who gave the Minister a properly made submission a written notice stating the Minister's reasons for the decision.
'(5) In this section—
capital investment value, for a project, includes all costs necessary to establish and operate infrastructure associated with the project, including, for example, the cost of—
(a) fixed or mobile plant and equipment; and
(b) designing and constructing buildings or other structures; and
(c) engaging consultants.
interested person, for a project, means each local government for the area in which the project is proposed to be undertaken.
properly made submission means a submission that—
(a) is in writing and is signed by the local government that made the submission; and
(b) is received within the stated period for making the submission; and
(c) states the grounds of the submission and the facts and circumstances relied on in support of the grounds.'.

2 Clause 7 (Insertion of new pt 5A)—
At page 17, line 16, after 'assistance'—
insert—
'**or recommendations**'.

3 Clause 7 (Insertion of new pt 5A)—
At page 18, after line 2—
insert—
' '(3) Subsection (4) applies if, other than for the giving of the step in notice, under the relevant law for the prescribed decision a local government could have imposed a condition, in relation to the decision, for infrastructure to which the Integrated Planning Act, chapter 5, part 1, applies.
'(4) The local government may, before the Coordinator-General makes a decision under section 76O about the prescribed decision, give the Coordinator-General a written recommendation to impose the condition.'.

4 Clause 7 (Insertion of new pt 5A)—
At page 20, after line 15—
insert—
' '(4A) If the Coordinator-General receives a recommendation under section 76M(4) to impose a condition in relation to the prescribed decision, the Coordinator-General must impose the condition unless the Minister directs otherwise.
'(4B) The Coordinator-General's decision to impose a condition under subsection (4A) is taken to be a decision for the purposes of the Integrated Planning Act, section 5.1.8(2)(b).'.

5 Clause 7 (Insertion of new pt 5A)
At page 25, lines 16 to 18—
omit, insert—
'(a) a decision of the Minister to declare a project to be—
(i) a critical infrastructure project; or
(ii) a prescribed project if the project is a critical infrastructure project; or'.

These amendments amend clause 7 of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act. The amendments to clause 7 amend a number of different parts of section 76 of the legislation.

Amendment No. 1 introduces a threshold that will define when the processes of the bill can be enacted. That threshold allows the processes to generally apply to projects with a capital investment value of over $50 million. Where the value is less than that it outlines a consultation process that needs to be established. I should say that this amendment was one of the ones sought by the Local Government Association of Queensland. It is, in fact, drafted consistently with what it proposed.

Amendment No. 2 amends the heading of section 76M to read 'Providing assistance or recommendations'. Amendment No. 3 amends clause 7 further by adding two new subsections to section 76M: firstly, that subsection (4) will apply if, other than for the giving of the step-in notice, a local government could have imposed a condition relating to infrastructure; and, secondly, that the local government may, before the Coordinator-General makes a decision under section 76O about the prescribed decision, give the Coordinator-General a written recommendation to impose the condition. That goes to the question of how infrastructure charges can continue to be levied regardless of the other processes of this bill.

Amendment No. 4 amends clause 7 by proposing to add two new subsections to section 76O. The effect of these amendments is that, where a local government has given the Coordinator-General a recommendation to impose a condition in relation to the prescribed decision, the Coordinator-General must, unless otherwise directed by the minister, impose the condition so that it operates in conjunction

with amendment No. 3. Amendment No. 5 proposes to amend section 76W to clarify that parts 3 and 5, other than section 41(1) of the Judicial Review Act, do not apply to a decision of the minister to declare a project to be a critical infrastructure project or a prescribed project.

Miss SIMPSON: I want to remark on what we just saw take place in this parliament—an extraordinary move by the Deputy Premier to gag the debate. If she was in such a hurry to trot off to a cocktail party, perhaps she could have consulted the other members of the parliament about her particular need. For her to gag a debate and not even have the courtesy to talk to the opposition about her intention is really rude and arrogant.

Ms BLIGH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Any suggestion that I have any other function to attend to tonight that is any more important—in fact, I have no other function; there is nothing more important than debating this legislation—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr English): Order! There is no point of order.

Ms BLIGH:—I find offensive and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the member withdraw?

Miss SIMPSON: Whatever she finds offensive I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! No. Member for Maroochy—

Miss SIMPSON: And I ask the minister to explain why the gag action on this debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member will make an unqualified withdrawal.

Miss SIMPSON: I did withdraw and I repeat that I withdraw. The minister says that she did not have a cocktail party to attend to but she wants to rush this legislation through. Apparently, according to this arrogant government, it has a mandate to gag debates. It has a mandate to do anything. It has a mandate apparently to lie to parliament. It has a mandate to bring in legislation that takes away people's fundamental principles. During the second reading speech I waited to hear whether the Deputy Premier was going to show professionalism and give us the courtesy of addressing some of the issues that have been raised—certainly some of the issues that I raised with regard to judicial review, and I will raise those issues again when I speak further to clause 7 later on.

What we have here are substantial amendments to the State Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. They are amendments to the amendments because this government did not consult with anybody other than itself. That is a really bad omen for these laws being applied in a consultative way with not only local governments but also the wider community. This government is arrogantly pushing through legislation, gagging legislation without even giving us the courtesy of revealing why it is in such a hurry to get this legislation through tonight. This government is tardy in how it responds to the issues of the day that matter, but when it is in trouble it is quite happy to use and abuse its numbers in this parliament.

So let us talk about these amendments before the House. They have come about because the Local Government Association quite rightly was outraged that this government would try to put through legislation that could have quite a significant impact on its own jurisdiction. In the short time that there has been to scrutinise the amendments that were tabled after the start of the debate, it appears that some of the issues that local government raised with the government have been addressed.

Surely a much more thorough and appropriate process could have been undertaken if they and the other community groups had been consulted on the legislation. Instead, we heard the line, 'Oh, we're going to streamline processes.' When we came into the parliament we saw that that meant extraordinary and unfettered powers being put into the hands of the Coordinator-General. As I said, I will come back to this issue in the debate on the substantive clause 7.

This amendment is being moved as a result of belated consultation with the Local Government Association, which raised the need for a consideration of thresholds as to when these processes could be enacted. The concerns of local government are very valid but, as we have just seen in the House tonight, this government cannot be trusted. We see the arrogance of government members in the way that they walk the corridors of this place and in the way that they use their numbers to push through legislation and throw the rules out of the window at whim. That bodes very poorly for the hope that they will respect the rights and liberties of the people of Queensland when applying this very important legislation.

What other areas have been missed because there has not been an appropriate consultation process? What other areas have failed to undergo a wider level of scrutiny because of the way that the government has acted? Certainly there is collective power with the Local Government Association, but what of the rights and liberties of individuals? People who are not major corporate donors to the Labor Party have been let down by the way that this legislation has been put together without any means of consideration.

The state opposition has clearly stated that we support good governance. We do not support bad legislation. Bad legislation does not make up for the bad decision making of a government. There is ample power in the existing legislation to undertake the timely and well-considered construction and approval process of the state's most significant infrastructure. This government has acted with extraordinary haste to take away certain powers of the people, beef up its senior departmental bureaucrats and, ultimately, deliver less for the people.

We have raised legitimate issues about the balance between people's rights and freedoms yet, in her second reading summation, all the minister could reply with was personal abuse and ridicule. What was her reaction upon hearing that the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee, a body of this parliament, had raised most serious concerns about the drafting of the legislation? It was to personally abuse those who actually raised the issues. The minister could not address the serious concerns that have been outlined in the tabled report of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. I think that bodes poorly for the consultation process and the hope that in future people's rights will be viewed with respect.

Ms BLIGH: I table for the information of the House the explanatory notes to the amendments.

Tabled paper: Explanatory notes to amendments 1-5 moved for consideration in detail.

Amendments agreed to.

Miss SIMPSON: For some time, one of the concerns that I have had about this government has been its tendency to take long passages of legislation and put them into one clause. Many people who read the *Hansard* from this evening would not necessarily know the procedures of the parliament and what that means for individual members in terms of their opportunity to scrutinise the clauses of a bill.

Often the debate on the clauses of legislation is the most important part of the debate, because it provides an opportunity to state specific issues of concern with regard to clauses and to ask the minister to answer specific questions. In this bill, 19 pages of legislation have been shoved into one clause. Some members may not understand what that means. In terms of the parliamentary rules, it means that as the shadow minister I have three opportunities to speak, but most backbenchers get no more than two opportunities to speak to each clause. Therefore, when dealing with 19 pages of legislation, considering the bill in detail becomes a very important stage of the debate because we can look at quite substantive issues that were not addressed in detail in the minister's second reading speech.

Nineteen pages of legislation have been placed within one clause, in this case clause 7, and significant issues need to be addressed as a result. I would ask the Deputy Premier to have the courtesy of advising the House about the significance of voluntary environmental agreements, which were certainly raised during the course of the debate. There is a concern about government owned entities being able to enter into a voluntary agreement with the Coordinator-General. The concern is that there will be less rigour in the way that government treats itself, particularly when a government owned corporation is involved. We deserve to see greater attention paid to the actual application of these voluntary environmental agreements. We have looked at the Nature Conservation Act and noted that there is not, as the minister has said, a strict parallel of the provisions under that act. Therefore, we ask: what are the full implications of these voluntary environmental agreements and how are they going to be used? I would certainly welcome the Deputy Premier's reply to that question.

I will attempt to cover a number of other specific issues. A major matter of concern is the way that judicial review has been curtailed. The Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's *Alert Digest No. 10 2006* raised some very strong concerns. The *Alert Digest* states—

The committee notes that proposed ss.76P and 76W (both inserted by cl.7) remove normal statutory appeal rights and severely curtail (or perhaps even completely remove) rights to judicial review, the first in relation to "prescribed projects" and the second in relation to such projects which are also declared to be "critical infrastructure projects".

In this regard the above provisions reflect the general philosophy underlying the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* in relation to projects of significant scope or importance.

The committee refers to Parliament the question of whether the provisions of proposed ss.76P and 76W have sufficient regard to the rights of persons deprived by these sections of appeal and review rights.

The report of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee is well written and I would have thought that it deserves greater attention from the Deputy Premier, because there are good reasons for putting protections, checks and balances into legislation. Is it really necessary to wipe out people's rights in order to build appropriate infrastructure? The answer is no! Major projects such as Lang Park have been constructed without introducing stringent legislation. Extraordinary powers are already available to the decision makers of this state.

So we have to ask: what is this government's real agenda when it uses its numbers tonight to gag debate? It really was unnecessary because we are always understanding where there is a legislative agenda. What we see is a government that is increasingly drunk on its own arrogance, a government that is willing to enter into personal abuse and then strut the stage and say, 'Look at us, we are actually doing something and too bad about how we did it.' We must demand better. Bad governance and bad decision making is a very poor excuse for bad legislation which is not necessary to enable the fast-tracking and the delivery of infrastructure. Good governance and good decision making is the answer, not bad legislation.

Ms BLIGH: I think contained somewhere in all of that were a couple of questions that I will do my best to address—extremely serious questions. The answer is very straightforward. What are the reasons that the government is putting forward the provisions in this clause in relation to judicial review and other appeal rights? They are exactly the same reasons that the government of which the member for Maroochydore was a member in 1997 put exactly the same provisions—in fact, the provisions that these provisions are modelled on—into the legislation for IPA. They are exactly the same reasons that the then National Party minister for planning, Di McCauley, put them into the IPA Bill. She was right to do it. She was right because it is simply a contradiction in terms.

Ms Nolan: She was right about Jeff Seeney.

Ms BLIGH: She was right about Jeff Seeney, too. She was part of a National Party government that actually wanted to get things done. Back in the good old days when the National Party had an interest in what happened in Queensland and it was, as a government, attempting to make things happen, Di McCauley recognised that it was simply a contradiction in terms to put forward a bill that was designed at its heart to ensure that the approval process was transparent, was as expeditious as possible and which made sure that projects could proceed with a minimum of blockage where that was important and then put in a whole lot of other provisions that would tie up those processes.

I remind members of the House that the provisions of this bill can be used only where a decision maker, whether it is a local government or a state government agency, has failed to make a decision in its legislated time frames. So these powers are not about to be rampantly imposed all over the state; they will apply only where a decision maker has failed to make a decision. The first step is the decision maker is actually given a notice to decide with a time frame in which to do it. So there is still another opportunity for it to get it right and to manage the decisions for which it has responsibility. It is only when it fails to comply with the notice to decide that the step-in powers are used.

The member for Tablelands asked earlier: given that there are existing call-in powers, why are these powers necessary? In fact, these powers are a softer option to manage some of the problems that might emerge in major projects. Yes, we could just call the whole project in and then what would we be using? We would be using the powers under IPA that Di McCauley put in place.

This gives us a two-stage process that tries to force decisions to be made by the appropriate decision maker in the required time frame. Frankly, I hope that we do not have to use these powers. I hope that their very existence focuses those agencies, whether they are state government or local government agencies, which have to make decisions about these projects on the need to do so within the legislated time frames.

In relation to the other points that the member made, I can only say that this is actually not the point in the debate to debate the motion to have this matter settled. That was settled by a division. This is actually the time to talk about the clauses of the bill. I am sorry that the member for Maroochydore finds 19 pages of legislation too much of an intellectual burden to undertake in 14 days and I will try to have shorter bills in future. For the benefit of the member for Maroochydore, I advise that in my experience the cocktail hour is well and truly over by 8 o'clock.

Miss SIMPSON: Perhaps I can educate the Deputy Premier as to the standing orders in this place with regard to the opportunity to speak to clauses. I have three opportunities to speak per clause and so, respectfully, I would ask the minister to understand that when there are 19 pages covering three clauses, that means that, if the Deputy Premier actually responds to an issue within a clause and then I seek further information about that and there are 19 pages on that clause, she has actually abused the process in the way she has drafted, but she does not seem to care about that.

I would like to ask the Deputy Premier to answer another question, which I actually put forward within the second reading debate. It is one that has been raised by numerous members of the coalition. Could the minister please advise this parliament what government departments are failing in their duties currently to meet their critical time frames to deliver infrastructure in this state which is making it necessary for her to put this legislation through?

Ms BLIGH: It has been a remarkable kind of proposition put forward by endless speakers from the other side that I ought to be able to point to endless problems in projects to justify this bill. This bill is here because we are one step ahead of it. We are not going to sit idly by and wait until local governments or state government agencies fail in their duty to do things like acquire the recycled water corridor. We are not going to wait until next year to think about these sorts of powers if we have problems acquiring the land that we need or getting the approvals through that have to happen. That is just on the water projects, but there are many other major infrastructure projects. This is about being ready and about having the powers necessary to progress them as we need to progress them. I make no apologies for being one step ahead.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 13, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Ms BLIGH (8.16 pm): I move the following amendment—

6 After clause 13—

At page 29, after line 17—

insert—

'13A Insertion of new pt 6, div 8

'Before part 7—

insert—

'Division 8 Easements for critical infrastructure projects

'153A Definitions for div 8

'In this division—

appropriate register means the appropriate register under the *Land Act 1994* or the *Land Title Act 1994*.

critical infrastructure easement means an easement registered under section 153B.

easement holder, in relation to a critical infrastructure easement, means—

(a) the Coordinator-General; or

(b) if the easement is transferred to another entity—the entity to which it is transferred.

registrar means the registrar of titles or another person responsible for keeping a register for dealings in land.

relevant public utility easement means an easement registered as a public utility easement under the *Land Act 1994*, chapter 6, part 4, division 8, or the *Land Title Act 1994*, part 6, division 4, or that would have been registered as a public utility easement under those provisions if it had been registered after the provisions commenced.

'153B Registration of critical infrastructure easement

'(1) This section applies to land that—

(a) is the subject of a critical infrastructure project; and

(b) is burdened by a relevant public utility easement.

'(2) On receiving an instrument of easement for the land, the registrar must record the particulars of the easement in the appropriate register if—

(a) the instrument—

(i) relates only to the land affected by the relevant public utility easement; and

(ii) is signed by the Minister; and

(b) the easement is in favour of the Coordinator-General.

'(3) Despite the *Land Act 1994*, section 363 or the *Land Title Act 1994*, section 83, the easement may be registered under the Acts—

(a) without the instrument being signed by a person other than the Minister; and

(b) for an easement under the *Land Act 1994*—without the approval of the Minister under that Act.

'(4) The easement is taken to be a public utility easement under the *Land Act 1994*, chapter 6, part 4, division 8, or the *Land Title Act 1994*, part 6, division 4.

'153C Terms of easement

'A critical infrastructure easement may include the following terms—

(a) the easement holder, or a person employed, engaged or authorised in writing by the holder, may construct, maintain, repair, renew, replace or operate infrastructure in or on land burdened by the easement;

(b) the easement holder is the owner of the infrastructure mentioned in paragraph (a);

(c) other terms the Minister considers necessary to facilitate the construction, maintenance, repair, renewal, replacement or operation of the infrastructure.

'153D Effect of registration of easement

'(1) The registration of a critical infrastructure easement over land under section 153B does not extinguish a relevant public utility easement.

'(2) However, the grantee of the relevant public utility easement can not, without the consent of the easement holder for the critical infrastructure easement, exercise any rights in relation to the relevant public utility easement to the extent the exercise of the rights would interfere with the exercise of rights under the critical infrastructure easement.

'153E Transfer of easement

'(1) With the Minister's written approval, a critical infrastructure easement may be transferred to—

(a) another public utility provider; or

(b) a person approved by the Minister as suitable to provide a public utility service in relation to the critical infrastructure easement.

'(2) On receiving an instrument evidencing the transfer, the registrar must record the transfer in the appropriate register.

'(3) The transfer may be recorded in the appropriate register—

(a) without the approval of a person other than the Minister; and

(b) if the appropriate register is a register under the *Land Act 1994*—without the approval of the Minister under that Act.

'(4) A person approved by the Minister under subsection (1)(b) is taken to be a public utility provider for the purposes of the critical infrastructure easement.

'(5) In this section—

public utility provider means a public utility provider under—

(a) the *Land Act 1994*, chapter 6, part 4, division 8; or

(b) the *Land Title Act 1994*, part 6, division 4.

'153F Amendment of easement

'(1) A critical infrastructure easement may, with the Minister's written approval, be amended under, as appropriate—

(a) the *Land Act*, section 370; or

(b) the *Land Title Act*, section 91.

'(2) However, the amendment may be registered—

(a) without the instrument of amendment being signed by a person other than the easement holder; and

(b) for an amendment under the *Land Act 1994*—without the approval of the Minister under that Act.

'153G Minister to give notice of registration or amendment

'(1) The Minister must, as soon as practicable after a critical infrastructure easement is registered or amended under this division, give written notice of the registration or amendment to each person who has an interest in land the subject of the easement.

'(2) The notice must include all of the following—

(a) for registration of an easement—particulars of the easement;

(b) for amendment of an easement—particulars of the amendment;

(c) information about the person's right to claim compensation under section 153I, and the process for claiming the compensation.

'153H Application of particular provisions

'To remove any doubt, it is declared that sections 153C to 153G continue to apply to a critical infrastructure easement even if the land the subject of the easement is no longer the subject of a critical infrastructure project.

'153I Compensation

'(1) Subsection (2) applies to a person who has an interest in land burdened by a critical infrastructure easement—

(a) when it is registered under section 153B; or

(b) when its terms are amended under section 153F.

'(2) The person has a right to claim compensation under the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967* in relation to the extent to which the person's interest is affected by the registration or amendment.

'(3) For claiming the compensation, the process stated in the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967* for the payment of compensation for land taken under that Act applies with any necessary changes as if the registration or amendment were a taking of land under that Act by the State.

'(4) Other than as stated in this section, a person has no right to compensation for the registration or amendment of a critical infrastructure easement under this division.'.'.

This amendment proposes a new clause 13A. It amends the bill to insert a new part 6 division 8 into the act. This new part provides a process to allow the registration of easements for critical infrastructure projects. I should say in relation to this clause that it has emerged because local governments, as I indicated in my summing-up, currently do not have a head of power by which they could transfer an easement to the state for a public infrastructure purpose. There is no dispute or disagreement between the state government and the Local Government Association about the importance of this clause.

I have to say that I think it is unfortunate that so much of the opposition's criticism of this bill has focused on local government. It is my experience that local governments are active participants in getting these projects moving. They are doing their absolute level best to get their end of the projects approved as quickly as possible. I have had nothing but full cooperation from councils like the Gold Coast City Council on the desalination project. If they do not have a head of power they do not have a head of power, and this clause is about creating the head of power needed to acquire an easement for a public purpose from a local government or from a public utility. It does also provide the power to acquire that if there is no voluntary agreement, but I do not anticipate that to be a problem.

Miss SIMPSON: We recognise that this is a provision that has been brought forward to enable the practical use of easements and to also ensure that other parties and government entities—infrastructure related entities—are able to access those easements. The minister has outlined the safeguards which are to apply with regard to people's individual rights. Obviously where an easement has been taken out across somebody's land—private property—there are conditions which apply to that easement. I understand from the briefing that the intention of this amendment to the amendment that we are debating here tonight is, in fact, to enable other uses of that new easement. I certainly appreciate the minister's confirmation again that the way that will be used will take into account that some easement usages are not always that compatible.

We recognise the broad intent of this particular amendment. The other most important issue concerns the rights of the original landowners. The legislation outlines that the existing provisions of the Acquisition of Land Act will apply.

I note that the member for Gladstone raised some very valid concerns about compensation. I appreciate that many of the abuses we have seen have happened under the existing legislation. Unfortunately, it is an area than does need reform. In order for the public benefit to be served by timely delivery of infrastructure there needs to be greater recognition of fairer compensation and also fair restitution. I think it is a valid point with the current Acquisition of Land Act and its ability to compensate people that people are not able to be relocated in the same area.

A new easement or the new activity within an easement could have no impact whatsoever or it could have an adverse impact. What springs to mind usually is the disturbance factor. We have to ensure that there is appropriate restoration and also consideration that there may be different uses within an easement. It may not be the case with a pipeline where it is buried but it may be the case with other potential uses in the future. That needs to be taken into consideration. We need to understand that beyond an easement there may be an indirect impact. I certainly would hope when considering using an easement for another purpose that the issue of the indirect impact on the balance of the property is properly considered.

We feel very strongly that the rights of those whose land is affected must be understood. These people who own property are not the landed gentry the way the Premier was talking about them earlier in the day. Often those who are most adversely impacted through a process are those who do not have a lot of dealings with government. They are not legal minded people. They do not always view these as easy processes.

Admittedly, the easement issue is a different issue to full acquisition. Maybe it would not be the case with the pipelines that are being considered, but with multiple uses of an easement it needs to be taken into consideration that there can be unintended consequences on the balance of property. It should certainly always be treated as fresh compensation rather than people being told that because they have already suffered an impairment they are not subject to the same level of compensation.

I put that on the record because I believe that the issue of acquisition of land and fair compensation, the disturbance factor and how they are dealt with requires a fairer, better approach by government. There needs to be a review to ensure that people can use the law in future to ensure their lives are not unduly disturbed.

Ms BLIGH: I think members have just heard a perfect reason why there is absolutely no point giving extra time to this business. What we have just heard from the shadow minister is a startling revelation that she has no idea what this amendment does or what this clause is about. I have at some length in my summing-up and again in the explanation of this amendment gone to some trouble to explain to the House, because of the genuine concerns raised by the member for Gladstone, that nothing in this bill and nothing in the amendments in relation to the acquisition of easements relates to individual landholders and citizens.

It proposes a new method of registering easements for public purposes that are on land that is owned by a local government or a public utility. It has no effect whatsoever on individuals or on citizens. The member for Gladstone understood that as soon as I explained it to her. I have now explained it to the House for the third time. I hope that when people vote on this clause they will understand that.

Miss SIMPSON: I thank the minister for her explanation to the House. I appreciate that she has clarified that it relates to public utilities. With regard to the Acquisition of Land Act and the amendments before the House, I note that I think it is appropriate for us as a parliament to consider these issues.

We have broadly talked about wider legislation tonight which does take into account the fact that people and their property rights will be affected. I know that your way is to enter into personal abuse. I am sorry that that is the way that you seek to use this parliament. I think the issue of land acquisition in the future is something that we need to take into account. We had the opportunity to state on the record tonight that we value the rights of individuals. We will stand by those people regardless of whether or not you want to enter into personal abuse.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr English): Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to refer her comments through the chair, not directly to the member.

Ms BLIGH: I want to draw to the attention of particularly the new members of the House that what we are seeing here is an opposition that complained bitterly about being given only an hour to debate the clauses and is now proceeding to waste the hour that it has. What we have just seen is one of the best examples of filibustering that members are likely to see. Unbelievable. They have nothing to say.

Miss Simpson interjected.

Ms BLIGH: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier and Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

Miss Simpson interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I warn you under standing order 253. Settle down, please.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—

Ms BLIGH (8.26 pm): I move the following amendments—

7 Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—
At page 29, after line 26—
insert—
'***appropriate register***, for part 6, division 8, see section 153A.'.

8 Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—

At page 29, after line 28—

insert—

'***critical infrastructure easement***, for part 6, division 8, see section 153A.'.

9 Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—

At page 29, line 29, ', for part 5A,'—

omit.

10 Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—

At page 30, after line 2—

insert—

'***easement holder***, for part 6, division 8, see section 153A.'.

11 Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—

At page 30, after line 11—

insert—

'***registrar***, for part 6, division 8, see section 153A.'.

12 Clause 14 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))—

At page 30, after line 12—

insert—

'***relevant public utility easement***, for part 6, division 8, see section 153A.'.

These amendments all go to matters that affect the establishment of the register to effect the acquisition of easements, as I have outlined in the previous amendment.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 22, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Ms BLIGH (8.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

13 After clause 22—

At page 32, after line 21—

insert—

'22A Amendment of s 296 (Tenure document to be returned to land registry)

'Section 296(2)—

insert—

'(d) a request to register a dealing under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, part 6, division 8.'.'.

This clause amends the bill by inserting clause 22A, which proposes to amend section 296 of the Land Act 1994 to provide that a tenure document for cancellation need not be returned to the registry for a request to register a dealing under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 25, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Ms BLIGH (8.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

14 After clause 25 (Amendment of s 89 (Easements for public utility providers))—

At page 34, after line 13—

insert—

'25A Amendment of s 154 (Lodging certificate of title)

'Section 154(2)—

insert—

'(i) a request to register a dealing under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, part 6, division 8.'.'.

The amendment inserts a new clause 25A. This clause proposes to amend section 154 of the Land Title Act 1994 to provide that it is not necessary to obtain the duplicate certificate of title from a landowner as a matter of course in order to register a critical infrastructure easement, a transfer or amendment of a critical infrastructure easement. Again it relates to the other matters that I have already discussed. Before taking my seat, however, I would draw to the attention of the House the extraordinary proposition of an opposition that protested loudly about having the parameters of the debate established but are unable to fill the time that they have been given.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 26 and 27, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

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

Motion agreed to.

Long Title

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

Motion agreed to.

POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL
POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 2 November (p. 504).

Police Service Administration Amendment Bill resumed from 2 November (p. 501).

Mr MESSENGER (Burnett—NPA) (8.29 pm): This amended legislation before the House is here because the Queensland community wants to decrease the injuries and stop the senseless deaths on our state roads. After examining the 58 clauses and 41 pages and reading the minister's second reading speech and explanatory notes, it is my and the opposition's opinion that this legislation will contribute to that very worthy goal of decreasing injuries and saving lives, and for that reason I congratulate the minister on her legislative effort. However, that is not to say that this legislation is perfect and cannot be improved upon. After all, as pointed out during the opposition's briefing, we were advised by staff of the police minister's office that this proposed Queensland vehicle impoundment and forfeiture legislation was unique in Australia and represented a major initiative in this area. Therefore, I and my conservative colleagues are looking forward to the debate and contribution of all members, particularly during the consideration in detail stage when we will get the opportunity to examine this legislation in greater detail.

I intend to introduce a small but, I believe, important and significant amendment to this bill to properly and carefully evaluate the results of the trial of the impoundment and forfeiture of property belonging to or used by an offender prior to the extension of these legislative provisions across the state. The amendments proposed in the bill were developed from matters raised at the government's Road Safety Summit held at Parliament House in February of this year. The key provisions of the bill are that the bill reclassifies certain vehicle offences for which confiscation provisions can apply into type 1 and type 2 offences. Type 1 offences are the previously so-called hooning offences such as street racing, burnouts, excessive noise et cetera. The new type 2 offences, which in certain circumstances can be subject to a vehicle being impounded or forfeited, include the offences of repeat drink driving—that is over the limit of .05—disqualified or unlicensed driving, driving in an unlicensed vehicle and driving an illegally modified vehicle.

If a driver has been charged or found guilty of a type 2 offence on a second or subsequent occasion, the vehicle can be subjected to impoundment or forfeiture as follows: at the second offence the vehicle may be impounded for 48 hours. At the third offence police may apply to court for a three-month impoundment order. The court must consider any defence arguments such as severe financial or physical hardship. At the fourth offence police may apply to court for an order that the vehicle be forfeited. The court may grant the order, make a further order for impoundment or make it an order for the driver to perform community service. The bill shifts liability for initial impoundment costs from the state to the offending driver, except in cases where the driver is a child or the driver is found not guilty of the offence. The potential costs of vehicle impoundments to the state were a significant flaw in the original anti-hooning laws. Amendments to other legislation include the extension of immediate suspension provisions to drivers charged with the dangerous operation of a motor vehicle when allegedly exceeding their permissible blood alcohol level.

The legislation is designed to target hoons and rev heads and is designed to take away their cars and make the road a safer place for families and Queenslanders who want to drive in a lawful manner. If we want to be brutally honest, when the minister says in her second reading speech that it is approximated that 18,000 vehicles will be impounded under the provisions over each of the next years—and I think that a major proportion of those vehicles impounded will belong to young men—why is it that some young men succumb to the temptation to spend all of their money and time on hotted up cars fitted with loud sound systems and to hoon and some do not? I will have to rely on personal experience, because I remember when I bought my first car. I was about 17-years-old at the RAAF base

in Wagga Wagga in New South Wales. I borrowed $2,000 from the bank and a group of mates and I took off one Friday afternoon and headed to Sydney. We slept in the middle of Parramatta Park on our sleeping bags. I had the money in my pillow and the next morning we bought the paper and hunted for that second-hand car. To this day I am still grateful to a good RAAF mate of mine who had an extremely old and wise head on a pair of young shoulders. He convinced me to buy the stock standard white Holden HJ six cylinder 173 three-in-the-tree bench seat with a standard set of roadworthy tyres instead of the black Ford V8 with the sunroof, the 350 Chev four-on-the-floor, bucket seats and the fat baldy tyres. No matter how logical and sensible the choice now seems almost 30 years later, I still remember the feelings and thoughts I had as a 17-year-old of wanting to impress members of the opposite sex with the car as I handed over the $2,000 for the stock standard Holden and how close I came to buying the black Ford V8.

My mate, who was older than me and a more experienced driver, then taught me how to drive safely in city traffic where road conditions were foreign to me. He helped supervise and allowed me to get my confidence. As a young lad growing up in the bush, I learnt to drive farm vehicles on dirt roads, so I was lucky to have a good skills base to start from. The lessons that I have taken from these significant life experiences are that, in order to reduce the road toll, as well as having strong legislation which will in effect target young people we also need to ensure that our young drivers are properly mentored and trained.

The best way that that kind of lifesaving training could be delivered is at driver training centres such as the facility at Gympie. The Roadcraft Driver Education Centre is located on the southern outskirts of Gympie, as my colleague from Gympie would well attest. The centre, which is fully equipped to supply a complete range of driver education courses with classroom facilities for teaching safe driving theory and a well laid out track incorporating a skid pan for practical driver training sessions, has made an important contribution to a safe road environment through its innovative program of courses aimed at producing safety conscious road users of all ages and all levels of driving expertise. At present quite a lot of Bundaberg and Burnett high school students through their schools have been travelling to Gympie to participate in this driver education program.

It was the Queensland coalition's election commitment earlier this year to build a new driver education centre in Bundaberg for our youths which was pushed by the member for Bundaberg, Mr Jack Dempsey. The driver training program would have been an asset to our region's economy considering that it has been estimated that around 900 year 11 students travel to Gympie every year to participate in this course. It would mean that those 900 students every year would participate in the program locally, with approximately $200,000 being injected into our local economy. I am sure that there are a lot of other regional areas in Queensland where a similar situation and similar needs exist where large numbers of students travel out of town to receive a good grounding in driver education.

I am aware that those driver training facilities cost significant amounts of money to build and to run. But, on the other side of the ledger, they undoubtedly would save lives by instilling in young people the right attitude and imparting the right skills. The recent tragic car accidents and loss of life on Queensland roads has further focused my mind and prompted me to think about ways to provide better driver education through the establishment of regional driving centres. I believe that the states have a responsibility to make sure that communities are helped to build these facilities.

Because of new fines and sales of impounded vehicles, the legislation before the House will raise significant amounts of revenue. I am looking forward to hearing from the minister in her summation. Perhaps she could provide further details on the projected amounts of revenue. I would like to see some of that money set aside for the development of regional driver training centres.

I also believe that the private sector, particularly the car makers and the racing industry, have a moral and social responsibility to help fund, run, resource and promote regional driver training centres. They are the people who profit from the business of racing modified, hotted-up cars or legalised hooning. Of course, the car racing business is marketed as a very glamorous occupation. Quite a skilled advertising campaign accompanies that racing. Of course, the implicit message being sold in all advertising that is hitting our young drivers, particularly our young mens' minds, I believe, is that if someone drives a hotted-up car and hoons around the road fast enough they will become famous, have lots of ladies chasing after them and have plenty of expensive alcohol to drink in front of a crowd of cheering people. I think it only fair that the private sector, which makes enormous profits from the car racing business, as well as the government should invest in driver education, especially the education of young drivers.

This legislation also toughens up our state's laws when it comes to alcohol related driving offences. In her second reading speech the minister said that the bill provides for a type 2 vehicle impoundment scheme. This scheme provides that if a repeat offender is the driver of the vehicle who commits the same kind of the following offence—driving under the influence of alcohol—the legislation will strengthen penalties for repeat drink drivers by confiscating offenders' vehicles for 48 hours for two offences inside three years or for three months for further offences. It is an attempt to deter drivers from getting behind the wheel under the influence of alcohol.

The *Sunday Mail* has examined this issue in detail in recent days and has asked the question of its readers: are our state laws tough enough to deter drink drivers? The readers reached the conclusion that our state laws are not tough enough. The editorial on page 57 highlights a message that we should all be supporting—when it comes to drink driving, the evidence is that tough laws work and that tougher laws work even better.

Our road toll is growing relentlessly. During last year alcohol was involved in 35 per cent of fatal crashes. That accounts for 114 lives. The newspaper also asked the question: how many lives must be lost to serial drink drivers before we ban them for life? That question was asked by Elisa Lawrence on page 11. It paints a very grave picture of the current crisis that we are facing on our roads.

The *Sunday Mail* statistics reveal that we are not getting through to drink-driving offenders. The majority end up becoming repeat offenders. The statistics show that the number of repeat drink-driving offenders has been steadily increasing since 2003. In 2003, repeat offenders accounted for 888 offences. In 2006—up to 10 November—the number has shot up to 1,255. That is a massive 40 per cent surge in drink-driving offences in just three years.

What more can we do to get through to the menaces on our roads? The *Courier-Mail* suggests that a lot more can be done. Seventy-five per cent of visitors to its web site, as of 2.30 pm Monday, 27 November, who took part in answering an online poll which asked the question, 'Do you think repeat drink drivers should be stripped of their vehicles and licences for life?' believe that we need harsher penalties to fit this crime and, as such, answered 'yes' to this question.

Charles, of London, who commented online to the *Sunday Mail's* story, puts it succinctly when he states—

Point a gun at someone and kill them and it is called murder, but do the same with a car and it's called an accident. That drink drivers are repeatedly caught just shows they either do not get the message or don't care about the potential consequences. Driving is not a right, it's a responsibility, and those who can't behave responsibly should not be allowed to drive.

It is a simple but blatantly true message: driving is not a right but a responsibility. Why should the lives of our loved ones be placed in danger by those few but increasingly irresponsible drink drivers who fail to care about the safety of those around them? It is, sadly, the innocent who are ultimately paying the price for those reckless, selfish drivers. What cost can we put on a human life?

Another online comment of significance was posted by Tony Graham of the Australian forensic drug testing service, who states—

This comes as no surprise to those who work in this area. Substance abuse involving alcohol and other drugs is a sad feature of our society. Alcohol, as a legal drug, is readily available, and our culture is one that encourages its use, in some quarters bestowing hero status on those who abuse it. Repeat offenders will continue to be just that until the cycle is broken. Research shows that ever increasing penalties are an ineffective deterrent for more entrenched offenders. It also demonstrates that while naming, shaming and punishment is an effective deterrent for some, the most cost-effective means of dealing with substance abuse is education, awareness and rehabilitation. The conduct of programs in schools, tertiary institutions, workplaces and as part of rehab programs for those convicted of drinking and driving must be the primary plank in any platform directed towards addressing repeat offending behaviour.

Should drug driving be included as a type 2 offence? I am interested to hear from the minister on that question. I know that this legislation bans multiple drink drivers, but what all Queenslanders would like to see is legislation that also targets drug drivers.

The International Council on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety is an independent not-for-profit body whose goal is to reduce mortality and morbidity brought about by the misuse of alcohol and drugs—licit and illicit—by operators of vehicles in all modes of transportation. The findings in the last 10 years—that is, up to May 2000—of those driving under the influence of legal drugs appears to be increasingly common amongst those arrested for driving under the influence, but it is less frequently detected, discouraged or treated when compared with drink driving. In Australia, the Victorian parliamentary Road Safety Committee held an inquiry into the effects of drugs other than alcohol on road safety investigations of fatally injured drivers from 1995-96. It revealed that 27 per cent had drugs other than alcohol present that may have affected their driving performance.

The Victorian government has produced an informative web site titled Arrive Alive, which provides information about driving under the influence of alcohol and drugs. Of particular interest, it dispels a number of myths about drugs and driving, which I would like to share with members. Myth No. 1: 'Drugs don't affect my ability to drive.' The illicit drugs can affect a person's ability to drive by causing impaired coordination, muscle weakness, impaired reaction time, poor vision, an inability to judge distance and speed, and distortions of time, place and space. The active component of drugs such as cannabis—called THC—impairs mental function and reduces attention and concentration on the driving task. THC significantly increases the risk of a crash, even when there are no extreme outward signs of impairment. Speed, ice or crystal meth—or the methamphetamine in ecstasy, the MDMA—increase risk taking and aggression. Speed is often used by drivers to temporarily allow them to continue to drive even though they are too tired to do so safely.

Myth No. 2: 'I'm safe when I drive while affected by drugs.' Increasingly, drug use is associated with road crashes and driving fatalities. People may think they are safe, but the statistics tell the real story. Drug driving is a major cause of road deaths in Victoria. In 2003, a total of 31 per cent of drivers

killed in Victoria tested positive to drugs other than alcohol. Research also shows that a driver who has recently consumed cannabis or an amphetamine based substance is at the same risk of having a crash as a driver with an alcohol concentration above 0.05.

Myth No.3: 'Drink driving is a much bigger problem.' Drink driving is a major community issue, but so is drug driving. In 2003, 28 per cent of drivers killed had a blood alcohol content of .05 or more. In the same year, 31 per cent of drivers killed tested positive to drugs other than alcohol. Recently I commissioned parliamentary research into this issue. It is excellent research. The paper reports that drug driving, like drink driving, is treated as an offence of driving under the influence. If a police officer suspects that a person's driving ability has been impaired by substances such as drugs or alcohol, the police officer may require that person to undergo a blood test. Drugs can impair a driver's ability to drive safely by causing poor motor and coordination skills, impaired reflexes, blurred vision, an inability to judge distance and speed, fatigue, memory loss, distortions of time, place and space, nausea and vomiting, dizziness and fainting, and aggressive or psychotic behaviour.

Queensland legislation relating to driving under the influence of drugs or drug driving is contained within the provisions of the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, which is affected by this legislation, specifically in section 79(1), which states—

Driving etc. whilst under influence of liquor or drugs or with prescribed concentration of alcohol in blood or breath

(1) Any person who whilst under the influence of liquor or a drug—

(a) drives a motor vehicle, tram, train or vessel; or

(b) attempts to put in motion a motor vehicle, tram, train or vessel; or

(c) is in charge of a motor vehicle, tram, train or vessel;

is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding 28 penalty units or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 9 months.

Further statistics show that 51 per cent of motorists admit to often driving within three hours of taking prescription medicine. Nationally, nine per cent of drivers admit to having driven while under the influence of recreational drugs. Insurer AAMI's 2004 crash index revealed that 14 per cent of Queensland motorists admitted driving after using drugs, including marijuana, cocaine, speed, or ecstasy. Secret government testing has revealed that one in 25 Queensland drivers is high on drugs behind the wheel while preliminary data exposes Queensland roads as minefields full of potentially deadly encounters with drug-affected drivers. The state government is finishing preparation for next year's random drug-driving tests. The shocking data shows that motorists are almost four times more likely to test positive to the recent use of cannabis, speed, or ecstasy.

Ms SPENCE: I rise to a point of order. This legislation is not about drug driving. We have heard from the shadow minister for 10 to 15 minutes about drug driving. This legislation is about a lot of things—it is big, groundbreaking legislation—but it is not about drug driving. I think the shadow minister has made the point that he would like to see drug driving included in the legislation. I am happy to respond to that, but I think to go on for 15 minutes about drug driving when the legislation does not even mention it is laborious, boring and unnecessary.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Jones): Order! There is no point of order. I ask the member to speak to the bill. You have spoken for a significant amount of time but not about the bill.

Mr MESSENGER: The police minister also told the *Courier-Mail* that 24 specialised police would take saliva from drivers by putting a swab similar to a cotton bud in their mouth. The swab will be mixed with a chemical solution that identifies the constituent that causes a high, such as THC in cannabis—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not relevant to the bill. You are going to have to make the rest of your speech relevant to the bill.

Mr MESSENGER: I note that there are concerns and questions expressed in the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's latest report. I ask that the minister address these issues in her reply.

Does the bill allow the delegation of legislative power only in appropriate cases and to the appropriate persons? Section 79B of the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, not yet in force, provides that a person's driver's licence is immediately suspended in several specified sets of circumstances. Clause 55 of the bill inserts into the act proposed section 79E, which relates to one such set of circumstances, namely, where the person has been charged with driving a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of liquor or charged under the Criminal Code with the dangerous operation of a motor vehicle when the person is over the alcohol limit. Section 79E(2) provides that, subject to certain conditions, a person whose licence is immediately suspended in that set of circumstances may make application to a court for an order authorising the person to continue to drive motor vehicles pending a hearing of the charge in stated circumstances. Most of the significant details of this application process, including the persons who are eligible, how an application is to be made, the criteria to be used, the types of restrictions imposed, the duration of orders and the consequences of failure to comply with an order are to be determined by regulation made under section 79E(4).

Given the significance of these matters, a question arises as to why they could not have been stipulated in the act itself rather than being left to regulation. The Scrutiny of Legislation Committee noted that clause 55 of this bill established a process whereby a person, whose licence had been immediately suspended because of particular charges under the Transport Operations (Road Use management) Act 1995, can apply to the court for an order to be allowed to continue driving pending the hearing of the charge. The committee also noted that under proposed section 79E(4), most of the important details of that process were to be determined by regulation. Given the significance of these matters, the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee seeks information from the minister as to why they could not be included in the act itself rather than being left to regulation.

This is a cognate debate: the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill is also being debated. I see this legislation as an important tool to fight all sorts of crime, particularly organised crime. Once this legislation is passed police will have the power to fight crime. The legislation aims to clear any doubt about the legal basis on which the Queensland Police Service discloses certain types of information through the national CrimTrac agency—such as criminal history information to media outlets, other police services and, in some cases, to private industry as well. For the overall protection of the community, I wholeheartedly support this amendment bill.

On the issue of organised crime and its prevalence in Queensland, I would like to introduce to parliament some of the findings of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee on the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill. In response to the question, 'Does the legislation have sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals?', the committee noted that clause 8 of the bill inserts proposed section 10.2A, which is the release of criminal history information in relation to employment screening; section 10.2B, which is the disclosure of criminal history for assessing suitability for diversion programs; and section 10.2D, which is the disclosure of information to the media by direct data feed—all of which expressly authorise release of information by the Commissioner of the Queensland Police Service in particular circumstances. In the first two cases the affected person's consent is required. In the circumstances, the committee stated that it does not consider the provisions of clause 8 to be objectionable.

In response to the question, 'Does the legislation adversely affect rights and liberties, or impose obligations, retrospectively?', the committee noted that proposed section 10.2F validates disclosures of information of certain types dealt with by the bill. The committee made no further comment in relation to that.

Mr Schwarten: We can all read that, you know. We are all literate. We can read the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee report.

Mr MESSENGER: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker Jones, for your protection. The amendments proposed in the bill were developed from matters, as I said, raised at the government's Road Safety Summit held at Parliament House in February this year. The opposition intends to support the bills.

Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (9.02 pm): I rise to support the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill 2006. This bill amends the Police Service Administration Act 1990 to authorise the disclosure of criminal history information for employment screening under a commercial or other arrangement.

The disclosure is authorised where: the disclosure is to the CrimTrac agency or another police service to facilitate the release of a person's criminal history record to a third party under a commercial or other arrangement; the commercial or other arrangement is for conducting national criminal history record checking for employment screening purposes; the written consent of the individual has been obtained; there is, or is likely to be, a benefit to the community or a section of the community from the disclosure; and the release is not subject to any other law which requires or permits the police commissioner to disclose, or prevents or restricts the police commissioner from disclosing, information about the person.

Other arrangements may include criminal history checks undertaken in relation to volunteers employed by benevolent or charitable organisations who may not be operating on a strictly commercial basis. I had a fair bit to do with the criminal history record people in the police department when I was a registrar of justices of the peace within the justice department. I have the greatest respect for the police officers and also the civilian staff who are employed in that area.

Before I conclude I would like to place on record my great admiration for the police officers who operate in my area, particularly the Goodna 24-hour police station and also the police beats and shopfronts at Riverview, Redbank Plaza, Redbank Plains, Goodna and Springfield Lakes. I would like to particularly place on record my thanks to Jose and Kirrilee, who are married police officers at Riverview, and place on record as well that their twin babies are doted on by the Riverview community. In fact, I think they are more famous than the police officers themselves.

Mr Lucas: Are they boys or girls?

Mrs MILLER: One of each.

Mr Lucas: Do they both wear blue?

Mrs MILLER: They should both wear blue, I think. I would also like to thank the police minister for her announcement in relation to the new police station for Springfield. Thank you very much. Our community is very grateful for her announcement during the election campaign. In fact, we cannot wait for that police station to be built. I thank the minister for bringing this legislation before the House and for her staff's commitment and also for the commitment of the Police Service.

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (9.05 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on these two bills and to make specific reference to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. On the Sunshine Coast there is great support for the government's attempts to respond to the hooning and antihooning legislation. I note in this bill before the House at the moment that the minister is expressly extending the liability of drivers to pay costs associated with the initial impoundment of any vehicle impounded under chapter 4 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act.

I also note that in the bill the minister is extending the ability of the Commissioner of the Queensland Police Service to have the forfeiture of any vehicle impounded under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act in circumstances where the vehicle may not have been recovered by the owner or driver within 30 days after the expiration of the impoundment period. The minister in her explanatory notes and second reading speech goes on to explain who has the responsibility if the vehicle is under hire purchase and there are not sufficient funds left over after the sale of that vehicle.

I think this bill is great news. I had many deputations prior to the antihooning legislation during my short time in the House from concerned residents in the Mooloolaba and Maroochydore areas. I think this legislation will be favourably received by the community on the Sunshine Coast. I congratulate the minister on her initiative and look forward to further amendments in the future.

Mr HOOLIHAN (Keppel—ALP) (9.07 pm): In rising to speak to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which is being debated cognately with the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill, I extend my congratulations to the police minister and her staff for reacting so quickly to the concerns expressed by people who attended the Road Safety Summit. I want to deal specifically with the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill, but firstly I will deal briefly with the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill in relation to hooning.

People in Queensland and generally throughout Australia have reached saturation point in relation to those people who would thumb their nose at decisions made by courts. From my own legal background and my work in the court, the only way to deal with people whose attitude is 'You can't tell me what to do. I'm going to go out there and drive and I don't care who gets hurt or what happens'—those people who make themselves irrelevant in relation to society's rules—is to take away the instrument with which they think they can thumb their nose at society. I believe that the amendments proposed will go a long way to addressing the requirements of our community to stop the senseless slaughter of our young people.

I want to address a very important issue in relation to the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill—that is, the safeguards that prevent the inappropriate use of disclosure of criminal history information. Traditionally, police services have exchanged information in relation to criminal history purely and simply for police purposes. However, through CrimTrac, the federal government has accredited third parties to use criminal history for other uses, including employment screening. That is done by contractual arrangement.

As with most other contracts at law, if one party breaches a contractual arrangement or if there is any inappropriate use of anything under the contract, the remedy is for the contract to be terminated. That remedy still exists in relation to inappropriate use or disclosure of criminal history information. The termination of the contract takes away the privilege of providing those services, but it does not protect the people whose criminal history has been wrongly disclosed. Imposing a criminal sanction against the wrongful provision of that information provides a strong deterrent against the misuse of criminal history information. That should show people that that information cannot be used for inappropriate and, in many cases, dishonest purposes. Contractual arrangements also provide administrative processes for the management and use of criminal history information, and includes procedures for the protection and destruction of criminal history records.

The bill provides an extension of provisions for the inappropriate use or disclosure of criminal history information in relation to diversion programs. Those programs are designed to assist the people concerned and the inappropriate use of such information is to be discouraged. The offence provision contained in the bill is considered a sufficient deterrent to the inappropriate use or disclosure of criminal history information in those circumstances, but there is some further consideration being given to whether administrative guidelines are needed to support the bill in relation to diversionary programs.

As I have indicated, both of these bills address concerns of the community. The Police Service Administration Amendment Bill protects the rights of people who allow their criminal history to be provided to CrimTrac. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms CROFT (Broadwater—ALP) (9.12 pm): Tonight it is my pleasure to rise to speak in support of the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. The aspects of the scheme that I would like to outline relate to the towing and disposal of impounded vehicles under the scheme.

Currently, a vehicle impounded under the hoon impoundment scheme is towed in accordance with existing Police Service agreements to tow and store impounded vehicles. The Queensland Police Service has found the requirement to meet initial impoundment costs to be very expensive and the recovery of costs from drivers and owners of impounded vehicles ineffective. The ineffectiveness of the existing cost provisions was identified by a 2006 QPS submission to the parliamentary Travelsafe Committee inquiry into vehicle impoundment for drink drivers. The submission identified financial records that indicated that, as of 12 January 2006, the Queensland Police Service had paid $198,000 for the towing and storage of vehicles impounded since the commencement of the hoon vehicle related impoundment scheme. Of this, only about $70,000 had been recovered through the State Penalties Enforcement Registry.

To address this ineffectiveness and reduce the financial impact of the impoundment schemes on the state, this bill makes key amendments to chapter 4 to clearly provide that the state is not liable to pay any costs of removing and keeping a vehicle impounded under chapter 4 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. This approach will mean that all costs incurred by a towing operator to remove and store a vehicle impounded under chapter 4 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act must be paid for by the driver/owner of the vehicle following the end of the initial impoundment period or the three-month impoundment order. Further, those costs must be paid for before the vehicle is released from a holding yard.

I will speak briefly about forfeiture. Currently, the existing provisions within chapter 4 enable the commissioner to administratively forfeit a vehicle under two months from the end of the period of impounding. Given that a large number of vehicles may be impounded annually, there will be substantially increased numbers of impounded vehicles that are not recovered by owners. Consequently, this bill reduces the existing period to 30 days. The bill moves to address concerns that may be made by towing and storage facility operators in relation to the large number of vehicles that may be unclaimed.

The bill also enables the commissioner to administratively forfeit and sell, transfer, or dispose of a non-recovered impounded vehicle to meet impoundment costs. There are essential requirements that must be met prior to the forfeiture of an impounded vehicle. Firstly, it must be established that the impounded vehicle was not recovered by the owner within 30 days of the end of the initial impoundment period or the police cannot find who owns the vehicle. Secondly, the commissioner must ensure that notice is given of the proposed sale or disposal of the vehicle by way of newspaper advertisement, but if the owner of the vehicle is not known the Police Service web site may be used to give notice. Thirdly, the commissioner must give written notice of the proposed sale of the motor vehicle to the owner if the owner is known. However, if the name of the owner of the vehicle is not known or the owner cannot be located, the notice may be given by making the information about the proposed sale available on the Police Service web site. The changes that have been included in this bill will address some of the issues that have been raised by the police.

I take this opportunity to thank the minister for recently opening the Biggera Waters police beat in my electorate. The police beat is working very well and has been greatly supported by the community, including the local chamber of commerce. Many people refer to it at our regular police consultative committee meetings. It has been really great for the area. I thank the minister for the financial commitment of $480,000 that made it possible, and I thank all the police for the fantastic work that they did—

Ms Spence: And thank you for your hard work in getting that police beat, too.

Ms CROFT: We are delighted to have it. It was a great outcome for the local community. Once again, I thank the minister and I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DEMPSEY (Bundaberg—NPA) (9.18 pm): I support this bill, but with an amendment. Bundaberg has the second highest rate of confiscations of vehicles under the current hooning legislation. That is mainly due to the hard work of the Bundaberg district police traffic branch, which is a dedicated team of individuals who go far beyond their job description to serve the community and the people of Bundaberg. Even when those officers are at home in their beds, their reputation is present on the streets. Due to their diligence, those hardworking police have established a no-nonsense approach to the enforcement of traffic laws and a positive approach that is supported by the people of Bundaberg. The introduced amendment would assist those officers and other police throughout Queensland in their duties.

The proposed amendment would allow for the immediate impounding of a vehicle from an offender in the first instance of hooning for a period of 48 hours. The impounding would be instant action in relation to the offence of hooning and that would reduce the impact on our already overloaded court system and the workload of our dedicated Police Service. The amendment would reduce the increase of traffic incidents and increase the safety of all Queenslanders.

If police are called to a situation where a vehicle has been reported for hooning and this vehicle is properly identified, police should be able to go to the offending vehicle's address and impound the vehicle for 48 hours. The cost for the removal to the holding yard in the first instance is borne by the offender. By doing this, police can take instant action and remove the threat to the general community. It could also be described as having the same effect as removing a firearm from a dangerous situation. The rights of the community and the further infringements by offenders are reduced with the win situation for all involved: the complainant, the community, courts, police and families of victims. Whether it is a vehicle or a firearm, the threat must be removed.

I understand the situation where a young family member removes a vehicle without the consent of a parent and it should not be a punishment for the parent as well. However, the vehicle is the responsibility of the registered owner and this will send a clear message to the community that the use of a vehicle is a privilege, not a right. The onus is already established in current speed camera enforcement for the owner to be identified, albeit at a later date. However, hooning legislation needs to be strengthened under this new amendment for instant action and not lengthy investigation that leaves the offending vehicle open for abuse by other offenders to use on the streets of Queensland.

Mr WEIGHTMAN (Cleveland—ALP) (9.20 pm): I rise to support the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. This bill has been developed as a consequence of the February 2006 Road Safety Summit that was held at Parliament House and the 100-day action plan, commitment No. 74. The aim of the 2006 Road Safety Summit was to identify key aspects of road safety in Queensland that affect the Queensland road toll, including discussions of issues arising from the 2005 road toll. The objectives of the summit were to identify, firstly, the key aspects of road safety relating to the Queensland road toll, including discussions of issues arising from the 2005 road toll; and, secondly, a suite of potential road safety measures for government to consider in order to reduce the road toll for 2006 and, of course, beyond.

Following the summit, the Premier announced a range of road safety initiatives, including the impaired driving initiatives. The impaired driving initiatives include the introduction of legislation enabling police to impound vehicles of repeat drink drivers on the major charge of driving with a blood alcohol content of .05 or more, disqualified or unlicensed drivers and drivers of unregistered vehicles. The government's 100-day action plan, commitment No. 74 builds upon the summit's impaired driving initiatives and includes illegally modified vehicles.

As was identified in a ministerial media statement in February 2006, the Queensland Police Service statistics indicate that, firstly, during the first 10 months from January to October in 2005, 5,100 drivers were caught more than once driving an unregistered vehicle; and 10,611 drivers were caught more than once whilst driving unlicensed. For the whole of 2005, 1,864 drivers were caught more than once driving disqualified and 1,041 drivers were caught more than once drink driving. There were also approximately 106 offenders repeatedly illegally modifying their vehicles.

This bill seeks to implement the components of the impaired driving initiatives and commitment No. 74. The bill amends the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 by, firstly, renaming the existing hoon vehicle related offences as type 1 vehicle related offences; secondly, incorporating type 2 vehicle related offences within chapter 4, 'motor vehicle impounding powers for prescribed offences and motorbike noise direction offences' of the PPRA; thirdly, extending the liability of drivers to pay costs associated with the initial impoundment of any vehicle impounded under chapter 4 of the PPRA; and enabling the commissioner to administratively forfeit any vehicle impounded under chapter 4 of the PPRA in circumstances where the vehicle has not been recovered by the owner or driver within 30 days after the expiration of the impoundment period.

The proposed amendments within the bill are reasonable, legitimate and a balanced extension of the law which will, in conjunction with other road safety initiatives being progressed by the Beattie government, have a positive impact on road safety in Queensland. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory—NPA) (9.24 pm): It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak to these two pieces of legislation this evening. I congratulate the minister for bringing the legislation before the House. When it comes to road safety, we cannot put a price on human life. I heard the member for Bundaberg and his colleague who just spoke—two ex-police officers and two people who would be well qualified to speak about such legislation.

The real issue here, as the member for Bundaberg said, is that a motor vehicle, if not managed properly, is no different from a firearm that is not managed properly. It is a very dangerous weapon and one that can cause grief to many people. I applaud the minister this evening for introducing this legislation. There are no ifs and buts when it comes to road safety. I see also in the House this evening the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, who is very passionate about road safety and trying to reduce the road toll. Being a former minister for transport and main roads myself, I have seen what the

medical profession and the Police Service go through in relation to road accidents and road trauma. I do not think too many people would appreciate the extent of what we are talking about this evening unless they have seen such things. I know it is a difficult situation. I know the population in Queensland is exploding, but there are no ifs and buts when it comes to managing a vehicle on our roads in a safe manner.

In relation to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the Immediate Driver Licence Suspension Scheme provisions are to be modified to cover persons charged with high-risk drink-driving offences and the impoundment of vehicles. It is very gratifying to see that the total onus and the cost of impoundment of vehicles is going to be borne by the law-breaker. This gives the police the power to do something about it. No doubt the shadow minister has canvassed this issue fairly precisely. There are no ifs and buts when it comes to driving under the influence of alcohol. We know that about one-quarter of the fatalities on our roads in Queensland are caused by people under the influence of alcohol. There is the old adage that people aged between 17 and 24 are the most vulnerable people on our roads in Queensland. About one-quarter to one-third of the fatalities on our roads are represented by people in that age group. Young people are the most important people in our society because they are the leaders of tomorrow. They are the future.

When I was a young fellow cars never interested me very much. Forty years ago a V8 motor car was certainly a pretty powerful weapon. However, today little four-cylinder cars seem to be able to generate so much power and speed that they become a flying missile when not driven properly. Unless people are really experienced in the art of managing a vehicle they have problems.

I applaud the Travelsafe Committee, under the guidance of the member for Fitzroy and his team. A lot of good things come out of the Travelsafe Committee and I think we can make a difference by taking a bipartisan approach and showing bipartisan support.

We hear every day about the heavy transport operators who must abide by a zero alcohol limit, but I think the day is fast approaching when we will see a zero alcohol limit for all drivers on our roads if people do not behave responsibly and consider the rights of other road users.

The member for Bundaberg made a valid point tonight—that is, it is an honour and privilege to drive a motor car on the road. The other important fact is that it should be an honour and privilege to respect other road users and pedestrians who walk across our roads. A few days ago at the end of the Queen Street Mall opposite the casino I saw police booking pedestrians for walking against the red walk light. I applaud the police for that. How often do you see people walk out in front of cars. If that continues to happen the number of fatalities will grow.

There is another side of what I am speaking about tonight. Those persons who are killed are not in our lives anymore and have gone to heaven. Unfortunately, we can multiply the number who are killed by about four and that is the number of people who are maimed or injured and fill our hospital wards and either become vegetables or never enjoy a decent quality of life again because the driver of the vehicle they were in did not use the roads in a safe and responsible way.

I do not care how tough any government gets with people who break the law when it comes to our roads. With our population growth in Queensland there has been an increase in the number of young people on our roads. We have to make certain that they are trained in a professional way.

Before my kids got their licences to drive my wife made certain that they went to driving schools and got proper tuition.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: No, I did not teach them because I learnt on station roads out the back of Quilpie and I thought I knew the road rules. When I went to get my licence in Quilpie I got in my motor car, drove around the block, the police officer gave me my licence and away I went. It was as easy as that. It is a different situation today.

One of my daughters nearly had to get a bank loan to get her licence because she was failed that many times. She failed on roundabouts. I think most of us would have failed on roundabouts. I hope Tanya does not read this because I will certainly pay for it. They are the facts of life. We can have a laugh and joke about it but regardless of whether it is my child or somebody else's child I think it is important that they are trained properly and are given proper tuition on how to manage a motor vehicle in tough conditions.

People talk about driving in the city. There are different situations. I think we need to put an emphasis on that. Other people drive on country roads. There are issues like using cruise control on country roads. A lot of people use cruise control thinking that all they have to do is steer the car, but they get tired and before they know where they are they have an accident. If they do not know the road and how to negotiate it an accident happens. There have been many bad accidents and some fatalities on country roads because people were using cruise control. I have spoken to the honourable member for Fitzroy about that in his role with the Travelsafe Committee. I think we need to pay particular attention to the environment in question—whether it is here in Brisbane, coastal roads, heavy volume traffic areas or in isolated remote areas like where I live. All places pose certain difficulties. The real issue is the responsible management of the motor vehicle.

The second piece of legislation we are considering tonight is the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill 2006. This is a very good piece of legislation. It is about the disclosure of criminal history information, with the consent of the relevant person, to the CrimTrac agency. I think the important fact is police dispatching some information to media organisations. This is where the media can play a very integral role in apprehending criminals.

A lot of the time the investigative journalists have information that they can obtain through responsible and professional management in their area and which they could divulge to police. This is something that I believe is very important in terms of creating a society that is safe for people regardless of where they live. There are a lot of crimes in Queensland that are still unsolved.

Every time I drive out around Goodna and see the name Sharon Phillips on the side of the road I wonder what happened to that poor girl. It is not her but her mum and dad who are affected. There are a lot of unanswered questions concerning young women or young children. This type of legislation that we are debating here this evening is going to assist in providing a safe environment or a safer environment in which people can live—for example, if their cars break down on the side of the road or whatever.

As a father of daughters I know how concerned I am about their safety. I have four little granddaughters. It is not girls only, but also young men and boys who we should worry about. Regardless of whose children they are they are still our responsibility. We have to make sure that we give the police the tools and the technology available in this modern age so that they can make our environment safer and help them bring the scum of society to justice. It is very important that we have a bipartisan approach to this.

The national criminal history checking is a very important aspect of this legislation. I refer to the minister's second reading speech. The provision of information to CrimTrac for employment screening purposes as well as MatCAD will be retrospective in nature to remove any doubt about the past release of information under the commissioner's discretion in these circumstances. The retrospective validation is considered reasonable, necessary and justified.

That is absolutely right. This is about making certain that these people are put on notice that their behaviour is not going to be accepted. We are going to give police the tools to do something about this. Regardless of where we live—whether it is Brisbane, the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast, Birdsville, Bamaga or Mount Isa—it is very important that police are given every opportunity to provide that mantle of safety across all our communities so that the people who reside in our communities can go about life safely.

I say to the minister this evening that she should make the finance available to bring this technology to their fingertips. I know in the past that I have raised the issue of helicopters and so on to make the Queensland Police Service one of the most sophisticated and technically advanced in the modern world. I think that we can boast that the Police Service is that. We have to maintain that service.

I hope that the Attorney General and Minister for Justice makes sure that the justice system complements Queensland Police by making certain that the necessary penalties are enforced on people who break the law and thumb their noses at society and the work that police do. It gives me great pleasure to support these two pieces of legislation. Whilst the shadow minister is going to move an amendment, it is still good legislation and legislation that I urge the House to support.

Ms STONE (Springwood—ALP) (9.38 pm): I wish to participate in the cognate debate tonight. I will speak to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2006. In particular I intend to outline an example of the application of the type 2 vehicle related offence impoundment scheme as I believe it will clearly demonstrate that this bill is just as much about road safety as it is about law enforcement and will clearly demonstrate to the community that we are bringing in laws that they certainly have been asking us to bring in.

This scheme applies when a person is charged, by arrest or notice to appear, with having committed a type 2 vehicle related offence on at least two occasions and has within three years—the relevant period—been charged with or found guilty of another type 2 vehicle related offence of the same kind. This will include repeat drink drivers with readings more than .15, disqualified or unlicensed drivers, drivers of unlicensed vehicles and those vehicles illegally modified who have been charged or found guilty of the same offence for a second or subsequent time. Something that is often raised with me in the community is the number of illegally modified vehicles on our local streets. The concerns that are commonly raised relate to safety and excessive noise, so it is this offence which I will use for my explanation of the scheme.

A driver is charged with an offence against section 9 relating to modifying silencing devices of the Transport Operations (Road Use Management Vehicle Standards and Safety) Regulation 1999. In addition, the driver is issued with a defect notice that requires the vehicle to be inspected by an authorised officer to ensure the remedy has been corrected. One month later the driver pleads guilty to the offence. The vehicle is not impounded on this occasion. Two months later the driver is charged with another offence against section 9 of the regulation and is issued with a defect notice that requires the

vehicle to be inspected by an authorised officer to ensure the remedy has been corrected. On this occasion the vehicle may be impounded for 48 hours—the initial impoundment period—following charging the person with the offence. The driver may be charged by arrest or notice to appear. One month later the driver pleads guilty to this offence.

In my example this driver just does not seem to learn. Two months after the last finding of guilt for the second offence the driver is charged with a third offence against section 9 of the regulation. Following charging, the vehicle may be impounded for 48 hours. If the vehicle is impounded, a police officer must, prior to the end of the initial impoundment period, make an application to a court for a further three-month impoundment order. This order cannot be determined until the third charge is determined by a court and the driver is found guilty of the third offence for which the driver has been charged. If the driver is found guilty of the third offence, the court may make an order that the vehicle be impounded for up to three months. Alternatively, the court may order the performance of community service and the return of the vehicle to the owner if it is satisfied that impounding of the vehicle will cause severe financial or physical hardship to an owner or a usual driver of the motor vehicle. Consistent with the existing provisions of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, police may give effect to this order.

To continue my example, this driver still has not learnt. Six months after the release of the impounded vehicle to the owner, the driver is charged with a fourth offence against section 9 of the regulation. Following charging, the vehicle may be impounded for 48 hours. If the vehicle is impounded, a police officer must, prior to the end of the initial impoundment period, make an application to a court for a forfeiture order. This order cannot be determined until this fourth charge is determined by a court and the driver is found guilty of the fourth offence for which the driver has been charged. If the driver is found guilty of the fourth offence, the court may make an order for that vehicle to be forfeited.

We have already heard some figures earlier from the member for Cleveland. If we add them up something like 20,000 motorists were caught by police more than once in 2005 for drink driving, driving while unlicensed or disqualified or driving an unregistered vehicle. I want to say to those drivers that the message is quite simple: if you keep repeating these offences you are going to lose your car. Repeat drink drivers need to be targeted and dealt with severely, and this bill will target those drivers who are putting their passengers, other road users and themselves in danger. Serious road accidents are traumatic for those involved, for family members and friends. I want to also make mention of those emergency services officers who have to attend these horrific crashes and the trauma they also go through.

Tonight I need to acknowledge the police officers who are too often called on to attend crash sites and deal with the carnage, the pain and the anguish created by road accidents. They see firsthand the destruction of life and the impacts on these communities from the actions of senseless and thoughtless drivers. We as a government and as a community must do whatever we can to reduce the road toll, increase road safety and reduce the trauma that affects so many. This legislation is similar to the hooning laws, and the figures of the cars impounded under those laws demonstrate that they are working and I have no doubt that these new laws will have the same effect. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—Lib) (9.44 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise tonight to speak in this cognate debate to the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill 2006. In echoing the words of the shadow spokesman and other members who have spoken before, I want to congratulate the minister on bringing this legislation forward. I come from an electorate and a region that has a higher number of hoon related offences than anywhere else in the state. When I served on the Surfers Paradise Community Consultative Committee, which is made up of members of the Police Service and local community members, the greatest number of complaints that we received were always about hoon related offences. I also know that our local police in Surfers Paradise and on the Gold Coast are very frustrated with the number of drink-driving offences and offenders who are caught. Even though they are warned that there are going to be activities on a Saturday night where they may well be caught, there is a particularly high percentage of people who come to the Gold Coast who think that they are going to get away with these sorts of offences.

As I say, I think it is great to see that the minister has amended legislation about impounding vehicles. It was good legislation when it was brought in by the former member for Mount Isa, I think. There were obviously problems there about impounding and costs and this bill is now modifying the legislation, as the member for Broadwater said earlier, to capture the costs when people do not pay for the cost of towing and storage of impounded vehicles. It is good to see the legislation being modified in that way and there is bipartisan support for the bill generally and also support within the community for what we are doing here tonight. As I say, I congratulate the minister for that.

I also attended the Road Safety Summit referred to in the minister's second reading speech, and I am glad to see that some very positive initiatives have come out of that in terms of legislation with regard to young drivers that the transport minister has announced will take effect from 1 July next year—the reform initiatives that Queensland is leading the way on—and also all of the other initiatives about impounding, some of which we are seeing in tonight's legislation. It is the cost, though, that probably concerns me. It is good to see that we are trying to make sure that we get the costs from offenders for recovering their vehicles. Motor vehicle impounding powers for prescribed offences will get our support, but I am concerned that the Police Service's resources may be significantly impacted on in carrying out the administrative functions of this act.

If the government diverts core resources away from the police department without sufficient additional funding, then the intention of the bill will not be fully realised and of necessity will not reduce the number of offenders driving motor vehicles who may be constantly offending against traffic laws. Impounding motor vehicles will not necessarily solve the problems of repeat offenders and in particular drink drivers. Offenders will have access to friends' and relatives' vehicles as well as purchasing new vehicles. Trends overseas, in particular in the United States, have shown a trend of young offenders driving cheaper vehicles who are happy to let the police have the vehicle because they have access to other motor vehicles from second-hand dealers and family, and that certainly can happen here as we see certain vehicles go down in value in that they are not as expensive to buy brand new. Obviously as they devalue then people will say, 'I don't really care if you have the vehicle,' and they will not care about losing it.

Then we will have the police left with the problem of disposing of vehicles of little value and attempting to recoup storage and transport fees. Parents will often pay the fees for the impounding, which will not affect their general financial status. On the other hand, less financial families will be impacted on in attempting to support family members who have had their vehicle impounded. These family members will use other methods to gain access to motor vehicles. Perhaps other alternatives that we may consider would be increasing premiums on insurance or registration of motor vehicles of a parent who constantly provides access to motor vehicles for an offender.

I would also support the impounding of motor vehicles and motorcycles that are defective or modified inappropriately, providing again that it does not impact on the Police Service budget. The difficulty in ensuring that this law is complied with does not lie in the notion of rights and liberties of individuals but in the need to protect the rights and liberties of the community and victims of road trauma. The potential for harm to the community should outweigh the civil libertarian rights of individuals in favour of, and a need for, a bipartisan desire to be safe, secure and have a reassurance that the roads are a safe place to travel on, and this government needs to fulfil its obligation to provide the safest roads in Queensland for our citizens on a daily basis. We have to balance the rights of people who are very aware of their rights with the responsibilities that they are expected to also demonstrate.

The improved amendments are necessary to ensure that persons who act illegally on our roadways are properly dealt with. There is a definite need for zero blood alcohol concentration to be applied to those drivers who have been suspended as a result of a drink-driving charge. This will provide some measure of certainty to our community that these people will not continue to drink drive whilst under a charge without a substantial penalty being imposed.

However, recent research by CARRS-Q, a road safety research centre at the Queensland University of Technology, demonstrated that recidivist traffic offenders will most likely reoffend, even though these provisions will be enacted. This legislation will have little impact on those drivers, although it is acknowledged that they make up only a small minority of daily road users. This is a problem in society. We see it with schoolies as well—people who think they can do whatever they like with no consequences. I do not really know how we can deal with that apart from education processes. Perhaps other alternative legislation and strategies should be adopted first, as outlined in the February 2006 Queensland Road Safety Summit. I already have referred to the young driver reform initiatives since Queensland and New South Wales have experienced a number of multiple fatalities of young people in the past few weeks.

Obviously the legislation in the past has had little impact on recidivist drink drivers, and more research and strategies need to be considered in regard to these offenders. In addition, the government has been slow to enact legislation to deal with drug driving, which appears to be increasing, particularly around entertainment centres and liquor licensing facilities. More needs to be done to address this issue and strengthen the powers under the liquor licensing act.

Furthermore, the government should provide more education to juveniles and the general public about the dangers and consequences of drink and drug driving as well as improving the legislation and the research on these important issues of road safety. Perhaps more funding from the revenue collected from speed cameras should be allocated to centres of research, such as CARRS-Q, to address policy and solutions to our growing road toll in Queensland. We have continued to have over 300 deaths per year on Queensland roads for the past four years.

I want to turn now to the Police Service Administration Amendment Bill 2006. Once again, I am supportive of the amendments to this bill, provided the government has properly resourced the Queensland Police Service to deliver the needed administrative requirements regarding media information. The implementation of the Crime and Misconduct Commission report, *Striking a balance: an inquiry into media access to police radio communications*, and in particular media access to the computer-aided dispatch MatCAD system, should address the government, media, community, Crime and Misconduct Commission and police department's concerns about the provision of information to the media highway in a legal way.

The commissioner's discretion to release information will need to be balanced against the operational imperatives of policing within the rule of law. Media interest is important for a democracy to be aware of issues and interests affecting the public in general and individuals in particular. However, informal arrangements between police and the media for or against sharing information has been a vexed issue for decades. The CMC report provides some clarity to the issue, and it provides a range of alternatives for the implementation of how this information can and should be shared with the general public.

The police commissioner has a legal and moral obligation to protect our society against crime and disorder and to provide reassurance but, at the same time, the office of the commissioner has to maintain the freedoms enjoyed in a democratic society, including the involvement of the media in those democratic rights and obligations. The CMC report also requires that the MatCAD system be introduced as secure digital communications are introduced throughout Queensland. Furthermore, the report recommends that the—

> Commissioner of Police invites news directors, editors of media outlets with authorised access to the dispatch data-feed, and representatives of media peak bodies, to form a joint committee to meet on a regular and continuing basis, to provide opportunities for ongoing dialogue between the major stakeholders and to provide a forum to consider any concerns raised by stakeholders, including media organisations refused authorisation by the Commissioner (Recommendation 13).

The recommendation should be transparent to the public and parliament and reported on in the Queensland Police Service annual report. The nexus between operational safety, public safety, individual privacy, public interest disclosure, accountability and public interest on media and police issues are all questions of moral right and wrong in relation to a complex problem. I believe the answer is appropriately addressed in the CMC report, which has found a balance to be more fully considered by this parliament and Queensland society.

The permission currently given to the media by the police commissioner to access radio systems which are not secure digital communications has not been addressed in this legislation. In time, the government will fund the police for the continued rollout of digital radios throughout Queensland. That will most likely include other government services, including Emergency Services, as well as the whole-of-government radio requirements. This raises a couple of questions, including whether the government will require further changes to other acts and require those departments with digital, secure communications to provide a MatCAD system solution to all media outlets. How will the government ensure that the provision of information to the media is not unduly fettered by bureaucrats? There are also issues about whether freedom of information questions will be raised about prerecorded information, which may then be kept for further scrutiny by the government, judiciary or other monitoring agencies.

Mr GIBSON (Gympie—NPA) (9.54 pm): I rise to speak briefly on the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The Police Service has a long and proud association with the people of Gympie. The first ongoing police presence was the establishment of the Gold Escort on 28 January 1868. Since those early days the community of Gympie has worked well with its police, and I am sure that this will continue. However, unfortunately, hooning offences, or the new proposed type 1 offences, do occur in Gympie and the surrounding district. As recently as last night the public were complaining about hooning in Gympie, and the police were called to attend.

I commend the minister for this bill as these amendments appear sensible, reasonable and within community expectations. There is a view from a minority that in regional areas vehicles should not be impounded or licences suspended or disqualified as it is seen as being a more serious punishment due to the difficulties with regional public transport services. We must ensure that there are not two interpretations of the law—one for the city and one for the country. Once these amendments are passed they must apply to all Queenslanders equally.

With regard to hooning, it is important to ensure appropriate driver education. One organisation that is well equipped to conduct this is the Roadcraft Driver Education Centre located in Gympie and spoken of earlier by the member for Burnett. The centre is well equipped, and it provides a full range of driver education courses, both in classroom facilities and on a track and skidpan. My son and his classmates from St Patrick's College recently attended this facility, as do most year 11 students from Gympie high schools. As a parent I was impressed with what he learned but, more importantly, I was impressed with the attitude that he developed towards road safety from that training. I would implore this government to ensure that education is an important element of assisting the police in improving road safety among drivers who engage in hooning crimes.

I note that there are provisions in the bill for immediate suspension. I commend the minister on these provisions. Clearly she has heard, as I have, that the community is fed up with dangerous driving offenders being allowed to drive until such time as the matter is dealt with by the courts. These amendments should fix this anomaly.

Finally, last week the police minister visited my electorate for the opening of the Rainbow Beach police beat and the Gympie Police Station, and I thank her for taking the time to do so. I would like to formally place on the record my thanks to the government and to the Queensland Police Service for their work in ensuring that Gympie received these facilities.

The old Gympie Police Station was first proposed in 1940, and it was opened on 30 May 1949. Whilst the old station was deemed state-of-the-art in 1949 with electricity, hot and cold running water and telephones, it was clearly past its use-by date in 2006.

At the opening of the new Gympie Police Station, the police commissioner said that the Gympie police district was a state leader in achieving results and that his statistics proved this. He said that it was a result of police living and working in the community and, as a result, police taking a keen interest in keeping their environment as free from crime and incidents as possible. I would like to place on the record my support for the Gympie police and for their work in ensuring that our society is one that we can live in comfortably. Any improvements to laws that help our police officers undertake their duties will always be gladly received. I commend these amendments to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Gibson, adjourned.

TABLED PAPER

Report

Hon. JC SPENCE (Mount Gravatt—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services) (9.58 pm): I table a report to parliament on compliance with section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992.

Tabled paper: Tabled Report to Parliament by the Minister for Police and Corrective Services in compliance with subsection 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. RE SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.59 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Douglas, Ms D

Mr FOLEY (Maryborough—Ind) (9.59 pm): Tonight I rise to pay tribute in this House to my cousin Delphine, who has left this world a sadder place after recently losing her battle with cancer. She was a modest, unassuming lady who went about her contribution to the community without any expectation of reward. She simply wanted to make the world a better place.

Delphine was a true champion of wildlife and the natural environment. She was born in Mount Isa in 1940 to Les and Clare Lewis and was the eldest of nine children. In May 1964 Del's husband, Bob, who is in the gallery tonight with his daughter Philippa, was transferred to Cleveland High School and so began their long association with the Redlands district. Del and Bob lived in Cleveland until 1979 when an opportunity arose for them to purchase their acreage property at Victoria Point.

During the 1980s, Delphine worked for the Blue Nurses until her retirement in 1997. She had a diverse range of interests that ensured that she was never bored during her retirement years. Del was interested in genealogy and spent many years researching her family history. But Delphine's greatest love was reserved for her three children, Justine, Blair and Philippa. They were the gems of her life on this earth. Delphine made the effort to assist them to understand the values of affection, tolerance, understanding, honesty and to do what is right. These values are sadly lacking in our society.

Delphine set the standard by example. She was a volunteer for Meals on Wheels and, such was her nature, made time during deliveries to share time with the less able of the elderly. Delphine made a significant contribution in a voluntary capacity to the development of the gardens at the Redlands IndigiScapes Centre. She was also a member of the glossy black cockatoo research program on Stradbroke Island. Delphine participated in the annual curlew count on Coochiemudlo Island. Delphine was also a member of the Eprapah Creek Landcare Association, the Koala Action Group, the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland and was a council bushcare volunteer.

Delphine was an absolute lady who we all loved dearly. Rest in peace tonight, Del. Your star shines brightly to remind us of someone who left an indelible mark on our world and in our hearts.

Fyfe, Ms M

Ms NOLAN (Ipswich—ALP) (10.01 pm): In speaking tonight I want to welcome Paul and Alison Fyfe to the gallery and extend my sympathy to them on the circumstances in which they have come. Ipswich lost a compassionate woman and a wonderful teacher with the recent tragic passing of Ipswich Central State School deputy principal, Maree Adelle Fyfe. Adelle lived her whole life in Ipswich. She attended Bundamba State School and Ipswich Girls Grammar School before becoming a teacher in 1977. She taught at Ipswich West, Raceview and Ipswich East schools and worked as a literacy adviser in the district office before heading back to the coalface as deputy principal at Ipswich Central State School in 1994.

Adelle was the heart and soul of that school. A literacy expert, she took a lead role in curriculum, mentored the many young teachers who came through and touched the children's lives as a firm and compassionate deputy, a sports coach and an instigator of school projects such as the Adopt-a-Family appeal. I knew Adelle through my years of involvement with the school and can absolutely attest to her place at its heart.

Hundreds of people attended the funeral at St Paul's in Ipswich and it was truly a testament to a life well lived. Her family spoke of her down-to-earth nature and her sense of fun, but even more striking to me was the mix of people who had come to say goodbye—from current Ipswich Central State School students, through to past students, to the children she had taught 20 years ago.

Teachers often get a bad rap. People who do not understand the profession suggest that it is an easy job, that the hours are not long, or that the teachers should fill the gap left by parents who do not carry their end of the load. But teaching at its best is not just a job; it is a vocation. It is a role that requires energy, patience and compassion. It demands intellectual depth and presents the psychological challenge of finding the key to learning in each individual child. Good teachers touch the lives of hundreds of students and inspire them to a life of learning. Adelle Fyfe was one of those good teachers who answered her vocation and, in doing so, cared for and inspired a generation of Ipswich children. She will be sadly missed.

Department of Corrective Services, Dog Squad

Mr MESSENGER (Burnett—NPA) (10.04 pm): As shadow corrective services minister, I have recently completed a number of visits to jails and a series of meetings with some very experienced members of the Prison Officers Association. The warnings, wisdom and commonsense of the POA are being arrogantly ignored by this government. The best example I have seen of this arrogance is the manner in which Minister Spence is proposing to manage change within the Queensland Corrective Services dog squad.

The Corrective Services dog squad has served this state with distinction. The 19 officers and two supervisors are the 'go to people' if an emergency situation arises. They are highly trained, dedicated professionals who will act as a team or as an individual and have, on numerous occasions, stopped prisoners escaping, protected the lives of the public, rescued hostages and prevented drugs from entering our prisons.

I have been alerted through the Prison Officers Association of Queensland and have been briefed personally at length by very experienced officers about the dangerous and harmful changes to the dog squad that have been proposed by this government. Minister Spence proposes to introduce the following changes in February next year: all positions in the dog squad being spilled, all dog handlers will loose their positions and will have to reapply for jobs at static positions when they are formed, drug detection dogs will have multiple handlers, and the central kennelling of drug dogs will be introduced as opposed to home care by handlers. This is cost cutting at its worst.

According to the Prison Officers Association, those changes will make the indications of drug dogs less reliable, diminish the operational capacity and capability of the dog squad and has underestimated the importance of a central training area. It has also left experienced, loyal and dedicated staff unsure of their job security before Christmas. The Police Service Dog Squad will not implement the same operational management practices that are being proposed for the prison dog squad. If its not good enough for the Police Service, then why should it be good enough for Queensland Corrective Services?

This is a shoddy, cost-cutting exercise by this government, which is desperate for cash. The situation in our jails is best summarised by John Mulholland, the Secretary of the Prison Officers Association, who said that there are only two reasons his members arrive home safely to their families: good luck and the goodwill of prisoners.

The Prison Officers Association of Queensland has a membership of approximately 800 prison guards. Even though that membership represents at least 50 per cent of the guards employed by this government, the minister for corrective services, Minister Spence, strangely and inexplicably refuses to officially acknowledge or even talk to them.

Time expired.

Bribie Bag

Mrs SULLIVAN (Pumicestone—ALP) (10.07 pm): Earlier this year on Bribie Island Mrs Valerie Taylor officially launched the Bribie Bag. This bag was an initiative of the Bribie Island Chamber of Commerce and the state government, and its aim is to reduce the number of plastic bags that are used on Bribie Island, which often ended up in the local waterways and caused the deaths of many marine and bird life. To date, the Bribie Island Chamber of Commerce has sold, through many businesses, over 15,000 bags. Although some are being sent overseas and elsewhere as gifts, many are being used to reduce the number of plastic bags in the local community.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Mrs Anne Kinchela, the president of the chamber, for her continued efforts in promoting the Bribie Bag, and it has paid off. The Bribie Bag project has won a prestigious Queensland state award in a new Keep Australia Beautiful competition—the Plastic Bag Reduction Awards. I contacted Queensland CEO of Keep Australia Beautiful, Kylie Johnston. She suggested that the chamber nominate its project for helping to eliminate single-use plastic shopping bags in Australia.

The Bribie Island Chamber of Commerce designed the bag and the Queensland government contributed $5,000 towards the purchase of the first 6,000 bags. The state government's Environmental Protection Authority assisted with the environmental wording on the bag and the supporting education and awareness campaign to help the island become a plastic bag-free zone. Everyone has been behind this campaign and I urge others to take on this project in their area. Littered plastic bags are a huge threat to our environment, harming wildlife, blocking drains and spoiling parks and beaches. Since 2002, Australians have reduced their use of plastic shopping bags from 6.9 billion to 4.5 billion, but there is still a lot to be done.

Keep Australia Beautiful and Veolia Environmental Services hope that the Plastic Bag Reduction Awards will inspire others to reduce plastic bag use in their communities. As well as Bribie's state award in the Business category, Keep Australia Beautiful announced that three other Queensland projects had picked up state honours. Redlands Tourism took out national and state honours in the Community category for its Ban Plastic Bags on Straddie campaign, while Hambledon State School won the School category and the Burke Shire Council was recognised in the Government category.

Redlands Tourism also picked up a national award, along with Centro Collonades Shopping Centre in Noarlonga, South Australia (Business) category, North Haven School in North Haven, South Australia (Schools) category and the Shire of Esperance in Esperance, Western Australia (Government Authority) category. The state government is a proud partner in this exciting local project and I urge everyone to contribute to it.

Currumbin Valley, Hideaway Development

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—Lib) (10.10 pm): I rise to speak tonight on behalf of the Friends of the Valley group who represent the views of the residents of Currumbin Valley and surrounds in what was to be a final plea to this government to show some environmental accountability with regard to the proposed Hideaway development earmarked for the Currumbin Valley. They asked me to table this motion, which I undertook to do and, despite the decision announced today to approve this development, I will carry out their wishes.

Tabled paper: A document titled 'Public meeting—Saturday 25 November 2006—Motion'.

Many reasons have been aired by residents over the past two years including: density of housing proposed is excessive for the rural character of the Currumbin Valley; the location is outside the urban footprint in the South East Queensland Regional Plan; the hillside is already showing signs of landslip, as demonstrated just over 17 months ago at a geologically similar site only a few kilometres away; flat land is decidedly flood prone, as demonstrated when it went under water; roads adjacent to the proposed development are of a rural nature and incapable of carrying the level of increased traffic that would arise; and native flora and fauna will be placed at risk. One resident wrote—

> Approval of this application outright or grant approval subject to conditions, places the integrity of the Beattie Government under serious doubt as it is a known fact that the Queensland ALP has received substantial election campaign donations from the developer in question.

Another suggestion if the minister refused the application was to set the land aside for development of a botanical garden for the southern region of the Gold Coast as compensation for the greenhouse gases produced by the Tugun desalination plant.

The battle to stop this inappropriate project of some 530 homes on a 148-hectare parcel of land saw this issue used as election bait in an attempt by the Labor candidate in Currumbin to win votes. This was, as I said at the time, nothing more than a cruel hoax and is devastating news for residents who fought so hard for almost three years to get this application properly assessed with an environmental impact statement.

The Premier has made public comments that he 'will not allow the South East Queensland Regional Plan to be compromised. It is the most visionary and comprehensive planning document ever produced in this nation'. Decisions to approve developments like this make a complete mockery of the South East Queensland Regional Plan. How many other developments that are outside the urban footprint are lying dormant and will now come forward to gain approval?

By placing a few conditions on this inappropriate project the Labor government has destroyed its environmental credibility and proved that deals with mates like Terry Mackenroth, who sits on the Devine board, come before ecological responsibility. An application in Montville on the Sunshine Coast bore a striking resemblance to the Hideaway development. It was called in and subsequently refused. Undoubtedly this approval consisting of over 500 homes will change the lifestyle of the Currumbin Valley forever as it will more than double the existing population, and equally undoubtedly there are many more inappropriate developments lurking in the shadows.

Beenleigh Logan Cricket Association

Mr MOORHEAD (Waterford—ALP) (10.13 pm): I wish to bring to the attention of the House the achievements of the Beenleigh-Logan Cricket Association in providing a player to the recent first Ashes test in Brisbane. The only problem for those of us who are supporting Ricky Ponting's Australian team is that Beenleigh-Logan's latest contribution to the Ashes is the English wicketkeeper Geraint Jones.

The Beenleigh-Logan Cricket Association was established in the 1994-95 cricket season and has grown to have over 890 members, aged between seven and 60 years. The BLCA is doing its part to promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles in our community. Importantly, the Beenleigh-Logan Cricket Association has a strong junior competition involving around 200 kids aged from seven to 15 years. Current players include two under-19 players who have just been selected to represent Queensland in upcoming national titles being held over two weeks in January in Brisbane, including both BLCA venues.

Not to forget women's cricket, the Beenleigh-Logan Cricket Association provides three to four players in the Queensland Fire squad—the women's state squad—including Belinda Mathieson and Delissa Kimmince. The BLCA also provides local Indigenous player Warren Williams, who has been selected in the Imparja Cup, the national Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander competition held in Alice Springs each year. Warren's dad is also the volunteer first grade scorer.

All of this success for a local cricket club is amazing. Not only do we provide players for Queensland and Australia; but for other countries as well. In my view, the key to the Beenleigh-Logan Cricket Association's success is a team of hardworking volunteers and staff. Long-term president, Rodney Hammel, is an institution in cricket in our area, while Kevin Berry has spent many matches as a volunteer one-day match scorer. Secretary Jennifer Jamieson started with the Beenleigh-Logan Cricket Association when her now 23-year-old son was in the juniors and is also the second grade scorer in whatever spare time she has.

But success is not far away for the first grade team currently involved in the Queensland cricket one-day competition. As minor premiers, they will be hosting a semifinal at Dauth Park on Sunday, 10 December 2006. I urge all members to consider coming along and supporting our team in their semifinal victory.

Water Charges

Mr HOPPER (Darling Downs—NPA) (10.15 pm): I wish to bring to the attention of the House my intention to call on the Minister for Natural Resources and Water to extend drought relief in respect of water charges and low water availability for all Queensland farmers affected by the ongoing drought. I have recently been approached by a constituent of mine who currently pays $2,738 every three months to SunWater but has received no water for the past three years.

I have also been advised by my constituent that she has received verbal advice from SunWater stating that they can obtain their water allocation via their bore due to the fact that there is no water available through their allocated SunWater source. This may sound like a logical solution. However, my constituent pays around $9,000 per quarter in electricity costs through Ergon Energy to pump this water from their bore. I understand that SunWater has put in place a hardship policy which enables customers to seek relief from charges. However, this policy only allows the customer to defer the payment for two months, which means they are expected to pay for two quarters within a four-week period, as the second charge would still fall on its original due date.

Another aspect of the drought that I would like to raise is with respect to water licences. I have previously made numerous representations to the various ministers—four in the last 12 months—on behalf of my constituents who believe that they are unjustly being charged for licence renewals even though there is no water available, and this has been the case for at least five years for the majority of

farmers. Why should they be paying for a licence for something that is not available? After all, any wise consumer does not pay for an item and not take possession of it. As the old saying goes: you pay for what you get. However, this is not the case with the Queensland government.

I call on the minister to defer all licence fees until the end of the drought. I understand that Victorian irrigators have been granted immediate relief via a $5,000 rebate on rural water bills where the allocation of water is less than 50 per cent, and irrigators whose water bill is more than $5,000 will be able to defer the remainder of the payment for up to five years interest free. Good on the Victorians! This rebate will cover water bills for 75 per cent of irrigators. I have also been informed that the New South Wales state government has announced a package of new drought measures of $250 million, as well as a $30 million emergency relief package for families on the brink. This package will grant farmers much needed extra drought relief, including waiving of water fees and a range of levies that will be deferred until they get back on their feet.

I am seeking the minister's urgent consideration of matching and or adopting the Victorian and New South Wales drought relief policies for all Queensland farmers affected by the drought. Unfortunately for Queenslanders, the government's drought measures have provided no new money for small business; no new support for families; no waiving of fees for irrigators who are receiving little or no water allocations; no waiving of any fees; and, finally, no tax relief. I believe that it is time for the state government to get serious about helping those in genuine need to enable our farmers to overcome this horrific drought.

SunWater is milking our farmers dry. It is charging us and no water is being provided.

Matthew Stanley

Mr WEIGHTMAN (Cleveland—ALP) (10.18 pm): I rise to speak about a matter that has greatly affected the Cleveland area and, indeed, the Redland shire. We should all still remember the untimely and distressing death of Matthew Stanley at a party in September last year. Matthew was a 15-year-old student at Redlands College in my electorate of Cleveland. The impact of his death within this school community was devastating to say the least. What has been remarkable is the way the school community has dealt with this debilitating event. The friends and school mates of Matthew have banded together to become a tight-knit group of people with a shared sense of purpose and a shared sense of direction.

The principal of the college, Alan Todd, has played a strong role in providing caring and careful leadership and appropriate ongoing support. He has allowed the school community to deal with this sad matter in a timely and, more importantly, a personal and appropriate manner. So far, the students have responded very well and in a very positive and effective way. They have melded together to extract some positive outcomes from what we all know were tragic circumstances. They have provided copious amounts of support to Matthew's brother, who is still a student at the school, and, of course, to Matthew's parents.

I attended the memorial service conducted by the college at the school, which was also attended by representatives from many schools within the shire and from outside the Redlands. To me, that was a strong indication of how far reaching the shock waves were in relation to this tragedy.

I have since become good friends with Paul Stanley, Matt's dad, and as such I have offered him my support in dealing with the loss of Matthew. Paul's strength in dealing with this matter has been nothing short of amazing. He is determined that Matt's death will not be forgotten and will not be for nought.

Paul has formed the Matthew Stanley Foundation which, amongst other things, seeks to raise money to support a program to combat youth violence. This foundation is running parallel to the Beattie government's task force into youth violence. I am proud to say that Paul asked me to be the patron of the foundation. Of course, I accepted this honour and look forward to working with Paul and his group of dedicated committee members.

The school community is working very closely with Paul and the foundation. They have already held a number of fundraising exercises and have passed that money on to Paul and his committee. Last Saturday I watched with pleasure as the school, Matt's Redlands representative touch football team and his Mooroondo soccer club assisted in a combined fundraising exercise.

I applaud all those involved as they strive to maintain not just the memory of Matt's passing but, more importantly, the circumstances in which he passed. I feel that this is an important part of both the grieving process for the community and the family and the fight against youth violence.

Crocodile Protection Plan

Mr CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—NPA) (10.22 pm): I draw the attention of members to the issue of recent calls for a review of the crocodile protection plan to provide a more effective regime for dealing with crocodiles near populated areas and public facilities. The issue has been given more salience in north Queensland recently with sightings of crocodiles off The Strand in Townsville, a near miss for a tourist at Cape Tribulation and a man being taken by a crocodile in Lakefield National Park.

In my electorate of Hinchinbrook and in many north Queensland and far-north Queensland electorates, the issue of crocodiles near populated areas and public facilities is of considerable concern to the community. The matter has had some coverage in the Herbert River district recently, where the Hinchinbrook Shire Council has called for a review of the crocodile protection plan to allow the professional capture of problem crocodiles near public facilities by accredited crocodile farmers. This follows discussion on the issue at a recent North Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils, where several councils indicated that they would be supportive of a review to give effect to that proposal.

It is always difficult to settle on a protection plan that conserves the population of native animals and provides adequate protection for the people in the community. It is clear from the large increases in instances where crocodiles and people are coming into close contact and from observations in the wild that crocodile numbers have significantly increased since they became fully protected and they are not endangered. At the same time, a call for the cull of crocodiles is not a desirable management tool for a native animal if an acceptable alternative can be put in place.

What is clear is that the current crocodile protection plan is not an adequate tool for the management of crocodiles that become problematic near populated areas or public facilities. A head-in-the-sand approach from the Beattie government, which refuses to make changes to the provisions of the protection plan on the basis of some misguided notion of conservation, will only result in further close calls and community unrest, which will encourage support for a cull. The government needs to be proactive and put in place measures to deal with this before the situation arises.

The proposal to allow certified crocodile farmers to remove problem crocodiles has merit because they are very experienced in handling crocodiles. They have an advantage over zoos insofar as crocodile farm facilities are often much better equipped to hold crocodiles directly from the wild. Moving from the wild to an artificial enclosure like a zoo is not ideal. Some zoo crocodiles get too big for zoo enclosures and, subsequently, become difficult to manage.

Again I would like to point out that this proposal would be pursued as a sensible approach to managing the interface between people and crocodiles. The current crocodile protection plan is not working. If it fails to protect the public and a tragedy occurs, there will be an increased call for a cull. If the government acts to provide this situation, we can have a positive result for both crocodiles and the wider community.

Death of Mr HG Hardie

Mrs SCOTT (Woodridge—ALP) (10.16 pm): It was a sad occasion as we gathered at the Great Southern Gardens of Remembrance at Mount Cotton to farewell Harold George Hardie, who sadly died of a heart attack on 30 October 2006. I first met Harold and his devoted wife Nancy several years ago when they shifted from Morningside in the electorate of my colleague Pat Purcell to Crestmead in the Woodridge electorate. It was a very joyous occasion, for Harold and Nancy had just become homeowners for the first time. In their 70s, they received their first homeowner grant and I was privileged to attend their house-warming party, along with a vast array of family and friends. Harold took me on a tour of their new home and he was the proudest man around.

Harold and Nancy were members of the German Shepherd Club and breeders of very sought-after puppies. They soon approached me with an invitation to become patroness of the German Shepherd Club. I have shared that position with Pat Purcell for several years.

Harold was a life member of the ALP and proudly catered for many functions in Sydney during his younger years. His hospitality was renowned. He was a great fundraiser who worked for many worthy causes.

Harold loved to tell yarns about his meeting with many of our Labor leaders over the years, including Gough and Margaret Whitlam, Bob Hawke and others. Locally, he and Nancy worked on many campaigns including those of Tom Burns, Ron McLean, Wendy Edmond, Gary Fenlon, Pat Purcell and my own. He was also a proud member of the RSL, having enlisted in the Army as a young man of 19.

Harold was born in Surrey Hills, Sydney and was one of three sons. One brother died at a very young age and the other died in his 30s. Harold was educated in Sydney and commenced his first job at the age of 16 at Cerebos. He worked at many jobs, one of which was an ambulance officer and, as previously mentioned, spent some time in the Army.

Harold and Nancy married and raised 12 wonderful children. Their grandchildren now number 30 and they have 19 great-grandchildren. As in most large families, there were many hilarious stories and fond memories to share. Sadly, during the past 12 months they lost their daughter Sue who died of cancer and one of their great-grandchildren, Dakota, who was aged 4. This caused Harold and Nancy great sorrow.

While funerals are sad goodbyes, the happy memories remain and Harold had many amusing habits, such as his love of superglue. He once tried to resole his shoe using superglue while his foot remained in the shoe. He pressed down to make it stick, following which he then attempted to remove his foot. Alas, it was firmly stuck. Luckily he did have a sock on but he lost a bit of skin as he jigged around, eventually releasing his foot. Everything in the house requiring repair was superglued!

As we bade farewell to Harold at the graveside with Vera Lynn's *We'll Meet Again* drifting across the lawn, Harold's children presented their final gift to their dad. All 11 of them stood around the grave and poured the contents of their large bottles of beer over his coffin, a final salute to his life of hospitality and love of friends and family.

Mr Schwarten: And beer.

Mrs SCOTT: And beer. I would like to thank Harold and Nancy's daughter Michelle for much of this detail of Harold's life. Harold, you will live on in the hearts of many. Your life has been rich and full and your family tree will continue to grow into the likeness of a mighty spreading oak.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.28 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Attwood, Barry, Beattie, Bligh, Bombolas, Boyle, Choi, Copeland, Cripps, Croft, Cunningham, Darling, Dempsey, Dickson, Elmes, English, Fenlon, Finn, Flegg, Foley, Fraser, Gibson, Gray, Hayward, Hinchliffe, Hobbs, Hoolihan, Hopper, Horan, Jarratt, Johnson, Jones, Keech, Kiernan, Knuth, Langbroek, Lawlor, Lee Long, Lingard, Lucas, McArdle, McNamara, Male, Malone, Menkens, Messenger, Mickel, Miller, Moorhead, Mulherin, Nelson-Carr, Nicholls, Nolan, O'Brien, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Pratt, Purcell, Reeves, Reilly, Reynolds, Rickuss, Roberts, Robertson, Schwarten, Scott, Seeney, Shine, Simpson, Smith, Spence, Springborg, Stevens, Stone, Struthers, Stuckey, Sullivan, van Litsenburg, Wallace, Weightman, Welford, Wellington, Wells, Wendt, Wettenhall, Wilson