



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>  
 E-mail: [hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au)  
 Phone (07) 3406 7314 Fax (07) 3210 0182

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

### Wednesday, 22 May 2013

Subject	Page
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>1657</b>
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier</b> .....	<b>1657</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 13 March 2013, from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Mulherin MP, to the Speaker regarding alleged misleading of the House by the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman.....	1657
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 2 May 2013, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, to the Speaker in response.....	1657
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier</b> .....	<b>1657</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 12 March 2013, from the Leader of the Opposition, Ms Annastacia Palaszczuk MP, to the Speaker regarding alleged misleading of the House by the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman.....	1657
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	<b>1658</b>
<b>TABLED PAPERS</b> .....	<b>1658</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1658</b>
<b>Agriculture Industry</b> .....	<b>1658</b>
<b>Government Administrative Precinct, Redevelopment</b> .....	<b>1659</b>
<b>Queensland Economy</b> .....	<b>1660</b>
<b>State Schools</b> .....	<b>1661</b>
<b>Queensland Health, Payroll System</b> .....	<b>1661</b>
<b>Queensland Law Courts Site, Sale</b> .....	<b>1662</b>
<b>Overseas Visit</b> .....	<b>1662</b>
<b>AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>1663</b>
<b>Report</b> .....	<b>1663</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 22— Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February and 19 March 2013. ....	1663

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 22 May 2013

<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>1663</b>
<b>Visitors to Public Gallery</b> .....	<b>1663</b>
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE</b> .....	<b>1663</b>
<b>Flood Levy</b> .....	<b>1663</b>
<b>Queensland Plan</b> .....	<b>1664</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 13 May 2013, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, to the Leader of the Opposition, Ms Anastacia Palaszczuk MP, relating to the Queensland Plan. ....	1664
<b>Tourism Industry</b> .....	<b>1664</b>
<b>Commission of Audit</b> .....	<b>1665</b>
<b>South of Embley Bauxite Project</b> .....	<b>1666</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release from the Wilderness Society titled 'Burke must knock back mines threatening reef' .....	1666
<b>State Schools, Closures</b> .....	<b>1666</b>
<b>Health Funding</b> .....	<b>1667</b>
<b>Ombudsman</b> .....	<b>1668</b>
<b>Public Hospitals</b> .....	<b>1669</b>
<b>Commission of Audit</b> .....	<b>1669</b>
<b>Gateway Motorway, Upgrade</b> .....	<b>1670</b>
<b>Nyanda State High School</b> .....	<b>1671</b>
<b>Brisbane CBD, Hotel Development</b> .....	<b>1671</b>
<b>RACQ North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service, Funding</b> .....	<b>1672</b>
<b>Flood Recovery</b> .....	<b>1673</b>
<b>Goods and Services Tax</b> .....	<b>1674</b>
<b>Emergency Services</b> .....	<b>1674</b>
<b>LIQUOR AND GAMING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1675</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1675</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 30—Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, government response. ....	1675
<b>LIQUOR AND GAMING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1706</b>
<b>Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Tabling of Documents</b> .....	<b>1709</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Changes for the Future: message from Hon. Jarrod Bleijie MP, the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice'.....	1727
<b>Consideration in Detail</b> .....	<b>1732</b>
Clause 1, as read, agreed to.....	1732
Clause 2—.....	1732
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes for Hon. Bleijie's amendments.....	1732
Clause 2, as amended, agreed to .....	1732
Clause 3, as read, agreed to.....	1732
Clause 4—.....	1732
Clause 4, as amended, agreed to .....	1732
Clause 5—.....	1733
Clause 5, as amended, agreed to .....	1733
Clause 6—.....	1733
Clause 6, as amended, agreed to .....	1733
Clauses 7 to 12, as read, agreed to .....	1733
Clause 13—.....	1733
Division: Question put—That clause 13, as read, stand part of the bill.....	1733
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	1733
Clause 13, as read, agreed to .....	1733
Clause 14—.....	1733
<b>NAMING OF MEMBER</b> .....	<b>1737</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1737</b>
<b>Suspension of Member for Condamine</b> .....	<b>1737</b>
Division: Question put—That the member for Condamine be suspended from the services of the House for seven days. ....	1737
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	1737
<b>LIQUOR AND GAMING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1738</b>
<b>Consideration in Detail</b> .....	<b>1738</b>
Division: Question put—That clause 14, as read, stand part of the bill. ....	1738
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	1738
Clause 14, as read, agreed to .....	1738
Clauses 15 to 47, as read, agreed to .....	1738
Clause 48—.....	1738
Clause 48, as read, agreed to .....	1739
Clauses 49 to 88, as read, agreed to .....	1739
Clause 89—.....	1739
Division: Question put—That clause 89, as read, stand part of the bill. ....	1739
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	1739
Clause 89, as read, agreed to .....	1739

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 22 May 2013

Clause 90—	1739
Division: Question put—That clause 90, as read, stand part of the bill.	1739
Resolved in the affirmative.	1739
Clause 90, as read, agreed to.	1740
Clause 91, as read, agreed to.	1740
Clause 92—	1740
Clause 92, as amended, agreed to.	1740
Clauses 93 to 95, as read, agreed to.	1740
Clause 96—	1740
Division: Question put—That clause 96, as read, stand part of the bill.	1740
Resolved in the affirmative.	1740
Clause 96, as read, agreed to.	1741
Clauses 97 to 102, as read, agreed to.	1741
Clause 103—	1741
Division: Question put—That clause 103, as read, stand part of the bill.	1745
Resolved in the affirmative.	1745
Clause 103, as read, agreed to.	1745
Clauses 104 to 111, as read, agreed to.	1745
Clause 112—	1745
Division: Question put—That clause 112, as read, stand part of the bill.	1745
Resolved in the affirmative.	1745
Clause 112, as read, agreed to.	1745
Clauses 113 to 120, as read, agreed to.	1745
Clause 121—	1745
Clause 121, as amended, agreed to.	1747
Clause 122—	1747
Division: Question put—That clause 122, as read, stand part of the bill.	1747
Resolved in the affirmative.	1747
Clause 122, as read, agreed to.	1747
Clauses 123 to 126, as read, agreed to.	1747
Clause 127—	1747
Clause 127, as amended, agreed to.	1748
Clauses 128 to 131, as read, agreed to.	1748
Clause 132—	1748
Clause 132, as amended, agreed to.	1748
Clauses 133 to 143, as read, agreed to.	1748
Clause 144—	1748
Clause 144, as amended, agreed to.	1748
Clauses 145 to 151, as read, agreed to.	1748
Insertion of new clause—	1748
Amendment agreed to.	1748
Clauses 152 to 170, as read, agreed to.	1749
Clause 171—	1749
Clause 171, as amended, agreed to.	1749
Clauses 172 and 173, as read, agreed to.	1749
Clause 174—	1749
Clause 174, as amended, agreed to.	1749
Clauses 175 to 190, as read, agreed to.	1749
<b>Third Reading</b>	<b>1749</b>
<b>Long Title</b>	<b>1750</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<b>1750</b>
<b>Torres Strait Islanders, Traditional Adoption</b>	<b>1750</b>
<b>Pine Rivers Electorate, Small Business</b>	<b>1751</b>
<b>Burleigh Electorate, Small Business</b>	<b>1751</b>
<b>Tabled Documents; Health Funding</b>	<b>1752</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 17 January 2013, to Ms Jo Linde, Principal Legal Officer, Strategic Policy, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, from Ms Janice Enderlin-Cooper, of the Gold Coast Justices Association Inc., regarding a QCAT question.	1752
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated 17 May 2013, titled 'Proposed Changes to Queensland Electoral Safety Regulation', by David Wilson, Springfield Test and Tag.	1752
<b>Health Funding</b>	<b>1752</b>
<b>Murrumba Electorate</b>	<b>1753</b>
<b>National Volunteer Week</b>	<b>1754</b>
<b>Charters Towers, Eventide Nursing Home</b>	<b>1755</b>
<b>Queensland Health, Brisbane Technology Park</b>	<b>1755</b>
<b>Ferry Grove Electorate</b>	<b>1756</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>1756</b>

## WEDNESDAY, 22 MAY 2013

---

The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

Madam Speaker (Hon. Fiona Simpson, Maroochydore) read prayers and took the chair.

### PRIVILEGE

#### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier



**Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 13 March 2013 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and member for Mackay wrote to me alleging that the Premier deliberately misled the House in statements made in the Assembly on 5 March 2013. I table correspondence from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Premier relating to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 13 March 2013, from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Mulherin MP, to the Speaker regarding alleged misleading of the House by the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman [\[2656\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 2 May 2013, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, to the Speaker in response [\[2657\]](#).

In considering this matter I note the following: firstly, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition acknowledged in his correspondence that at the time of the initial statements on 5 March 2013 he raised a point of order in the House and the Premier conceded this point of order. Thus the matter could have been considered to be largely dealt with in the House at that time. Secondly, I am aware that the Premier in subsequent statements in the House largely repeated the matters considered by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to be misleading. However, the Premier made a ministerial statement to the House on 18 April 2013 in which he explained his understanding of the matter and tabled a number of documents on which his initial statements were based, but clearly apologised to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for any offence. Thirdly, there was no evidence provided as to the Premier's knowledge of the statement being incorrect or an intention to mislead the House, which are the second and third elements necessary for the statement of 5 March 2013 to be considered contempt.

As this complaint lacks sufficient evidence to support it being further investigated, it does not meet the threshold for referral. Accordingly, I will not be referring the matter to the Ethics Committee.

#### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier



**Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 12 March 2013 the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the Premier deliberately misled the House in statements made in the Assembly on 6 March 2013. I table the correspondence in this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 12 March 2013, from the Leader of the Opposition, Ms Anastacia Palaszczuk MP, to the Speaker regarding alleged misleading of the House by the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman [\[2658\]](#).

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Premier deliberately misled the House in the comments he made about the release of her diary. In considering this matter, I note the point made by the Leader of the Opposition that she had decided to seek assessment from the Integrity Commissioner and Acting Privacy Commissioner before releasing the diary. I also note that the Leader of the Opposition did, in fact, release her diary subsequent to these statements being made in the House by the Premier. However, I also note that in the evidence provided to me there is no dispute regarding the matter that at the time of the statements made by the Premier the diary being referred to had not been released by the Leader of the Opposition.

With respect to allegations of misleading parliament, the obligations of the Speaker include assessing whether a prima facie case exists and the matter must have sufficient evidence to support it being further investigated. This matter does not meet that threshold. Accordingly, I will not be referring the matter to the Ethics Committee.

## PETITIONS

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

### Charters Towers, Eventide Aged Care Facility, Closure

**Mr Knuth**, from 1,000 petitioners, requesting the House to oppose any plans or proposals to sell off, close down or privatise the Eventide Aged Care Facility in Charters Towers [\[2659\]](#).

### Gladstone-Boyne Tannum, Bus Service

**Mrs Cunningham**, from 76 petitioners, requesting the House to resume the old bus routes and timetables for the Gladstone and Boyne Tannum bus network until a solution to the unacceptable new timetables can be found [\[2660\]](#).

### Calliope State High School, Proposed

**Mrs Cunningham**, from 1,045 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the parcel of land at 55 Don Cameron Drive, Lot 126 Calliope is not sold but retained as government land for the proposed Calliope State High School [\[2661\]](#).

### Mental Health Services

**Mrs Frecklington**, from 2,105 petitioners, requesting the House to support mental illness, clinical depression and addictions by providing the level of help sufferers need at the onset of diagnosis by ongoing therapeutic counselling and specialised residential programs [\[2662\]](#).

### Isis Junction Railway Station

**Mr Bennett**, from 1,888 petitioners, requesting the House to give consideration to re-opening the Isis Junction Railway Station for passengers from Buxton, Childers and surrounding towns to access train services, including the Tilt Train [\[2663\]](#).

Petitions received.

## TABLED PAPERS

### MINISTERIAL PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Health (Mr Springborg)—

[2664](#) Response from the Minister Health (Mr Springborg) to an ePetition (1994-13) and a paper petition (2094-13) sponsored by Mrs Miller, from 748 and 12,142 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to seek an assurance from the Government that it will not close the Wynnum Hospital and the Moreton Bay Nursing Care Unit

### MEMBER'S PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK


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

Member for Burnett (Mr Bennett)—

[2665](#) Non-conforming petition regarding fund flood mitigation project for the Burnett River, Bundaberg

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS


### Agriculture Industry

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (2.06 pm): Last night I hosted an industry reception with my colleague the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and had the opportunity to meet the men and women who work on the front line of agriculture. We are committed to doubling agricultural production at the farm gate by 2040 and will do so by supporting this sector and growing this core pillar of our economy. The industry recognises our targets as being ambitious but they tell me they are up for the challenge—the opportunity—of getting the sector back to its full potential.

Our agricultural strategy will be launched in the coming weeks and will set out how we will achieve this goal and offer a long-term vision for agriculture in Queensland. We are committed to working with industry to develop long-term initiatives. Just last night we passed landmark reforms to the native vegetation management laws in this state. We have now restored the balance between farming development and protection of vegetation. Yesterday the agriculture minister released Queensland's Agricultural Land Audit which identifies key agricultural land in Queensland and opportunities for future development. We have allocated \$3 million to boost R&D in agriculture and horticulture. We have announced \$705,000 for wild dog management programs across Queensland. There will be \$2 million available through the Queensland Cattle Industry Biosecurity Fund to assist producers affected by BJD. We are investing in the future of Queensland agriculture. However, the industry faces many challenges.

Recent natural disasters have left producers struggling with the impact of floods and the emerging curse of drought. This government is acting and doing everything it can to alleviate the pressures that the industry is currently experiencing. We have announced a temporary opening of selected properties and national park land for emergency cattle agistment. This is land that has previous grazing history and provides a much needed lifeline for this dire animal welfare situation. We have cut red tape to help drought affected cattle producers by ensuring that major central Queensland stock routes remain open. We welcome any opportunity to investigate any further measures of support for those producers who are struggling with drought. Agriculture is the lifeblood of many rural and regional communities across this state and this government is in full support of this core pillar of our economy.

### **Government Administrative Precinct, Redevelopment**

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (2.08 pm): Redevelopment of the government precinct bordered by George, William and Alice streets provides Brisbane with a unique opportunity to modernise and revitalise a significant portion of the CBD. Our government said we would get the 1 William Street development underway and then turn our attention to the precinct as a whole. Today 1 William Street has received final planning approval from the Brisbane City Council and is clearly proceeding, as those of us who watch work on the site can attest.

The time has come to engage the community in an extensive consultation process to define the redevelopment of the broader government precinct. Cabinet has approved a five-stage process, with the first stage being focused on defining the project as a lead-up to an expression of interest process which will engage the private sector to undertake the redevelopment.


In this early stage of defining the project and before we take any decisions at all, we are going to consult widely with a broad range of stakeholders. Between now and September we will engage with the community, the council, business and the property and development industry before moving to the expression of interest for the private sector to put forward proposals for the redevelopment of the government precinct. That consultation process will seek and test community opinion about the redevelopment of the precinct and the property sectors' ideas and appetite for the project and seek views about the best value use of this area. My department will undertake a consultation and community engagement process to enable members of the public to provide their thoughts, ideas and feedback.

The Brisbane City Council is currently engaged in developing a new city centre master plan, and we will work closely with Mayor Graham Quirk and his councillors to ensure alignment between the precinct redevelopment and the council's master plan. Business and the property and development sectors' views will be sought and canvassed widely through a market sounding process to determine the private sector's appetite for the various investment options possible in the precinct.

My department has already initiated this process through the peak bodies—the Property Council of Australia and the Brisbane Development Association. We will also be closely involving the Heritage Council and the National Trust about the future use of heritage buildings. The government will seek expert advice through the independent Precinct Advisory Committee, comprising chair Renaye Peters and members Andrew King and Bevan Lynch. These three people from the private sector bring an extensive and valuable wealth of knowledge of the property, development, planning and design sectors to the oversight of this transformational project.

There will be a number of key questions to answer that will define this redevelopment. We will seek to answer those before we proceed to the EOI process. Land use will be a critical consideration—what sites are to be involved, what form of tenure should be over those sites and what are the appropriate uses for the various sites within the precinct? A key question will be: should a casino be ruled in or out of the EOI process and what other uses would a casino make possible or preclude? What uses are appropriate for the heritage buildings that will be preserved as a valuable part of the precinct redevelopment? How will that redevelopment appropriately relate to Parliament House, to the new 1 William Street building and to the Brisbane River? These are just some of the questions that we will seek to answer through the extensive consultation process that begins today. We will seek to answer those questions before seeking expressions of interest from the private sector for a redevelopment that will redefine this part of our city.

## Queensland Economy

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (2.12 pm): Yesterday the opposition released its response to the independent Commission of Audit's final report. Astoundingly, after 15 months in opposition, Labor is still in denial. This morning, the member for Mulgrave told Steve Austin on 612ABC that there was not a debt problem. But I think some of the things that we have been saying for a period of time in this House have finally penetrated because, within a matter of minutes, he changed his tune. He said, 'There is a debt problem, but it's not that difficult to solve.' If it is so easy to solve the debt problem, why did the member for Mulgrave not fix it when he had the opportunity?

It was the member for Mulgrave who was part of a government that lost Queensland's AAA credit rating. It was the member for Mulgrave who was part of a government that saw debt grow and grow and grow and saw interest become the fastest growing expense of the Queensland state budget—growing faster than health, growing faster than education, growing faster than police and community safety. The fastest growing component of the Queensland state budget under Labor was the interest bill.

He also did not accept that there was a budget black hole. He thought that all those years of deficits actually were not a black hole. He could not be more wrong. In the dying days of the Bligh Labor government, Andrew Fraser released a midyear financial update containing overly optimistic revenue projections for the forward estimates, which the member for Mulgrave curiously does not refer to.

Labor was banking on there being a miraculous overnight recovery in the property market that would deliver 14 per cent year on year annual growth in transfer duty. From 2013-14 through to 2015-16 the property market was going to deliver 14 per cent annual growth. If only that were true! The reality is that in 2012 this government was forced to write-down the overly optimistic projections of the former Labor government by almost \$1 billion—\$812 million in fact—over the forward estimates to ensure the financial projections actually represented reality, not the fantasy land that Andrew Fraser and Anna Bligh lived in.

Without making any changes to legislation or policy they also expected employee expenses, which were growing at an average of 9.6 per cent year on year, to miraculously fall to 3.7 per cent. Business as usual under Labor—all of a sudden their employee expenses were going to drop by more than 60 per cent. Labor's plan was not credible then and it is not credible now. The Labor Party has not changed its spots and debt and deficit remain in its DNA.

I have already referred to the comments of the independent officers of Treasury about Queensland's fiscal position and outlook being unsustainable and restoration being an urgent priority for the next term of government.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I am going to keep saying it until they acknowledge the independent officers of Treasury. Until they do, they keep slandering the independent officers of Treasury and do not take them at their word. What did the Queensland Treasury Corporation say—

The State's debt has reached unprecedented levels. Together with its published forward estimates showing an even greater volume of debt required, Queensland is now in uncharted waters ...

It was not just those two organisations that said it. What have we got from the Queensland Auditor-General, an Auditor-General appointed by the Labor government in its last term of government? On page 35 of his report it states—

Borrowings by the General Government Sector have grown by 338.5 per cent between 2008 and 2012.

The increase in borrowings over this time has increased risks to the long-term financial sustainability of the state.

It continues—


For the GGS, annual interest expenses increased from \$347 million in 2007-08 to more than \$1.65 billion in 2011-12.

Page 28 of the same report states—

The growth in borrowings required to finance asset acquisitions has been greater than the growth in state revenues, reducing the state's capacity to repay debt from its own-sourced revenues.

That is the finding of the Queensland Audit Office and the Auditor-General. It backs up the findings of the Queensland Treasury officers and the Queensland Treasury Corporation. Labor is advocating the same approach that has seen Queensland go from a position of strength to a position of weakness. There is still after 15 months no plan and no alternative from an opposition that has no position.

## State Schools

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (2.17 pm): It gives me great pleasure to announce that the Newman government will build 10 new schools to meet growing student demand in Queensland. These 10 schools will be developed through an innovative public-private partnership that will see private companies contracted to finance, design, construct and maintain the package of schools.

The new schools will be built in Pimpama, Burpengary, Pallara, Ripley Valley, Springfield, Griffin, Bellbird Park, Caboolture—two of them—and Redbank Plains. Now this may come as a surprise to those opposite, but these schools were not selected on the basis of their electorate or a feeling we got from a local meeting.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Will the interjections and unacceptable exclamations from my left cease. I will start warning members under the standing orders if they continue.


**Mr LANGBROEK:** These schools were selected on the basis of careful planning resulting from the analysis of rigorous data. The Newman government recognises that Queensland's student population is growing rapidly so for the first time ever a Schools Planning Commission has been established to identify the areas where schools are needed most. The ground work has been done and this project will deliver 10 new schools to Queensland's growth hot spots. For example, there are four in the growth belt south of Ipswich and four in the growth belt on Brisbane's outer north. The 10 new schools will consist of two secondary and eight primary schools, catering for up to 10,800 students during peak periods of enrolment. The schools will employ up to 540 teachers and 130 non-teaching positions, with the first schools expected to be open from the 2016 academic year.

This project is a wonderful opportunity to innovate the way we design, build and maintain buildings. By clustering the schools we will be able to achieve efficiencies and by partnering with the private sector we can improve the quality without increasing the price. The short-listed bidders for the project are: Inspire Schools Partnership, Edvantage, Exemplar Education and Bright Futures Partnership.

In my role as the minister responsible for training, I am acutely aware of the importance of the construction industry to Queensland's economy. It is one of our four pillars. This project will also boost economic activity during the five-year construction phase and generate around 1,700 jobs a year.

Unlike those opposite, we are taking a structured view to planning for the education asset base which consists of over 1,200 schools and \$18 billion. To build new schools in areas where they are needed we must simultaneously make tough decisions and look at innovative delivery methods, otherwise we simply will not be able to cater for our growing student population.

## Queensland Health, Payroll System

 **Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (2.20 pm): The painstaking process of rebuilding a reliable and efficient payroll system to serve Queensland Health employees continues. The disastrous mismanagement of the Labor Party that left 70 per cent of health workers overpaid, underpaid and some not paid at all is behind us. But the legacy of cost and inconvenience remains. Since March last year more than 280 payroll system changes have been introduced. We take another step forward today as we begin the staged introduction of an automated recovery system to address the problem of payroll overpayments. This problem has bedevilled health workers pay packets since March 2010 when the SAP/Workbrain payroll system was implemented.


Unlike its predecessor, this government is working to address overpayments. Last year we changed the pay date to make time for staff and managers to submit, approve and process payroll forms. This has prevented many overpayments that would otherwise have occurred. An automated repayment process is another important step towards better managing overpayments. Sometimes overpayments occur simply because someone missed a shift and the form outlining the change was not submitted in time to adjust the pay. In these cases the automated repayment process will make it easier for everyone involved by resolving the overpayment as quickly as possible.

Under the new process staff members will be notified of new overpayments via their pay slips. They will then have 14 days to question and resolve any concerns that arise with the payroll office. Repayment through staff pays will then commence automatically 28 days after the initial notification. Repayments will be calculated at 15 per cent of the employee's gross base wages in the fortnight the overpayment commences. As 80 per cent of overpayments are under \$500, this means most will be

repaid in full within one or two pays. In July the new process will be introduced in three hospital and health services—Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast and the children's health services—and for some staff within the Health Service Support Agency. The remaining Queensland Health staff across the rest of the state will be added in stages before the end of the year.

This process is clear, transparent and timely. It enables us to recover taxpayers' money and ensure staff are not disadvantaged. Still much more work needs to be done to recover money lost over the years, and I will certainly update parliament and the community as each step is undertaken.

### Queensland Law Courts Site, Sale


 **Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (2.23 pm): The LNP went to the last election with a clear commitment to achieve a vibrant, dynamic and sustainable property and construction industry, which would once again be the jobs powerhouse of Queensland. I am pleased to say that yesterday's announcement of the sale of the old Supreme Court site in Brisbane's CBD to the Shayher Group will help achieve this commitment. It will also provide a major boost for the tourism industry via the building of a five-star hotel on the site. As construction and tourism are two of the Queensland government's four pillars of economic growth, Minister Stuckey and I welcome this development with open arms.

This is a fantastic opportunity to continue major renewal in this part of Brisbane's CBD. The development involves the construction of three towers. The largest is a 70-storey residential and serviced apartment building, along with a 39-storey office tower and the previously mentioned 18-storey five-star hotel with at least 190 rooms. This development is a great outcome for the local construction industry and is expected to create over 5,700 direct and indirect jobs. This site is in a fantastic location, being just a short walk from Suncorp Stadium, the cultural, arts and convention centre precinct, South Bank parklands, the Queen Street mall and the casino. This development will add to the renewal of that end of George Street which has seen the building of the new Queen Elizabeth II courthouse, the Magistrates Court and private development like the Santos tower and 400 George.

The Shayher Group has a number of development sites around Brisbane. It has bought a site in the Northshore Hamilton development area, and in 2011 it won the federal Labor government's tender to buy the old CSIRO site at Indooroopilly. Internationally the Shayher Group has undertaken several major development projects. These include a 300-apartment tower with significant commercial and retail space in Vietnam, along with a number of towers in the group's homeland of Taiwan—such as one with 276 apartments over 19 levels.

Construction on the old Supreme Court site will start in late 2015. The hotel component should take approximately three years to deliver. When considered along with the development of 1 William Street, this government is really driving the stimulation of the construction industry. This shows how serious the Newman government is about attracting investment to Queensland which will secure local jobs and the economic development of our great state.

### Overseas Visit

 **Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (2.26 pm): I travelled to Indonesia last week to start rebuilding a strong relationship with Indonesia and to get more live cattle into what was a major market for northern producers. We all know live exports to Indonesia have nosedived since federal Labor and Joe Ludwig foolishly suspended the trade two years ago. The impact from that decision ripped the heart out of the northern cattle industry. The industry has not recovered and has been further impacted by bushfires and the failure of the wet season, while some properties have also been under movement restrictions for bovine Johne's disease.

We desperately need to get the live trade going but, as was evidenced from this month's beef crisis meeting in Richmond, Joe Ludwig has no interest whatsoever in fixing the mess that he made. So it was important that, along with my Northern Territory counterpart, the agriculture minister, Willem Westra van Holthe, I visited Indonesia. I am pleased to advise the House that our visit included very positive face-to-face meetings with the Indonesian Minister of Agriculture, Mr Suswono; the Vice Minister of Trade, Mr Bayu Krisnamurthi; as well as the Minister of State-Owned Enterprises, Mr Dahlan Iskan. We visited feedlots, wet markets, supermarkets and the PT Elders abattoir at Bogor. From all of these visits I came away with a very strong and positive impression of the supply chain in Indonesia.


While no official announcement has been made, the Indonesian ministers, as confirmed in their own media in Jakarta—in particular, Minister Dahlan Iskan—spoke of their country's growing appetite for beef, especially among burgeoning middle classes and in the short term the need to make more beef available for the upcoming Ramadan festival in July-August. It was made clear that the Indonesian government could bring forward the next third quarter by one month, increasing the level of live cattle imports and boxed beef by the equivalent of 20,000 to 25,000 head this calendar year if that move is made. Even that small move would give our northern industry a much needed shot in the arm.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I will ask the minister to wrap up.

**Mr McVEIGH:** Madam Speaker, unlike the Gillard federal government and Minister Ludwig, the LNP Newman government here in Queensland remains absolutely determined to rebuild the relationship with Indonesia.

## AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

### Report

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (2.29 pm): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 22 of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee.

*Tabled paper:* Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 22—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February and 19 March 2013 [\[2666\]](#).

This report covers the subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February and 19 March 2013 considered by the committee. The subordinate legislation has disallowance dates of 23 May and 6 June 2013. The committee did not identify any significant issues regarding consistency with fundamental legislative principles or the lawfulness of the subordinate legislation. I commend the report and the committee's recommendations to the House.


## SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### Visitors to Public Gallery

**Madam SPEAKER:** I acknowledge in the gallery today the Friends of Buderim from the electorate of Buderim.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Flood Levy

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (2.30 pm): My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's comments yesterday that he wants a conversation with Queenslanders about his proposed flood levy, and I ask: given that the state budget is less than two weeks away, will the Premier confirm that his big, new tax on families is already included in the budget, and is the conversation over before it has even started?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I know it pains the Leader of the Opposition that we do business somewhat differently from them. I know it hurts. I know it rankles. I know it gets right under their skin that we are a different government; that we actually go out and talk to Queenslanders faithfully and openly about important issues.

I need to talk again today about the background to the comments that Minister Crisafulli raised in the media last week. Minister Crisafulli has been doing a great job going around to disaster affected and flood affected areas of the state over the last five months working with mayors and councils about the challenges that they face. It is very, very clear that the idea of continuing to just rebuild to see it all wash away again and cop it again is unsatisfactory. It is not just unsatisfactory to us but unsatisfactory to mayors and councillors and of course unsatisfactory to Queenslanders.

I guess what Minister Crisafulli is saying is that there is a way to bring together sufficient funds to undertake these much needed projects which for too long have been put in the too-hard basket that can improve the flood and disaster resilience of communities across the state. That is the question. We are after feedback. Should this be the way forward? Should we make a bold move to bring in this revenue so that it can be spent on appropriate projects not just for the state government and its assets but also for local government assets? That is what Minister Crisafulli has been saying.

How would the Labor Party have done it? They would have been asked a specific black-and-white question, 'Will you keep the fuel subsidy?' 'Yes.' That is how they would have done it. Three weeks later: 'No.' They would have been asked to make a solid promise on asset sales. 'Will there be asset sales?' 'No.' A few weeks later: 'We are working and we will have the member for South Brisbane in Trades Hall geeing up the numbers so we can flog off the silverware in a big panic.' We do not do business like that. We are putting this out there because we are interested in what the community has to say.

Before I close, I say this to give some extra context. One other thing that we are concerned about right now is the pressure on families—the cost-of-living issue. That is an important consideration. That is something we continue to take very seriously in every decision that we make. We have to keep downward pressure on the cost of living for families and individuals across this state. That is all I can say today. I guess they had better wait until the budget.

### Queensland Plan

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** My question is to the Premier. Yesterday the Premier denied that the Queensland Plan would be taught in schools, in direct contradiction to the plan outlined in a letter to all MPs. I ask: does the Premier stand by his statement in the House that the Queensland Plan will not be taught in schools considering there are lesson plans being prepared for schools? I table a copy of the letter so the Premier can be reminded of exactly what he said.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 13 May 2013, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, to the Leader of the Opposition, Ms Annastacia Palaszczuk MP, relating to the Queensland Plan [2667].

**Mr NEWMAN:** One thing that is clear from various questions and the standard of debate from the opposition over the last 12 months is that they are down in the weeds. They are down in the forest. They certainly do not get the big picture. It is not even university debating society standard that we see from the opposition. We see an obsession with minutia. I say to them rhetorically: get up high, look down and see the big picture that we are trying to achieve with the Queensland Plan. What pedantry! If the Queensland Plan were to be taught, there would have to be a document to teach. I ask them to produce the Queensland Plan.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** You wrote the letter: 'Lesson plans are being developed.'

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, please cease your interjections. I ask the Premier to continue answering the question.

**Mr NEWMAN:** What a pedantic splitting of hairs. What I said yesterday is very clearly what the case is. In Queensland schools we will have a program and an opportunity for young people to be engaged in consultation on what the plan will be. We are not teaching them about the plan because they are helping develop the plan. Have I spelt it out enough for them?

To talk about what it is all about again, this is a vision for the next 30 years that we are developing. In contrast, they have something called Q2. Where did Q2 come from? It came from New South Wales, we suspect.

**Mr Nicholls:** A Mike Kaiser special.

**Mr NEWMAN:** It comes from that discredited vote rorter Mike Kaiser, who cooked it up and copied it from New South Wales. Lo and behold, there it was—shazam! It was presented—written, printed, finished.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members!

**Mr NEWMAN:** Q2 was delivered and served up to Queenslanders: this is what you get; this is what the Labor Party are saying. In that context if Q2 was taken to the classroom I guess it was being taught to people. It was certainly an issue in spin and propaganda. Everything is fine in the health system, they said in Q2, as we saw the rorts continue. The Queensland Plan is a plan that is being developed by the people across this state. It is particularly important that young people have their say because they are the ones who will be the grown-ups, unlike those opposite, in 30 years time when the plan's outcomes have to be delivered. That is what it is all about.

### Tourism Industry

**Mr DOWLING:** My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier please advise what action the government is taking to encourage investment in the tourism industry?

**Mr NEWMAN:** This is a far more relevant and important question to Queenslanders this afternoon, as tourism is one of the four economic pillars. We said that we would grow tourism. Our aim is to achieve \$30 billion in overnight visitor expenditure by 2020. What have we been doing? In the first three months of this government we hosted the inaugural DestinationQ Forum in Cairns, with hundreds of tourism operators coming together from right across this state. We signed a historic partnership agreement with QTIC and committed to a 12-month action plan.

Delivering on this plan tonight, I will be joined by Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games, the Hon. Jann Stuckey, to host the inaugural Queensland tourism investment forum. Tonight's forum will bring together more than 100 key industry representatives, many of whom are potentially significant investors in our state in tourism ventures. Other investment initiatives to encourage investment in tourism include the establishment of a one-stop shop for tourism investment—that is, the Tourism Investment Attraction Unit—to link investors to tourism investment opportunities; cutting green tape by changing legislation to encourage private investment in sustainable ecotourism ventures in and around national parks; delivering tourism marketing activities; and attracting new and increased capacity on aviation routes. In the last few days Emirates have made a commitment to bring A380s into Brisbane resulting in 100,000 extra seats into Queensland each year.

We are also getting development moving across Queensland. We are making real progress on streamlining the planning system. For example, for the first time our State Planning Policy recognises tourism as a land use. We are also working in partnership with the Brisbane City Council to create a positive environment for new hotel development, offering streamlined planning processes and case management support to assist investors, operators and developers to get the approvals they need and to start building.

I note again that this government has approved the Jewel project on the Gold Coast as well as the Great Keppel Island redevelopment, a huge new opportunity for Central Queensland. We have also approved the Ella Bay project south of Cairns for which one would think the member for Mulgrave would be more appreciative. These approvals alongside yesterday's announcement of the outcome of the competitive bidding process for the former Supreme and District Court site, which includes a 190-room hotel, demonstrates the government's commitment to stimulating investment in major new tourism infrastructure projects. By investing in tourism we are creating a bigger economy and new job opportunities—exactly what is needed to create a stronger Queensland for the future.

### Commission of Audit

**Mr PITT:** My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the fact that the Premier has previously likened our state's economic performance to that of Spain, and I ask: does the Premier stand by the dire prediction in the final Costello report that Queensland's labour force participation rate is likely to fall to 53.7 per cent, well below that of Spain's current rate of 59 per cent?

**Mr NEWMAN:** Firstly, I wish to ensure that I am not verbaled, because members of the Labor Party are good at that; they are the masters of that. Sadly, our Prime Minister and her incompetent Treasurer and sidekick are masters of verbal, spin and nonsense. That is what we have seen today. I said that amongst the Australian states this state had the worst performing public sector finances. Let's not be confused about what I said. I was saying we were the Spain of the Australian states. It was a comment meant as a comparison.

In relation to the specific figure that the member has quoted, it is the lower bound estimate. 'Indeed, what of it?', I say. The point again is that the Costello report is pointing out the things that we have to do to get the state back on track. I could assume from the question that the member for Mulgrave perhaps thinks there is something wrong with those figures; he is worried about those figures. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot come in here today and use a figure and say, 'Oh dear, here's a figure in the report; it's a problem,' and then on another occasion—or, indeed, on many other occasions—say he does not believe in the Commission of Audit report. It is inconsistent and that is all we see from the party with no position whatsoever.

We have to get the economy of Queensland going and we have to use all the people of Queensland to their best possible capacity to take the state forward. We know that we have a growing population. There will be huge challenges for the health system, for example. Honourable members will no doubt see in the budget some responses to some of those issues. We should not be saying to older people that they are not wanted in the workforce; we need their skills, expertise and particularly wisdom. God knows the opposition could use some of the wisdom of the past because there is not much wisdom opposite me this afternoon.

I know they have talked about bringing back people like my predecessor in Ashgrove and that chap from Greenslopes. However, I would go further back. I would be going after Wayne Goss, Keith De Lacy and maybe even Terry Mackenroth because the budget was holding together reasonably well until Terry left and after that it really tanked. We know who the Treasurer was then. That is right, it was the former member for South Brisbane, the current member for South Brisbane's little pal. That is when the rot set in. That is why we had the Commission of Audit report—those important findings, those important things that we as a government have committed to do to get this state back on track.

### South of Embley Bauxite Project

**Mr KEMPTON:** My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. Can the Deputy Premier inform the House of the significance of federal environment minister Tony Burke's recent approval of the South of Embley bauxite project on Cape York?

**Mr SEENEY:** I thank the member for Cook for the question. The approval that Tony Burke gave last week for the South of Embley Project is especially significant for the communities that the member for Cook represents. It is significant also for the Queensland economy because this is the sort of project that the Queensland economy will depend on in the future. It is significant also in that it is the second time that this project has been approved because in May last year the original approval was revoked by Tony Burke. He revoked that approval for that important project based on a single page of anonymous claims—and I will table a copy—and that project has been delayed for 12 months.

*Tabled paper:* Media release from the Wilderness Society titled 'Burke must knock back mines threatening reef' [2668].

Essentially, the claims were from a conservation group which claimed that the project was going to lead to 900 extra shipping movements through the Great Barrier Reef—900! On that basis, the federal environment minister delayed for an entire year that project that was so badly needed. The EIS that was completed during that process to consider that claim identified that there would be 60 extra ships through the Great Barrier Reef, a one per cent increase in shipping movements.

Consider carefully what this situation has revealed: the federal environment minister, a man who should be considering these major projects from the perspective of how all Australians will benefit but especially the Australians who live in Aurukun, who live on the cape, who live in a world of welfare and despair, who need these projects for their economic future. But instead of considering the project from their perspective, the federal environment minister is held captive to the blind green ideology that has made these projects almost impossible to get up. He has turned the approvals process at a federal level into a farce.

Tony Burke has become a mindless puppet to these blind, green ideology people who hold his government to ransom. Their mindless cheer squad in here did exactly the same last night: they voted against a proposal that would give the community of Aurukun an opportunity to develop an agricultural component to their economy. The same blind, green ideology that has done so much damage to the Australian economy, that has done so much damage to the Queensland economy, has turned the approvals process at a federal level into a farce. The sooner we get a change of government and ministers in a federal cabinet who can represent all Australians, the better it will be for all Australians.

### State Schools, Closures

**Ms TRAD:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. I refer the minister to the answer he gave yesterday regarding the proposed amalgamation of Brisbane State High and Coorparoo Secondary College, and I ask: for the benefit of local families will the minister confirm that the government's preferred option for amalgamation would see the two current catchments become one large catchment with Coorparoo Secondary College to become the junior secondary campus for years 7, 8 and 9 for State High?

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I thank the honourable member for the question. It is a very important discussion that we are having—a consultation process about this proposed amalgamation—but we are still in the consultation phase. So I can advise the honourable member that any plans about who might be where and when in terms of which classes or which grades might be represented at either campus are still things that are to be worked out; we have not decided what we are doing. We are consulting with the community. That is why I went to a public meeting at Coorparoo Secondary College a couple of weeks ago to listen to those parents and students about their concerns; about matters such as that; about which classes or which grades might be at which campus; issues such as

transport, uniform and leadership issues; the subjects that students may be studying that they particularly like doing at either or both campuses, and whether they are going to be able to do any of those are subsequent decisions that we might make.

I can confirm for the honourable member that the catchment area is right next to the existing one in South Brisbane. Therefore, the catchment area would be as it currently is—adding another area right next to it. As there would have been a separation of catchments, we ruled out other areas which may have been considered such as Balmoral or Yeronga State High. When it comes to the details, we are still in the process of community consultation. We want to have individualised student plans should we decide on amalgamation after the consultation phase, and all of the concerns that students and parents have will be addressed in those student plans.

When it comes to this issue of school closures, it is unbelievable that after 20 years of Labor government there was no process in place for looking at the viability of schools. What did we hear from the opposition leader today about our proposal to build 10 new schools? She said, 'Why are you potentially closing nine if you are building 10?' That is the attitude of the opposition leader. There was no consideration by the previous Labor government to discern whether enrolments in certain schools had declined over a period of time and nor was there a process to forecast areas in which there may be significant population growth.

We have seen the outrageous efforts of those opposite and the unions with which they are associated to use children to protest against the potential closure of the Fortitude Valley school. Let us look at the statistics pertaining to the Fortitude Valley school. Teneriffe, Newstead and Bowen Hills have had significant growth, yet fewer than 50 per cent of the students at the Fortitude Valley school come from that catchment or the surrounding catchments. There are hundreds of students in the Fortitude Valley area, but they have not been going to Fortitude Valley school; they have been going to Brisbane Central, New Farm and other schools.

*(Time expired)*

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, I warn you under standing order 253A. I have asked members to be considerate of people who have the call or who are about to receive the call. I was speaking when the interjections were occurring.

### Health Funding

**Mr BERRY:** My question without notice is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade. Can the Treasurer inform the House of any changes to health funding, and are there any alternative views?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. There have been changes to health funding, and I will detail those changes to the Health budget in a moment. I want to comment briefly on a question asked yesterday by the member for Bundamba. The member for Bundamba tabled a copy of the quarterly statement for the Consolidated Fund. When asking questions, it would pay for those opposite to check the document to ensure it has been read and understood correctly.

Yesterday, as the Premier was giving another of his comprehensive and complete answers, I did briefly feel a pang of sorrow for the member from Bundamba. When I heard her contribution to the vegetation management debate my pang of sorrow disappeared. Yesterday was not a good day for the member for Bundamba because of one issue relating to the Ethics Committee, but she was also set up by the shadow Treasurer. I am not sure what factional games are going on over there. There would be little factional games going on over there, because you would have to know whether you were moving from the front seat of the Tarago to the back seat of the Tarago or whether you were going to be on the roof rack.

The question asked in the House yesterday by the member for Bundamba is a shining example of everything that is wrong with the Labor Party and illustrates the fact that they do not know how to read a Treasury document. The member's question was, 'Here is a quarterly statement showing expenditure. You are spending \$1 billion less.' If the member had taken one moment to look at page 29 of the Service Delivery Statement—the top-secret document that is hidden away on the websites of Queensland Treasury and Queensland Health—and had looked at the income statement on page 29, which means the money we are earning, it would have become apparent to her that service revenue has gone down but grants and charges have gone up by \$3 billion. If she had looked a little further down in the notes she would have seen what the member for Mulgrave did not tell her when he set her up. It states—

The decrease in service revenue is due to the reclassification of the national health reform funding from appropriation revenue to grants and contributions.

Under the deal that the Labor Party in this state signed with the Labor Party in Canberra, instead of the money coming into the Consolidated Fund and going out to the hospitals the money goes straight to the hospitals. This year the LNP government put \$800 million extra into the budget. It was the federal government that ripped out \$500 million over the forward estimates and \$103 million this year alone. I caution the member for Bundamba against asking questions she is given by the member for Mulgrave in the future.

*(Time expired)*

**Mrs Miller** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Bundamba under standing order 253A. I was speaking and calling the member for Nicklin.

### Ombudsman

**Mr WELLINGTON:** My question is to the Attorney-General. I refer the Attorney-General to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's recent public hearing at which the Queensland Ombudsman answered questions about the Callinan-Aroney recommendations relating to the Ombudsman. Has the Attorney-General received a detailed response from the Ombudsman in relation to this matter? Will the Attorney-General release the Ombudsman's report?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank the member for Nicklin for the question. I have had a lot to say about the CMC in recent weeks. We have had the Callinan-Aroney inquiry into the CMC operations. We have also had the PCMC inquiry which was independently led by the Independent member for Gladstone. I thank her for her contribution in that regard. We now have two reports which the government must consider. We have a responsibility to ensure we consider them in full. We look forward to ensuring that we have a fully independent crime-fighting body in this state. It is the Premier's and the government's intention to have the best independent crime-fighting corruption watchdog in this nation. We will not settle for second best. To do that we have to make some changes, because we know that the CMC's current structure is flawed.

I take particular interest in the member for Nicklin's questions regarding the CMC, because on the last occasion on which this House sat the member for Nicklin was going on about the resources to the CMC. He did it through the PCMC inquiry. 'Why does the Attorney-General and the honourable Treasurer not sign blank cheques to the CMC? They are unaccountable bodies. Just sign a blank cheque so that they can do whatever they want to with taxpayers' money.' This is despite the fact that we only found out because of the Callinan inquiry that the CMC spent \$50,000 to survey their staff. If that is where a top corruption crime-fighting body spends its money, then the government should seriously look at the structure of that body.

That is why we will be responding to the PCMC inquiry. I have received correspondence from the Ombudsman with respect to that. When we look at the 15 or so serious recommendations contained in the Callinan-Aroney inquiry, the government is considering all of them. I also note recommendation 1 of the PCMC inquiry—of which the honourable member was a member—which essentially said that there should be an administrative restructure of the CMC through the PCMC inquiry report and it should be restructured so that there is a chairman and CEO. Our own parliamentary committee is recommending an administrative restructure, and the Callinan-Aroney inquiry, pursuant to recommendation 1, is also recommending an administrative restructure.

We will do that restructure. We will respond, as we are required to do, to the PCMC report. I have recently written to the PCMC committee seeking their feedback with respect to the Callinan-Aroney inquiry. I have spoken to the Independent chair when I recently visited Gladstone, and I look forward to a continuing dialogue with the PCMC and its chair but also an ongoing dialogue with respect to—

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I rise to a point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for Nicklin, what is your point of order?

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I would ask you to make a ruling on the issue of relevance. The question was, 'Will the Attorney-General release the'—

**Madam SPEAKER:** Please take your seat. I call the Attorney-General.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The only irrelevance here is the member for Nicklin. He asked about the Ombudsman; I mentioned the Ombudsman specifically in my answer. He asked about the CMC; I mentioned the CMC. He asked about the PCMC report; I mentioned the PCMC report. I have given three minutes of detailed explanation in terms of the government's response. What more could the member for Nicklin want?

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Seeney:** They want the Labor government back.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I now warn you under standing order 253A. I would ask members to pay attention when I have the call and I am about to call a member for questions.

### **Public Hospitals**

**Mr RUTHENBERG:** My question is to the Minister for Health. I refer to claims by Labor-barracking union bosses that public hospitals are up for sale, and I ask: is there a single website anywhere in Australia that lists any public hospital for sale?

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** I thank the honourable member for Kallangur for his question. In the last month or so I have visited quite a few hospitals throughout Queensland. I must admit I have been very interested in what is being said by some of the Labor Party apologists, the union bosses around Queensland, particularly the Nurses Union bosses. Only recently I had the opportunity to visit the hospital in Ayr. I looked out the front but I did not see any 'for sale' signs. I also had the opportunity to visit the hospital at Logan and there were no 'for sale' signs out the front. Craig Emerson has a few in his office as he is trying to whip up a bit of a frenzy in a search for relevance. I have also been at the Gold Coast Hospital, Ipswich Hospital, RBWH and the PA but I have not seen any of these 'for sale' signs.

I took the opportunity to do a bit of a search on the web to see if there were indeed any 'for sale' signs for Queensland public hospitals. The only ones I could find were in Queensland Nurses Union publications. They have conveniently put a little 'not' on them. What we have here is the Queensland Nurses Union advocating that the RBWH is for sale. We also have them advocating that a range of other hospitals throughout Queensland, including Longreach Hospital, are for sale. I was there the other day and I did not see any 'for sale' signs in Longreach. What we see here is that the Queensland Nurses Union bosses have joined the league of the grassy knoll conspiracy theorists.

Quite clearly recently we ruled out any privatisation of existing Queensland public hospitals. Indeed, if that is too hard for the Nurses Union bosses or anyone else to understand, we cannot vouch for their intellectual competence. But we have ruled that out. We are more than happy to engage with private or not-for-profit providers in relation to any new or additional health service facilities in Queensland. That is appropriate and prudent.

What might be news to the Deputy Premier is that the Queensland Nurses Union claims it has stopped the closure of Theodore Hospital. I was not aware there was any move to close Theodore Hospital. In actual fact, a doctor at the hospital with whom I was speaking the other day had heard no such thing. He saw the press release from the Nurses Union which suggested that Theodore Hospital was for sale. He looked out his door, but he could not see the sign.

The Labor Party, the Queensland Nurses Union bosses and their coterie of hangers-on in the union movement are running around in a desperate attempt to prop up a failing Gillard-Swan government. That is what this is all about.

*(Time expired)*

### **Commission of Audit**

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport. Given that recommendation 18 of the Costello report suggests that the Mount Isa-Townsville rail line be transferred to the Port of Townsville and jobs be outsourced, coupled with the recent removal of a 'no forced redundancy and relocation' clause, what guarantee can the minister give workers in respect of job security to alleviate employees' concerns?

**Mr EMERSON:** I thank the member for the question because it brings forward a very interesting point. First I will go back to the Commission of Audit. We have ruled out certain things recommended by the Commission of Audit, as we have heard very clearly. There are other things we are considering. One of those is the bolting of the line from Mount Isa to Townsville on to the port and then the possibility of leasing that port out for 99 years—not selling it but leasing it out. We have made no decision on that; we are still considering that. But it is a recommendation we are considering.

I have heard criticisms and complaints from particularly those opposite about what is going to happen to the rail—what is going to happen to maintenance and who is going to do the work. The reality is that a quarter of our regional rail services and the maintenance on it is already outsourced. Who outsourced it? Labor did it as part of their rushed QR National sale. The reality is that 1,200 kilometres of our 6,000 kilometres of regional rail service maintenance is already outsourced. That is the kind of behaviour we see.

So in terms of what is going to happen, we have not made a decision. But if the member looks at what Labor members did he will see that it is already outsourced. It was done when they sold QR National—when they had their secret plan. They did not tell anyone about it. They went to an election and what did they say? 'No, we are not going to sell assets. We are not going to get rid of the fuel subsidy. We swear—cross our hearts. We will not do it,' they said. Did they talk about the increases to public transport fares—15 per cent per year after year after year? No. They did not talk about asset sales, they did not talk about the abolition of the fuel subsidy and they did not talk about public transport fare increases, but they went ahead and did it. This demonstrates the hypocrisy and deceit of Labor. They are responsible for fiscal mismanagement, debt and deficit but also engage in deceit.

The reality is that we have not yet made a decision on this issue. It is still under consideration. Why was the Commission of Audit commissioned in the first place? Because of the fiscal mismanagement of Labor—because of the debt and deficit they left us by their mismanagement, by their incompetence. Who made those decisions? Honourable members should look at the opposition frontbench. The Leader of the Opposition was transport minister, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a minister and the member for Mulgrave was also a minister. And then there was the member for Bundamba as well.

*(Time expired)*

### **Gateway Motorway, Upgrade**

**Dr ROBINSON:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Can the minister outline what offers are on the table for the Gateway Motorway North upgrade and what the government is doing to fix one of the worst bottlenecks in Queensland?

**Mr EMERSON:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I also acknowledge in the public gallery people from the Buderim War Memorial Community Association who are visiting the House today. They have come down from the Sunshine Coast. Those people travelling from the Sunshine Coast would use the Gateway North and they would know the congestion that is the problem. The RACQ has identified it as one of the most congested sections of the road.

This is a federal road. Let us talk about the realities of who has funding responsibility for that road. In terms of federal roads, the traditional arrangements are that 80 per cent is contributed by the federal government and 20 per cent is contributed by the state government. I know that the Labor opposition has a view that the state should not pay for any federal roads. That is not our view. It does not want to contribute any money for the Bruce Highway. On that basis it would not want to contribute any money for the Gateway North upgrade. It would not want to contribute any money for the Ipswich Motorway or the Warrego Highway. But the reality is that, traditionally, federal roads are paid for 80 per cent by the federal government and 20 per cent by the state government.

At the moment there are two offers out there from the federal parties. One offer is \$1 billion for the Gateway upgrade—for the \$1.3 billion project. That offer is consistent with the traditional contribution share of 80-20. Who made that offer? It was made by the coalition. There is another offer—one from the federal government. That offer is for only \$718 million—50-50. They want to change the rule. Wayne Swan, Kevin Rudd, Julia Gillard and Anthony Albanese want to change the rules and take the funding share for the Gateway Motorway to 50-50. That is what they want to do. They want to change it from 80-20 to 50-50.

It is particularly discouraging to hear Queenslanders like Wayne Swan and Kevin Rudd selling out their own home state—short-changing it. We see Labor members on the other side of the chamber. What do they want to do? They want us to sign up, because they do not care about Queenslanders. They only care about their mates in Canberra, wanting us to support them. The reality is that we will not sell out Queensland. The offer from Tony Abbott on the Gateway Motorway fits.

**Ms Trad** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** The member for South Brisbane will cease her interjections. I will start warning you under the standing orders, too. The interjections are not being taken. I call the minister.

**Mr EMERSON:** I once again say that we will stand up for Queensland. We will not sell out Queensland. All that members of the Labor opposition want us to do is to back their mates in Canberra. They do not care about Queensland. All they care about is getting the Julia Gillard government re-elected.

### **Nyanda State High School**

**Mr JUDGE:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister confirm if he will be attending any public or P&C meetings in relation to the possible closure of Nyanda State High School and whether the final report and any recommendations made by the independent consultant will be released for public scrutiny in line with the Premier's promise to uphold an open and accountable government?

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I thank the member for the question. When it comes to matters about the consultation process with all of the schools that we have proposed potentially for closure, subject to the consultation process, I have made an effort to attend a couple of these meetings. It is not possible for me to always attend meetings at every school, but I have certainly attempted to do so in order to reassure the parents and students at those schools that we want to take on board all of their concerns. As I just mentioned to the member for South Brisbane about the potential amalgamation of Coorparoo Secondary College with Brisbane State High, that was a meeting that I did attend and subsequently I attended, with the Minister for Public Works and Housing, another public meeting at Everton Park State High. I will attempt, as I have already said, to attend more, but importantly we are encouraging local members to attend those meetings and get that feedback from parents, because this is the reassurance that we want to give to all of the parents, students and teachers involved in the potential arrangements where the discussion is about consultation about potential closure—that is, to listen to the concerns that they may have.

Our aim in all of this is to make sure that we have the best facilities for our students to study in with the resources and the teachers available to give them the best subject selection, because the last thing we need to do following last week's examples of NAPLAN and the concerns that some parents are expressing and that I feel at times they are passing on to their children are the concerns that are also being expressed by parents that they could be passing on to their children in these potential school closure sites.

We want to reassure all of these students throughout the consultation process about the concerns that they might have about any of those issues, no matter how small or large—such as if they are in a catchment area and are concerned about what is going to happen to them in terms of where they are going to go next or other issues to do with subject selection, transport matters, uniforms, even down to such things as the leadership that they may have had in their current positions or the fact that they are in grade 10 or 11 and are concerned about what is going to happen to them following any potential closure. We want to make sure we have an individualised student plan for all of the students who will be affected and, importantly, that we will see all of that information and ensure that they do receive that information. That is what we have committed to doing and, as the member for Greenslopes asked me yesterday, potentially having departmental representation there so that we can reassure and assuage the concerns of anyone about our intentions. Again, our intention is to have our children studying in 21st century facilities in 21st century Queensland to ensure they have the best opportunity to progress in a state that we know should have the best standards but where sometimes they are doing them in outdated facilities.

**Mr JUDGE:** Madam Speaker—

**Madam SPEAKER:** What is your point of order?

**Mr JUDGE:** Relevance.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Please take your seat. The question has finished.

### **Brisbane CBD, Hotel Development**

**Mr CAVALLUCCI:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games. Can the minister please advise the House of the benefits of new hotel developments to the Brisbane CBD?

**Mrs STUCKEY:** What a great question to get from the honourable member. The honourable member understands full well the importance of hotels to tourism and events in our capital city in Queensland. The honourable member also understands that Brisbane is Australia's premiere hotel investment destination. This government is committed to doubling overnight visitor expenditure from \$15 billion to \$30 billion by the year 2020. To achieve this target, we have identified the need for more hotel beds, particularly in the Brisbane CBD in the honourable member's electorate, and this government is showing leadership in this respect.

The lack of planning by the former Labor government left a shortage of Brisbane hotel rooms, and this has cost the local economy—wait for it—\$136 million and 87,000 visitors every single year. Research has identified that we need between 300 and 400 new rooms every year by 2022 in order to realise our potential. But rather than dealing with this problem in isolation, the Newman government is addressing it with a whole-of-government approach by coordinating the efforts of government departments with private industry and local government. I am very pleased to say that we are starting to see the success of this joint effort pay off. In March I partnered with the Brisbane Lord Mayor to launch *A guide to hotel investment in Brisbane*. This guide is targeted at encouraging private sector investment here in Brisbane.

It has been many years since new hotels were built in Brisbane, and the growth in demand has not been matched by the growth in supply. Yesterday was great news for the city and for Queensland when I joined the Hon. Tim Mander, the Minister for Housing and Public Works, to announce that the Shayher group of companies was the successful bidder for the redevelopment of the former Supreme and District courts facility. As a minimum requirement for redevelopment of the site, Shayher Group is required to deliver a 190-room, five-star hotel building. However, this group has announced it proposes to build 320 rooms in the Brisbane CBD, recognising the potential opportunity that exists. That is 320 additional hotel rooms to allow visitors to stay overnight in our CBD and experience the diverse attractions and great events that Brisbane has to offer. I also remind the House of the Treasurer's good news last year that the Sheraton brand will return to Brisbane, with construction of its 246-room Four Points by Sheraton Brisbane in Mary Street. The Queensland government is serious about fixing the tourism industry—an industry that has suffered too long under the hands of the former Labor government. These new hotel rooms allow us to show the world that Queensland is a great state with great opportunities.

### **RACQ North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service, Funding**

**Mr KATTER:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. The Mount Isa based RACQ North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service is seeking financial assistance from the state government to upgrade coverage for the north-west to seven days. Although the service received state government approval to be included in the emergency helicopter network in 2011, it received no state funding for its operations while other rescue helicopter bases in the state received government funding. It raises \$1.3 million a year to fund itself for six days. It is seeking \$200,000 per year to fully fund this service seven days a week. It has already saved 33 lives in the first year of operation—

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member, that is a very long preamble. I am going to ask you to rephrase the question and cut it down and speak clearly, because there is detail in the question that is not able to be clearly heard. Please shorten the question.

**Mr KATTER:** I appreciate that, Madam Speaker.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I ask you to put the question again and shorten it.

**Mr KATTER:** The Mount Isa based RACQ North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service has saved 33 lives in the first year of operation. Can the minister tell me why, when every other rescue helicopter base in the state receives government funding, Mount Isa base does not?

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** I thank the honourable member for his question. All members would be aware that there are a whole range of helicopter rescue services throughout Queensland, and of course they are very much based on a community model and it is very important to ensure that we have an appropriate mantle of safety and coverage for communities right throughout Queensland. Indeed, there are a range of them right through the Torres Strait all the way down to Capricornia, Central Queensland, the Sunshine Coast and CareFlight. To complement that, there are other services which are provided to appropriately triage people and to repatriate them at a time of need and often involving tragic accidents and tragic circumstances. In some cases around Queensland there is a preference to use motor vehicles or fixed wing aircraft to deliver that particular service. That is the situation and that is what has been assessed in the case of the service that the honourable member is talking about.

Recently my department has undertaken—and prior to us coming into office under the previous government—a review of the sustainability of funding to community based helicopter rescue services in Queensland. I was not very happy with the way in which that review had been established and recently brought in some consultants to finalise that. In our discussions with the community based helicopter rescue services throughout Queensland we are now getting a large and significant consensus of view with regard to a new funding model going forward. Many of those helicopter rescue services provide an extraordinarily good job to Queensland and, obviously, we need to ensure that we have sustainability in their base funding and also appropriateness with regard to the overfly hours, which they do as well. Many of those do hundreds and hundreds of hours.

I know the honourable member may be disappointed with this answer. However, it is not beholden to the department of health in Queensland to step in and provide block funding to a helicopter service that establishes themselves under the guise of being a rescue helicopter service. In 2011, this service was recognised as being able to do ad hoc work for the department of health. Indeed, I understand since about July last year they have been contracted to undertake about nine fly hours, equivalent to around about \$30,000 to \$35,000. That decision has been made by local clinicians. Also, recently we have seen the withdrawal of funding available to that particular provider in north-west Queensland by one of their benefactors—a sponsor. I think the honourable member needs to consider how these services should be established. It is not the role of the state to step in and just bail them out.

*(Time expired)*

### Flood Recovery

**Mr BENNETT:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience. Will the minister please provide the House with an update on the flood recovery and explain how the government is increasing resilience with a limited amount of money?

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** Can I start by acknowledging the local member and indeed the role he has played in the hour of need for his community. He has been magnificent, as has the police minister, in their part of the world.

The question was in two parts, but let me start by speaking about the recovery effort. The member asked how the recovery effort is going. The answer is that it is going very well. I have to pay tribute to those local governments—not just Bundaberg and North Burnett but right across the state—that have rolled up their sleeves in a way that I have never seen before. The attitude from local government to want to get on and make this work has been wonderful.

I also acknowledge the work of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority. Gone are the days of the paper warfare that existed where a council would put in an application and then it would be assessed and then the QRA would come back and say, 'No, maybe, maybe this way, maybe that way' and then it would go back and forward. This time the Reconstruction Authority has been on the ground from day one and the argy-bargy that we have seen in years gone by has happened from day one rather than a trail of paper that is taking months. Of all the statistics that I can give there is one in my mind that crystallises how this recovery effort is going compared to the last one. In 2011, it took the Bundaberg council 18 months to get \$25 million worth of work to market. In 2014, it has taken four months to get \$40 million of work to market. If ever you need proof of what happens when two levels of government work together, it is that on the ground.

I acknowledge that there has been a huge social impact as well and the uncertainty and the fear in some communities as I have walked the streets in places like Mundubbera is very real. In places like Gympie, where businesses have flooded five times in two years, it is real. It is against that backdrop that I have discussed the need not just to replace like for like but to look at mitigation and to look at betterment. Whilst the fund that we have been able to secure for betterment is much less than we would have liked, today I can announce a further three projects to be funded out of that betterment fund for the Bundaberg Regional Council. They are for three projects in the member's electorate and three projects that he knows all too well. In fact, I have even inspected one with him. They are Gentle Annie Bridge, Barretts Road, and Blacks Road. In all cases, for a small investment upfront we can prevent what we have seen, which is over and over going back and doing the same culverts, the same bridges. In all cases it has prevented the community from going about their daily lives—from getting medical treatment, from going to school, from doing all of the things that we take for granted. So \$80 million may not be what we were chasing, but it is my great desire and my intention to make sure that we deliver huge value for money and show that there is a better way with disaster recovery.

## Goods and Services Tax

**Mr HOPPER:** My question is to the Premier. Given that the federal government has not ruled out a goods and services tax on fresh food and vegetables, will the Premier unequivocally rule out agreeing with the Commonwealth government to any increase on the GST or imposing a goods and services tax on any item that is not yet subject to this tax?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I start by pointing out to honourable members—to all in this place this afternoon—that one reason we still have this incompetent federal Labor government is the KAP. At a critical moment when there was a vote of no confidence, where was their fearless leader? Where was daddy? Daddy was absent, as he is so often, because he can tell you the problems but he never comes up with the solutions. The other day there was a meeting at Richmond. As the meeting went on and on, he shrunk further and further and further back into the crowd. He disappeared because he realised that he had lost control of his little agenda. He took Joe Ludwig up there. He should have stood up there and told them all that Senator Ludwig is there because he keeps them there. But Senator Ludwig—the cowardly poltroon who gave us the animal welfare crisis in the north—is there because Bob Katter keeps him there. And yes, I am angry. I am angry at these people who come in here and dress themselves up in this cloak of helping rural people, but they do not. The Katter party has kept the Australian Labor Party in office for many, many months. That is the fact.

So to the GST. What about it, I say to the member? We have made some comments and these are our comments. Before we will go leaping into the minutiae again—and the Labor Party is doing that with its scare campaign on the GST—the first thing we need to resolve is the whole issue of Commonwealth-state relations. I am talking about making sure that our Constitution works. The exciting thing is that last week Tony Abbott made a commitment that he would focus on sorting out how our federation works. We need to work out who does what in the year 2013, because, frankly, it is clouded. We have overlap and duplication and waste. We have the federal government trying to reach in and take over schools, as if it knows what it is doing. It could not build the school halls and it could not put insulation into people's roofs without burning them. It cannot stop the boats. It cannot build superclinics. But now it can run schools. My point is that we need to sort out who does what. The federal government needs to deal with its things, we need to deal with our things and then we can move into a rational discussion about the revenue to support the legitimate functions of the various levels of government. That is what we should be doing.

But I make my point that that debate could have started a lot earlier. You cannot have that debate with Julia Gillard. She is not interested. At the moment she is interested in photo ops in schools. We could have had that debate if the Katter party had voted to kick them out several weeks ago and we could be going to an election right now and Australians could have their say and get rid of the worst Australian federal government that I have seen in my lifetime.

## Emergency Services

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! I could not see who was interjecting then, but I am in the process of calling a member to ask a question. It should be clear by now that I am warning members under standing orders if they interrupt.

**Mr HOBBS:** My question is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. The minister recently visited a number of fire and ambulance stations in the south-west, including in my electorate of Warrego, where he handed over a number of vehicles. Could the minister please inform the House of any new infrastructure or equipment that has been delivered to south-west Queensland communities to improve their emergency service operations?

**Madam SPEAKER:** I call the minister for one minute.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** It is a great pleasure to answer a great question from the member for Warrego, a passionate member for the people of the south-west. It was great to visit many of the assets out there, but the No.1 asset of the communities of the south-west is its people. They have certainly been through adversity brought on over a number of years by the former state Labor government and its federal counterpart.


I did have the privilege of going through those centres—from Charleville to Roma, from Chinchilla to Dalby—to visit the fire, ambulance and police stations as well as the volunteers, the SES members. I had the privilege of attending a barbecue with a number of those SES members during

Volunteer Week. It was a great privilege to see the gold bars of the community, the volunteers, who come together to give of their time selflessly helping their community. They are the heart and soul of their communities. It was a great privilege for me as the Minister for Police and Community Safety to be there and say thank you on behalf of all of the people of Queensland for the great work that the emergency services do, as well as the work that the many volunteers do across the length and breadth of this state but particularly in the south-west.

## LIQUOR AND GAMING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 19 March (see p. 676)

### Second Reading

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.31 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I note that the committee tabled its report on 14 May 2013 and I now table a copy of the government's response to the committee report.

*Tabled paper:* Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 30—Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, government response [2669].

I thank also the stakeholders who took the time to make submissions to the committee's inquiry. The committee has made five recommendations on the bill. The government supports all five recommendations. I note the member for Rockhampton's statement of reservation, although no detail has yet been provided as to the reasons for this reservation or what issues there may be with the bill. In fact, on the point of statements of reservation, could I digress and make the point that when this government was in opposition and we provided statements of reservation we actually set out what our reservations were through the committee process. We actually said what we had reservations about. I note that in many statements of reservation the member for Rockhampton or honourable opposition members say, 'Here is our statement of reservation. We will explain to you later.' I do not think they understand the legislation and they have to wait until they work out what is going on. It is not until we come to this point in time—the anticipation nearly kills me—we finally work out where the opposition stand on all of these important matters.

**A government member:** Twenty-two staff is not enough. They need more staff.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable assistant minister at the back, I think it was. Someone interjected that they need more staff. I make the point that the opposition is the most overresourced—well resourced—opposition in Australia. For seven members of parliament they have about 22 staff members. If all they can do is concoct a statement of reservation that says 'we reserve our position' then what is the whole committee process for? If they do not have the guts to put forward what they are actually reserving their position on or dissenting on and leaving it to the very last minute then what is the whole committee process for? That is how the opposition—the most overresourced opposition in the country—do things. We know they are absolutely lazy about the whole legislative process.

I particularly note the first recommendation that the bill be passed. As I said in the explanatory speech, the passage of this bill will mean significant reductions in red tape for Queensland's clubs, hotels, restaurants, cafes, casinos and community groups which will provide many benefits for the broader community such as better community services and more enjoyment and employment opportunities. Secondly, the committee recommends that the government prepare guidelines to clarify best practice in relation to the service and the sale of alcohol at low-risk community events and ensures the guidelines are publicly available on the Department of Justice and Attorney-General's website. This is a sensible recommendation. The government endorses it. The government does not seek to dictate to community groups every detail of how to conduct their events by inflexible one-size-fits-all legislative provisions.

Can I digress again? I note the enthusiasm last night of my honourable ministerial colleague, the Hon. Andrew Cripps, in relation to the changes to vegetation management laws. My enthusiasm is equivalent to his enthusiasm for vegetation management laws. We are getting out of the business of telling community groups what they can and cannot do. This law is about making sure that community

groups can go and fundraise without government intervention, without government being at every step of every person's life when a rotary club wants to run a raffle, when a community group wants to have a local small show, when a rodeo wants to take place. It is about government getting out of the way, letting community groups get on with the job of doing what they do best. What situation have we got ourselves into in Queensland—the nanny state—when a P&C that wants to have a school trivia night has to pay \$57, fill out an application form for a community liquor permit and, if the numbers are assessable, have a security guard out the front to make sure the P&C members and the principal do not misbehave at the trivia night? That is what the Labor Party have done to this state. It is a nanny state. I am pre-empting what will happen because I am not sure whether those opposite support the bill—I hope they do—but in the event they do not this is all relevant. The Labor Party have put us in the nanny state we find ourselves in today where we are dictating to a P&C. Members will know why. Because the Labor Party do not trust the community. They do not trust teachers, they do not trust the president of the P&C, they do not trust principals of schools to hold these events without government intervention. It is the typical socialist way. Socialists say, 'We do not trust people. We have to hold their hand and make sure they get it right.' This LNP government believes in the individual and their capacity to have a social fun night without government intervention, regulation and red tape.

Minister Cripps last night was so enthusiastic about vegetation management. This is my vegetation management equivalent because we are freeing up communities to get on with the job and fundraise. When we sell this to our constituents we can now tell Rotary clubs that with the passage of the bill, if it goes through, they no longer have to have the bureaucracy of a liquor permit for their little fundraising event. At a P&C meeting I attended a few weeks ago at Meridan State College, a great local school in my electorate, they asked me when this legislation was going through because they have a school fete coming up. When I visited the Pacific Lutheran College open day a few weeks back, teachers asked me when the liquor laws were being revised because they have their school fete coming up. They love this stuff because government will get out of the way so they can get on with the job. They do not have the bureaucracy, red tape and the \$57 application fee.

If I can give a statistic to honourable members in this place, in 2011-12 we issued about 6,500 community liquor permits. Under these changes we are making today we will impact about 4,500 community groups that will no longer have to get community liquor permits. They will no longer have to fill out paperwork. Their hands will be washed of bureaucracy. Labor Party bureaucracy and red tape will be washed away because we believe in those community groups. I make the point that if anyone mucks up at these events the law is there to protect the citizens of this great state. If anyone assaults anyone or mucks up, the laws are there. Government does not need to intervene at the outset to make sure we know what is going on at every school across Queensland. We want people to free their capacity and get on with the job of raising money for their schools.

Safeguards have been built into the legislation. Not only do we have laws applicable to licensing and other criminal laws, if that is ever to happen, we have built some safeguards into the legislation. Much of the detail on how to manage liquor sales at fundraising events is best dealt with in guidelines that we can issue. Consistent with the committee's recommendations these will be made public and available online.

Thirdly, the committee recommends clause 152 of the bill be amended to ensure it is consistent with clause 144. Specifically, it recommends that the legislative provision should be clear that for the purposes of section 155AD—in the case where the holder of a commercial special facility licence has entered into an arrangement under section 153 of the Liquor Act with another person—the approved manager that is required to be present or reasonably available should be an employee of the other person and not the commercial special facility licence holder.

Again, I say to the committee that that is a sensible recommendation. Commercial special facility licensees, such as the Brisbane Airport or South Bank, sublet premises to other persons to sell liquor. I will propose an amendment to the bill to clarify that the person who is responsible for the sale of liquor is also responsible for ensuring that an approved manager is fulfilling their role in accordance with the legislation.

The bill also addresses important amendments to the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997 to close a gap in the legislation with the potential to delay or put at risk some key Queensland infrastructure projects. These are integral to the government's plan to drive Queensland forward as part of our four-pillar plan. When completed, the projects will provide infrastructure that improves the everyday lives of Queenslanders and will also enhance the experience of tourists to our great state.

The committee made two recommendations in relation to the amendments to the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997. Recommendation 4 was for clause 4 of the bill to be amended to clarify that a review under section 47B(2A)(b) of the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997 is only available because of a formal acquisition affecting the scheme. The government supports this recommendation as it was not the intent that a broadscale review right be granted under section 47B. Rather, the intent was that a right to apply for an order of a specialist adjudicator or QCAT for an adjustment of the contribution schedule for the scheme be available.

The intent of new section 47B(2A) is that this right is only available where an adjustment has been made to the contribution schedule attached to a new community management statement that has been recorded following a formal acquisition of land and the owner of a lot in the scheme believes the contribution schedule lot entitlements are not consistent with the deciding principle or are not just and equitable to the extent the deciding principle allows or, if there is no apparent deciding principle, are not just and equitable. Because it is possible to apply a wider interpretation to the proposed new section 47B(2A), an amendment during the consideration in detail stage of this bill will be moved to clarify the limits to this application right.

The final committee recommendation is that clause 5 of the bill be amended to clarify that the amended sections 51(7) and 51A(6) of the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997 will compel a constructing authority to include any changes to lot entitlements that have been requested by a body corporate under sections 51(5)(b) and 51A(4)(b) of that act when lodging a new community management statement. Clause 6 will also be similarly amended to affect the amendment to section 51A(6) noted by the committee. The government supports this recommendation and I will be moving an amendment during the consideration in detail stage of the bill to achieve this clarity. I would like to thank the Strata Community Australia Queensland branch for the written submission they made which assisted the committee during the committee's examination of the bill.

Additionally, I want to foreshadow that I intend to move a number of other minor amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill. I will propose a minor amendment in relation to country shows to the section that deals with community liquor permit exemptions. The bill provides for an exemption for fundraising events from the requirement to have a permit to sell liquor under the Liquor Act. However, this is limited to low-risk fundraising events that start and end on one day and where the sale of liquor is for not more than eight hours in one day.

We know however that there are many country shows that go over a two-day period or are on one day but go for longer than eight hours, which is an issue if they are selling alcohol. I will propose an amendment that will allow low-risk country shows to be exempt from these two restrictions. These shows are important cultural events and are often part of the fabric of many of our smaller rural and regional towns in Queensland. It is appropriate that these small important local community events are exempted even if they extend beyond eight hours or a single day. The Liquor Act will provide authority for a regulation to prescribe criteria which the show must meet to minimise any adverse effects on the health and safety and amenity of the community. This will ensure that it is only low-risk events that are exempted. All other exemption criteria that apply to other fundraising events will apply to country shows.

I will also propose a minor amendment to clarify that non-profit associations cannot hold a fundraising event that is exempted from the requirement to obtain a community liquor permit if they or an executive officer has been convicted in the last five years of an offence of selling or supplying liquor to a minor, in a licensed premises, public place or private home, under section 155A, 156 or 156A. Additionally, they will not be exempted if they or an executive officer has been convicted in the last five years of an unauthorised sale of liquor, as a licensee or otherwise, under section 169. This will disqualify the entity from being an eligible entity. The current provisions only apply to convictions for these offences if the person is a current or former licensee or permit holder. The intent of the amendment is to apply these provisions to all persons convicted of these offences, and so a minor change is required to the bill.

Two minor amendments will also be moved to amend a reference to a defined term in the Gaming Machine Act and change a cross-reference in the Liquor Act. Further amendments will also be proposed to the bill in relation to amendments which provide for the Queensland Sentencing Information Service known as QGIS. QGIS, which up until now has been managed by the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, does not currently contain certain highly sensitive transcripts. To ensure that this practice is continued, I will propose an amendment to ensure that the QGIS collection


does not include: any part of a record of a criminal proceeding that has been made while the court is closed under a provision of an act or an order made under a provision of an act requiring the court to be closed; and any part of the record of a criminal proceeding if a court makes an order prohibiting access to or the disclosure or publication of the recording.

Prior to starting the debate today, can I clarify for speakers on this bill today the late amendment that I am proposing to move. We offered the opposition a briefing on this, which I believe occurred a little while ago. Currently under this legislation to be exempt from requiring a community liquor permit the event must be held on one day or go for less than eight hours. To make sure that our small regional and rural shows that are low risk are exempted from complying with the requirements of the Liquor Act, I am proposing an amendment, which has not been foreshadowed until now but has been distributed, that essentially says that if a small country show meets certain criteria at a later date through regulation then we will also exempt that country show. It may be the case that a country show is a low-risk venue but it has a two or three day country event or has a one day show where they sell liquor from midday to midnight, which is 12 hours. They necessarily may not be exempt under this act because of the eight hour issue. However, the amendment I will move will make sure that frees up the agricultural, horticultural and cultural shows in rural and regional Queensland. They will have just as much right to be exempt from the Liquor Act.

Regional and rural communities will know this more than suburban shows, but regional shows may have a liquor stall and it has a hessian fence around it.

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** We do not cage people in in Longreach. The member for Gregory raises an important issue, though. This is the stupidity of the current law. Labor governments in the past have not trusted people to drink alcohol responsibly with their families. They put them all in the corner and put a hessian fence around them and hope for the best. We believe people are responsible and these show societies are responsible. They will be allowed to pull down the hessian fence and actually participate properly with their families at the shows as they ought to be able to do. However, if the show society, for instance, want to on their own account apply their own rules—and that is local community members deciding that—then that is completely a matter for them. The best part of this is that the government will move out of the way and we will let the community get on with the job and fundraise for those vitally important community groups that contribute so much to Queensland society that has made this state a great state to live and that we all want opportunities in. I commend the bill to the House and I look forward to the debate.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.49 pm): I thank the members of the committee who participated in the report in relation to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I also thank the Attorney for the briefing that was provided to my office. But in relation to the amendments we might seek some further clarification from his office, if he does not mind, just before we go into consideration in detail at a later stage this evening.

From the outset I want to say that the opposition will be supporting this bill but we will be raising a few issues. I am quite sure that the Attorney and his staff will be able to answer some of these issues in more detail. I note that the Attorney has tabled some amendments and I note the comments of the member for Gregory in relation to the fact that there is going to be a permit to sell alcohol over two days for country shows. That is my understanding from what the Attorney just said. Whilst I do not see any huge issue in relation to that, I do want to ask the Attorney what that criteria will be. Whilst I acknowledge that most people when they intend to go to these shows do expect to behave responsibly, as the member for Gregory pointed out, with their families, I do have some concerns about alcohol fuelled violence that could occur on the rare occasion. In relation to that matter, I would ask the Attorney if he could address in some detail the criteria and what safeguards will be put in place to ensure that there will not be any alcohol fuelled violence at these particular events.

**Mr Choat:** They're responsible people!

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! Member for Ipswich West, I am going to warn you under standing order 253A. That was a completely unnecessary interjection. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. In relation to the offences, I think the Attorney mentioned a second amendment that he was proposing where if a person had—please correct me if I am wrong—a conviction over the last five years they would be exempt from approval. If that is the case then we would have no problems with supporting that amendment. But I do want to know what the criteria is if you have an event over two days. Whilst I acknowledge that the

majority of people do act responsibly when around their families, there will be other people attending the event and my concern is of alcohol fuelled violence, especially when there are young children around these particular individuals. We all know that everyone goes there with good intentions, but it only takes one or two people to cause a problem, and that can then flow on to the event and make it uncomfortable for those people who are there who want to actually enjoy the show. I think we might be able to reach a compromise here tonight in relation to this—the responsible serving of alcohol and ensuring that it is a safe event for the families that attend these shows.

Whilst we are talking about travelling country shows, I want to point out that it was this government that actually shut down the travelling show school. I know that was an issue last year that we raised extensively in estimates. I was able to meet with those families.

**A government member:** What's the relevance?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The relevance is that we are talking about country shows. I will end on this point: it was the federal Labor government that actually came to the aid of the travelling show school and saved that school when the state government should not have touched that school in the first place. We were talking about nine school closures; it was actually 10 school closures.

I will not go into depth in relation to consultation on omnibus bills. I think that was raised extensively by some parts of the committee. We do accept in this parliament that we address omnibus bills. But sometimes there are issues in those bills that could be dealt with separately. That is probably the preferred method of the parliament.

I now move on to the substantive parts of the contents of the bill. The vast majority of the amendments contained in this bill relate to liquor and gaming. As the explanatory notes state, one of the purposes of the legislation is to 'reduce the regulatory burden on the liquor and gaming industries'. One of the red-tape reduction strategies in the bill is to exempt low-risk community organisations from requiring a permit to conduct not-for-profit events. This will include schools, community organisations such as Lions and Rotary clubs, and sporting organisations for one-off events.

The opposition supports moves that reduce the burden for volunteers working for the good of the community. All members of this House will be aware of the untold hours that go into organising each and every community event across their electorates, and many of the same people are involved in more than one of those organisations. However, we are not prepared to do so where safety is sacrificed in the name of red-tape reduction. This is particularly, as I mentioned previously in my comments, where children are concerned. These amendments have a sound basis but we are concerned about the impact on the amenity of these events for families, especially those with young children.

Both the Queensland Police Union of Employees and P&Cs Qld expressed concerns in their submissions to the committee about these amendments. What they are worried about—and the opposition echoes these concerns—is that, without any restrictions on or regulation of how these events are organised, community safety could be put at risk. Schools can often be large places. The schools will be permitted to serve alcohol for up to eight hours—some of those hours could be after dark. The responsibility for event organisers or for parents trying to supervise multiple children at the event then becomes quite onerous. If alcohol can be served and consumed across the entire venue, how can parents be sure that children will not be able to access alcohol from persons out of sight of the alcohol service area?

Without a designated area for the consumption of alcohol—an area that can be supervised by persons charged with that responsibility—the dangers are very real. The danger posed by abandoned glass bottles from alcohol is also very real, where empty bottles can be strewn around the school grounds, not only left broken for children to find that night in the dark but also carelessly disposed of in grass and bushes to be found the next school day by students. Could the Attorney perhaps explain in his reply how he can guarantee the safety of the community in relation to those two aspects of the bill and whether he considered the proposed amendments suggested by the union.

Insurance for the organisation might also be an issue. Just because something is not illegal or prohibited by law does not mean it is not negligent. Community organisations need to have guidelines to protect them when conducting these events. P&Cs Qld has recommended that guidelines be produced. I note that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General in its response to the submissions advised the committee that it will consider preparing guidelines 'in line with P&C Qld's recommendation' to clarify best practice. The department also noted—

The Department recognises that the recommendations of P&Cs Qld provide a sound basis for best practice for the supply of liquor in schools. However, the Department believes this can be achieved without further prescription in the legislation, as the amendments in the Bill already provide an effective framework, with safeguards to protect minors and community amenity.

However, even if guidelines were introduced, there is no requirement in the legislation for any such guidelines to be complied with. Therefore, there can be no action taken for noncompliance with the guidelines.

There are consequences prescribed in the legislation for noncompliance with the specific criteria in the bill. If, during the course of the event, an investigator or police officer considers that the school or community organisation has not complied with the criteria, the investigator or police officer may give a notice stating what must be done to conform with the criteria of the exemption or that the sale of liquor must cease immediately. If such a notice is served, this means the community organisation cannot qualify for the exemption for six months. It also means that, where a community organisation auspices an event where other groups have stalls or their own areas, each of the groups, provided they fit within the criteria set out in the act, will be able to come within the exemption. This means many organisations can benefit from the new provisions. The exemptions in themselves are a sound idea, but the opposition is just looking for some guarantee from the Attorney that community safety will not be jeopardised.

The bill also contains an exemption from a liquor licence for a non-profit group that has alcohol as a prize in a fundraising raffle. There are some restrictions such as the prize must be worth no more than \$1,000, tickets must only be sold to and prizes delivered to adults who cannot be unduly intoxicated, and the proceeds of the raffle must go to either the objects of the non-profit group or the benefit of the community.

These amendments make good sense, and there are sufficient protections contained in the bill to ensure community safety is not jeopardised. The opposition has no objections to these amendments. Similarly, there are amendments which allow hospitals and nursing homes to serve a limited amount of alcohol to patients. This brings these establishments into line with retirement villages which have a similar exemption allowing them to serve a limit of two standard drinks to residents and guests. Some hospitals already serve a small amount of alcohol, usually beer or wine, with their meals so this clarifies the law for those places. There has been some concern expressed by certain stakeholders about hospitals, in particular, serving alcohol to patients. The National Alliance for Action on Alcohol stated in its submission—

The NAAA is very alarmed by the proposal to exempt the supply and sale of liquor to hospital patients from the *Liquor Act*. Around 30,000 Queenslanders are hospitalised each year because of injuries and diseases attributable to alcohol consumption. The NAAA is astonished that, in the face of this enormous drain on the State's hospital system, the Queensland Government is considering ways to increase the access and availability of alcohol to hospital inpatients. This is a senseless proposal and should be abandoned.

They are the words of the National Alliance for Action on Alcohol. In a letter from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General dated 19 April 2013, it states—

The provision of any liquor to patients would also be subject to the determination of the administering health professionals.

As that is not contained in the bill, could the Attorney address during his speech in reply where that protection is contained? Some commercial operators have suggested the restriction of two standard drinks is too low for hospitals and nursing homes as they feel it is also too low for other exemptions currently existing, for example, for hairdressers and limousine operators. As the department explained in its response, and the opposition supports this view, the exemptions are 'not intended to allow operators to set up quasi bars not regulated by the act'. For this reason, a limit of two standard drinks is currently considered appropriate. Any operator who wishes to supply more than two standard drinks is entitled to apply for a liquor licence and comply with the regulation that goes with providing more alcohol than is currently allowed under the exemption. This exemption, however, will save hospitals and nursing homes up to \$500 per year and the inconvenience of applying for a licence where they wish to restrict the supply in the manner provided.

I also note with interest the amendment that is extending the exemption for liquor sold at Parliament House. Section 12 of the *Liquor Act* is amended by this bill to exempt a sale of liquor in Parliament House by permission and under the control of the parliament. This means that the sale of alcohol in the Parliament House Gift Shop and other areas of parliament will be excluded from the provisions of the *Liquor Act*. Let us hope there is a lot of responsible drinking that occurs in the House.

**Mr Bleijie:** I think the Clerk put that one in there.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I can speak for my team. You can talk for your own team, Attorney-General. As the act currently stands, the exemption in this section applies only to the supply of liquor in a refreshment room of Parliament House. In fact, I note that coffee outsells alcohol in Parliament House by something like four times. The coffee machines get a very good work-out here on any parliamentary sitting day.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I take the Attorney's interjection and say to him in response that I think members of government enjoy frequenting the bar on a regular occasion.

I turn now to the amendments in the bill removing the need to advertise for liquor and gaming licences in the *Government Gazette* and newspapers. The reason given for these amendments is that the vast majority of objections come from people who have seen on-site signs. Few members of the public read or are even aware of the *Government Gazette* and the cost of advertising is up to \$1,500. Instead of newspaper advertising, applications will have to be published on the department website. This procedure will commence on 1 January 2014 to allow the department to prepare the website for this new requirement. Whilst the argument in relation to the *Government Gazette* is understandable, people will often read their local newspaper and see the advertisement for the application. This may be the first time they know of a licence being applied for in their local area. By only requiring advertising on the website, this eliminates this important method of public consultation. People would have to be aware of the existence of an application before they even go on to the website. As the submission from the National Alliance for Action on Alcohol states—

... we strongly support providing local communities in Queensland with a greater say in liquor licensing decisions ... Local communities are often well placed to inform decision-making in relation to local alcohol matters, particularly liquor licensing, as they often have in-depth knowledge of the local circumstances and context.

The response letter from the department states—

The removal of the requirements to advertise in newspapers and in the *Government Gazette* reduces red tape and modernises the process by requiring notifications online. The Department does not believe this decreases the ability for the community to have input, as the internet is widely available. On-site advertising will remain for all but those venues deemed low risk.

With all due respect, this is not a logical argument for the reasons I have already outlined. A reduction in community consultation should be of concern to community members. In 2010 the Law, Justice and Safety Committee released its report into the inquiry into alcohol related violence. Both the Manager of Government Business and the Attorney-General served on that committee. Recommendation 29 states—

That there be legislative amendment to ensure a greater emphasis on community consultation and opinion in the application process, with a licence to be granted only if, on balance overall, the grant of the licence will benefit the community.

This amendment reduces community consultation, in direct contradiction of the report's recommendation. The reduction in community consultation in this bill under the guise of red-tape reduction goes even further. Applications for low-risk premises such as restaurants, cafes and bottle shops will be exempt through amendments in the bill from having to advertise for public objections if they are not applying to trade outside ordinary trading hours, which is after midnight for restaurants and cafes and after 10 pm for bottle shops, and there is no amplified entertainment provided at the venue. This exemption from advertising even applies to on-site advertising.

The bill also removes the need for applicants for restaurant and cafe licences to complete a risk assessed management plan if they do not trade after 12 midnight. A RAMP is a submission lodged during the application process requiring applicants to detail the employment of security, suitability of lighting and noise mitigation on the premises as well as the availability of public transport. The commissioner will still have a discretionary power to require otherwise exempt premises to prepare a risk assessed management plan for the approval of the commissioner where it is considered appropriate in order to ensure reasonable compliance with the Liquor Act or to minimise alcohol related disturbances.

Many of the community organisations opposed this amendment on the basis that it does not have regard to the damaging effect of alcohol on the community, and it extends the provision of alcohol in suburban areas close to residents without informing the general public and allowing them to have a say. The amendments are not even supported by all industry organisations. The BARS Consultants, Commercial Licensing Specialists and RSA Liquor Professionals also expressed concerns in their submission to the committee. As they submitted—

Whilst the vast majority of restaurant premises are low risk, the removal of easily achieved and best practice procedures such as a RAMP, strips away almost any deterrent to a rogue trader obtaining a restaurant license.

The department has responded that—

... safeguards are in place to guard against this, as the exemption is restricted to operators who close before midnight, and the Bill allows the Commissioner to require a RAMP if there is a potential risk to public safety or amenity.

The opposition cannot accept the proposition that the concerns should be allayed because the exemption only applies to premises which close by midnight. Significant disturbance to a community can occur before midnight. RAMPs are considered best practice, even by industry. To remove the need for advertising and a risk assessed management plan is more than red-tape reduction and the government should reconsider these particular proposals.

**Mr Bleijie:** No.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The Attorney can have his response later. In their submission to the committee BARS Consultants, Commercial Licensing Specialists and RSA Liquor Professionals recommended an amendment to the bill to require that a risk assessed management plan form part of the accompanying documents to support the office of the department for its consideration of a licence but the requirement of the commissioner to approve the RAMP for all licence types is removed. I understand that is the current requirement for community impact statements under the act. Whilst that may appear to be a waste of resources for the applicant of a licence, the submission contends that, 'the reality is that a RAMP is a management plan that should be developed by all licensees regardless of whether they are low or high risk'. It is certainly the case that licensees should consider all issues that are currently contained in a RAMP to consider the risk that their licence application will pose.

The opposition believes there is some merit in this suggested proposal. There are matters that should already be considered before an application for a licence is made so the burden would not be too great. Coming from the industry as it is, and balanced with a degree of protection this would provide to the community, it should be considered by the government rather than being rejected out of hand. But not even content with the attack on community consultation and abolishing the need for a risk assessed management plan, this bill goes even further. The bill enables the commissioner to exempt certain applicants of restaurant and cafe licences from completing a community impact statement.

Many of the stakeholders who made submissions to the committee have expressed concern about the commission being given the authority to waive the requirement for this at restaurants and cafes. It is their view that operators who sell liquor from such premises should be required to demonstrate that they have properly considered the impact of their business upon their local community. This is similar to the previous argument about the risk assessed management plans. If licence applicants should be considering these issues in any event, the burden cannot be so great as to outweigh the confidence that the community would gain in this process.

One of the other amendments contained in the bill is to remove the requirement that currently exists for an approved managers' register to be kept for all licensed premises. Since 1 January 2009 approved managers have replaced liquor nominees under the Liquor Act as the person responsible for ensuring alcohol is supplied or possessed in line with the licence. Approved managers are required to undergo probity checks and to have completed the responsible management of licensed venues course. Currently, licensees are required by the act to keep a register which states the name of the approved manager on duty as well as the dates and starting and finishing times of each shift worked. This bill removes that requirement. It does not affect the requirement for licensees to have an approved manager on premises during operating hours and to keep approved manager certificates available on the premises.

One of the submissions expressed concern about the removal of this requirement and felt the register should be retained as it ensures that licensed premises are required to have responsible and qualified personnel at the premises at all times to manage the premises. It seems that they may have been under a misapprehension about the amendment. There is no change to the requirement for a responsible, qualified person to be on premises; they still must be there. Existing licensees' employment records would also be able to establish whether or not a person was employed to work and was working at the premises at any given time. The opposition considers that registers may have been an unnecessary administrative burden and a duplication of existing employment records kept by licensees and, therefore, does not oppose this amendment.

One of the more concerning aspects of this bill, however, is that it will abolish the Community Investment Fund and the Sport and Recreation Benefit Fund. The Community Investment Fund collects a percentage of gaming machine taxes from licensees. The money collected by the

Community Investment Fund has been of significant benefit to the community. It is used to fund research into gambling and social issues arising from gambling and to provide grants to community groups and for major public sporting facilities. The fund also provides funding for the operations of the Office of Regulatory Policy and the department in relation to risk and harm minimisation. When the fund is abolished, moneys will instead be paid directly into, and be distributed from, consolidated revenue. In the explanatory notes the government has given an assurance that the amendments will not affect the continuance of activities funded by the Community Investment Fund, particularly the various community benefit funds.

Currently, all annual fees paid by the liquor industry in excess of \$18 million are paid into the Community Investment Fund. As the submission from BARS Consultants, Commercial Licensing Specialists and RSA Liquor Professionals contends, the moneys from this fund go to finance not only community initiatives and grants but also, as the then minister said when the fund was established in 2008—

The new fees will ensure that licensees contribute appropriately to the direct on-going costs to Government of administering, managing and regulating the sale, supply and consumption of liquor at the premises; to harm minimisation initiatives aimed at changing social and cultural attitudes towards alcohol consumption, particularly among young Queenslanders; and backed-up with additional inspectors to ensure licensees are under no doubt as to the Government's commitment to ensuring the safety and amenity in and around licensed premises.

Although the government has pledged that there will be no change to the current practices, once the money is paid into consolidated revenue there can be no guarantee that it will be paid out in accordance with the current practice. So my question to the Attorney-General is: as he has given an assurance to the committee, will he give an assurance to this House that the same amount of moneys that are paid in will be the same amount of moneys that are paid out? We are not the only people to hold this view. As BARS Consultants, Commercial Licensing Specialists and RSA Liquor Professionals raised in their submission, they also hold concerns regarding the impact of this amendment. The committee report states—

In particular, these organisations considered the current mechanism whereby monies are paid into the CIF ensures the administration of OLGR is not '*left to ... "Whole of Government" budgetary considerations*' and ensures the OLGR is sufficient staffed and resourced with monies used in a '*defined manner to benefit the industry and community*.' It is their view that where monies are '*absorbed into consolidate revenue*' they 'are likely never to be returned to the current system'.

The bill is a dead giveaway of their intent. It does not even protect payments where the Treasurer or the minister had decided before these amendments take effect to make a payment from the fund and the payment has not yet been made. The bill provides that the payment 'may' be made in those circumstances. Surely the bill should require that the payment be made by using the word 'shall'.

The next set of amendments that I intend to address is the amendments to the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997. These amendments relate to compulsory acquisition of body corporate land by a constructing authority. The Airport Link, Gold Coast Rapid Transit and Cross River Rail are all projects that pass through community title scheme land. These projects apparently affect some 18 to 79 community title schemes. Under the act as it currently stands, if a constructing authority intends to resume body corporate land under the Acquisition of Land Act 1967, it must obtain the endorsement of the relevant body corporate for the premises to record a new community management statement. There is currently no enforcement regime in place in the circumstances where a body corporate fails to comply with its obligations under this process. This can have significant consequences for the project that would prevent the final step of the registration process being carried out by the constructing authority. It was suggested in a submission from Strata Community Australia that, as currently drafted, a lot owner may be able to seek a review through QCAT or a specialist adjudicator of the entire contribution schedule lot entitlement rather than a review limited to the changes resulting from the formal acquisition and that this is not the intention of the bill.

In its response, the department has also agreed that greater clarification may be useful in order to avoid this unintended consequence. The committee has therefore recommended that an amendment be made to the bill to the effect that a review under this particular section, section 47B(2A)(b) of the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997, only be available because of a formal acquisition affecting the scheme.

A further concern that was raised by Strata Community Australia relates to the current drafting of the bill, which does not compel a constructing authority to incorporate changes in the community management statement which have been requested by the body corporate. They therefore suggest

that the bill ought to be amended to expressly compel the constructing authority to include the requested changes. The committee supported this suggestion and recommended that such an amendment be made. I am pleased to see that the Attorney-General has accepted the recommendations made by the committee to this effect.

There are further amendments in this bill that transfer responsibility for the Queensland Sentencing Information Service to the Supreme Court library. The amendments also extend access to QGIS to a number of different groups, including prosecuting agencies, community legal centres and legal practitioners. They also provide protection to staff who collate the QGIS database from liability for any offence and ensure that access to, and use of, personal information available on QGIS is restricted.

The Queensland Law Society has suggested that restricted information that has been made available about juvenile offenders or victims, for example, should be de-identified. The department has explained that only specified categories of entities will be given access to restricted information on the database, and access to the database will only be granted for limited purposes and will be the subject of a written agreement. Misuse of information obtained from the database will be an offence. These protections should put to rest the fears of the Law Society, and the opposition supports these amendments.

The Queensland Law Society has suggested that consideration be given to enable the Queensland Law Society's members and educational and research bodies to have access so that much needed research on sentencing matters regarding criminal justice may be undertaken. The department has explained that the Supreme Court library committee has the power to authorise access by QLS entities to all parts of the QGIS database that do not contain restricted information. The committee may allow full access to individual members of the QLS who fall within particular categories. This would include access to restricted information contained in the collection of sentencing remarks. University libraries, researchers and members of the media may be provided with access to any part of the database that does not contain restricted information.

We move now to the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 that are also contained in this bill. These amendments cause some concerns to the opposition, and I will now address those concerns.


The bill amends the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 to defer 'uncommenced' amendments to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 so that it will harmonise with the national model. The Work Health and Safety Act commenced on 6 June 2011. The 'uncommenced' amendments to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 were postponed by regulation for a period of two years and are now due to automatically commence on 7 June 2013. Electrical safety is not a concern for this government. As I mentioned earlier, amendments were made to the Electrical Safety Act last year to abolish the position of the Commissioner of Electrical Safety, as well as the Electrical Safety Education Committee and the Electrical Education Committee.

This followed on from last year's budget, when it was announced that Workplace Health and Safety Queensland and the Electrical Safety Office inspectorate's numbers will be reviewed so as to bring them into line with Victoria and New South Wales. This review means a massive reduction in inspectorate numbers and savings of \$3 million over two years. The department is conducting a review of the Electrical Safety Regulation 2002. As we have seen, any review of electrical safety could mean a reduction in safety protections. The government's desire to delay the 'uncommenced' provisions until this review is completed can only mean that they want to cut back the protection provided by these provisions.

**Mr Bleijie:** Wrong!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I take the Attorney's interjection. He says it is wrong. I would ask him to give a detailed explanation in his reply and address these issues that are of concern to us. This is something that the opposition is very concerned about. The protection of electrical workers—in fact, everyone—is far too important to dismiss lightly. We would like a full explanation. I would like to hear what the Attorney has to say.

This completes my comments on the specific amendments contained in the bill. The concerns which I have expressed during this debate are real and have been expressed by members of both the community and the industry, as has been outlined in detail in my response. I would ask the Attorney to kindly address those concerns in his speech in reply and to reassure Queenslanders that steps purportedly taken in the name of red-tape reduction are not in fact reductions in regulations which serve to lessen the safety of our community.

 **Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (4.25 pm): The Leader of the Opposition has raised matters on which I wish to comment, so I rise to make my contribution to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Bill 2013.

The first matter that I wish to address, and which is hot in my mind, relates to the submissions received and some of the conclusions drawn from those submissions and which were highlighted by the Leader of the Opposition. I need to explain what my understanding is of cause and effect and correlation. A reading of the submissions of the AMA and the Queensland Police Union shows a mixing of the meanings of correlation and cause and effect. I am specifically referring to the taboo of the serving of alcohol to hospital patients and the reasoning that this will cause them to become alcoholic. I cannot quite see the cause-and-effect connection there. It is more of a correlation in the sense that there are people in the community who do consume alcohol for many reasons and there are people in hospital who are alcoholic, but that does not necessarily mean that there is a cause and effect. The reality is that alcoholics are more likely to be admitted to hospital, but there is no cause and effect in relation to those two premises. One needs to keep that in mind whilst reading the submissions.

The AMA—and I thank the AMA for its submission—does something very similar. Its submission commences with the statement that there is too much alcohol in our society and therefore the laws should not be relaxed. I am having difficulty in understanding the cause-and-effect link. The reality of life is that there may well be too much alcohol in society, and consuming too much alcohol is not something I agree with, but I do not think that can be blandly said without going into the reasons for it. I do not think it can be said that there is too much alcohol in our society so therefore anything that takes red tape away and creates an imbalance will lead to more alcoholism. I am not prepared to accept that is a reasonable link or a correlation.

As an example, I will take censorship. As our society has matured over the past 10, 15, 20 or 25 years, censorship laws have changed. They have not become tougher; if anything, as society has matured, they have become less restrictive. I am sure that most people in this House would agree with me in that regard.

That is not to say that we can do anything, because as our society matures that will evolve. And that is what happens with laws. When government looks at changing laws it looks for a problem. What is the problem here? The problem is in relation to the amount of red tape. I refer to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland report released in July 2009 titled *Blueprint for fighting Queensland's over-regulation*. A couple of statements contained in the report have certainly resounded within me and tend to summarise what has been happening. The report states—

The single greatest thing a business can do to enhance the wellbeing of our state's community is to provide secure ongoing employment.

That is one factor we need to take into account in respect of this balance. It goes on—

The difficulty with red tape is that each individual regulation can normally be justified by Government as being in the public interest, however, when we sum all these individual regulations together it creates a staggering regime that essentially blunts business from growing and employing.

The report points to the government agency of the Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing, as it was then called, as having the highest level of regulation in Queensland. At page 10 the startling statement was made that only four per cent of businesses believed that the Bligh government communicated new or changed regulation and business compliance requirements very well. Another statistic in this report was that 38.9 per cent believed there was inadequate communication of new developments and regulatory reviews. This backdrop illustrates why there needs to be a check—stopping and taking account of how regulations have changed. In fact, the 2012 report of the DestinationQ tourism forum also identified the same issue of red tape being a burden on business.

As I understand the statistics, in July 2009 the number of people employed within the Queensland Public Service was at an all-time high. Even with an ability to investigate, there was no evidence that alcohol was a problem in respect of the areas this bill deals with. Now that we know the problem, the question is: how do we address it?

The government has identified that the problem really is the amount of red tape that has accumulated over a period of time. Perhaps we need to look at other countries in which red tape has been a similar problem—that is, you make one or two changes but when you sum up the lot you realise that there is really more than one change and it has become such a burden that business has now said, 'Enough is enough. Let's take stock of what the regulation is and make some adjustments to it.' That is not an unreasonable approach, because similar comments are being made in other

places around Australia and across the world. For example, Victoria and South Australia have both had the idea that there is too much regulation. As I understand it, South Australia in particular has taken huge steps to reduce the regulatory burden regarding liquor and gaming. The UK, Canada, British Columbia and the Netherlands also identified the problem of red tape and have taken steps to alleviate it in order to allow business to do what it does best. We know anecdotally that when we go to a cafe or to a social function there are no difficulties. There have not been and are unlikely to be.

It has been identified that there are some common elements involved in this cause of reducing red tape—things like political leadership. That is certainly what is involved in this process. It is a matter of looking at the evidence and determining that something needs to be done. There is also an element of determining the baseline of existing regulatory burden, and we have done that. We have determined that it is simply too high for business and it rather treats our fellow Queenslanders as something less than mature. Then we must establish the targeted reductions, and that is happening with this bill. This bill is comprehensive, it is balanced and it targets the problem exactly. Another thing you have to do is tell stakeholders what you have done or what you are doing. That goes back to the previous government not communicating what it intended to do and why it was doing it.

A startling fact that I uncovered as part of my research is that since 1 July 1992 the Liquor Act has been amended 70 times, and a substantial number of amendments were actually made in one year. For instance, in 2004 the Liquor Act 1992 was amended four times and in 2005 it was amended five times. The point I make is that the previous government saw this area as one which required legislative change. When you take stock and look at the sum effect of the 70-odd amendments you see that clearly it has gone too far.

The amendments contained within this bill are really a first go at red-tape reduction. Of course, the process is both extensive and formidable for any government attempting to undertake red-tape reform. Why should we do away with the requirement for advertising applications in local newspapers and government gazettes? It seems to me it is because it is ineffective. Very few people read the *Government Gazette*. In fact, I suspect that if I conducted a straw poll today I would find that about 99 per cent of people had not read the *Government Gazette*. In terms of newspapers, perhaps some people read the obituaries. Maybe some read the public notices.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr BERRY:** The Leader of the House indicates that he reads the obituaries in the *Courier-Mail*.

**A government member:** And the horse racing.

**Mr BERRY:** Indeed. In the law area we abolished advertising when it came to transmissions by death, when one lodged the transmission with the titles office. The evidence was that nobody was reading the paper. That seems to be the state of play here. If we know these things anecdotally, why do we not do something about it? They are just extra burdens that businesses need to bear. The reality of life is that Queensland is a mature state, that we are evolving. Our laws ought to evolve at the same rate and keep pace with the maturing of our society. It has been mentioned that these sorts of measures can cost as much as \$2,000. Quite frankly, \$2,000 for licence application advertising is far too much for any business.

The evidence is quite clear that small business provides employment opportunities, and we need to take stock of our laws to ensure that we do not unduly fetter that employment aspect. But as I have said before, it is all about balance in that we have to ensure that these laws are sound in application. We know that when most people go to a restaurant or to a ground they behave, and that leads to the other issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition—that is, what I call the one-person test, and we see it so often. We cannot change a law because one person might disagree with it.

**Mr Dillaway:** Nanny state.

**Mr BERRY:** A nanny state; thank you, member for Bulimba. The reality of life is that we should always have a mature debate and that debate means that we cannot make laws to satisfy 100 per cent of the population. We do it for the majority, and that is the consideration that has been made here.

It seems obvious to me that it is inappropriate for organisations which have as their main purpose serving meals to have risk assessed management plans and community impact statements, and, for that matter, as I have said, to undertake public advertising. It just simply is not relevant. I note that of the 139 restaurant licence applications considered in 2012 not one was rejected and less than five per cent attracted any objection when a licence condition was imposed. That in itself is a significant factor. Again, when restaurants are located away from schools and are located in shopping

strips or commercial areas, that has to be an area where advertising is considered to be irrelevant. But, of course, it is like all things: there is balance, and perhaps when they want to locate near a school there might be different rules that come into play.


Removing community liquor permits is also a common-sense approach in a mature society. The reality of life is that the majority of Queenslanders do consume alcohol sensibly and maturely. If that is the position—if that premise is correct—then why do we not change those laws to reflect that? There are other provisions about removing courses because the Commonwealth vocational education and training legislation will actually then set the standard.

The matter that perhaps most concerns me as it affects my constituents in Ipswich in terms of having the greatest impact is the exemption of community groups that apply for community liquor permits for low-risk events, and the Attorney referred to shows. The Ipswich Show was held on Friday, Saturday and Sunday last week. It would have been an appropriate course in some instances for this law to be in place, but this is perhaps not as relevant to Ipswich because the show society has a liquor licence. Queensland is such a regional state in that the population is diverse and spread throughout Queensland and the local shows, the local horseraces, the local Rotary, Lions and sporting clubs ought to have some freedom by which they are able to raise money. The portal through which a non-profit organisation must pass to avoid a breach of these provisions is eminently sensible. In terms of the regional nature of the shows, the member for Whitsunday, who is in the House, tells me that his constituents run a show. The member for Gregory's constituents have a show, and I understand that show is in Longreach—the place my grandparents came from. The member for Keppel's constituents have a show. So it is quite extensive. I might say that my mother went to St Ursula's at Yeppoon.

**Mr Costigan:** Good school!

**Mr BERRY:** Indeed. Notwithstanding, my mother came out all right. Perhaps I will not elaborate on that. Effectively, the event must be one-off—that is not unreasonable; it must be between 7 am and midnight and for not more than eight hours in a single day, subject to those amendments of course; and the sale proceeds must be for the community event. It is eminently sensible for these provisions to pass. As I said, I have looked at the submissions made to the committee and the arguments put forward. With the greatest of respect to all of those submitters, the case has not been made that this will increase alcohol consumption in Queensland. In fact, the mature way in which Queenslanders conduct themselves is a big reason these laws ought be passed.

I want to take the opportunity to thank my committee. It did a fantastic job considering this bill; it was quite extensive and we had a lot of work to do. I thank the Attorney for his input in relation to it. I consider that this bill is measured, tempered and ought to be passed. I certainly commend it to the House.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (4.45 pm): I rise to speak to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I start by endorsing the comments of my colleague the member for Ipswich regarding Ursuline girls. My mother went to St Ursula's at Dutton Park, which is where the Catholic Education Commission is now located. I wholeheartedly endorse his comments that Ursuline girls do turn out perfectly well.

I thank the committee secretariat. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee secretariat does a fantastic job of supporting committee members. We are a particularly busy committee. We like to be kept busy, but we would not be able to do our work without the great support it offers. I again pay tribute to it and thank it for its help and support. Of course, I thank my committee colleagues, ably led by the member for Ipswich along with the member for Ipswich West, the member for Bulimba, the member for Toowoomba North as well as members of the opposition. We would not be able to complete our reports if it were not for those in our community and in the public who take the time to make submissions to these bills, so I thank them.

First and foremost, this bill honours a commitment that this government made to the people of Queensland. One of the first things that we said that we would do is cut red tape for the people of Queensland, and that is exactly what this bill does. I acknowledge in absentia the Assistant Minister for Finance, Administration and Regulatory Reform, the member for Nanango, who has done a fantastic job of helping us find red tape to cut. One of the first things we did was establish an expert panel to look specifically to see what red tape we could cut from this area. As a result, we have the bill before the House today. It is important to note that this expert panel was indeed made up of people from the industry and community who know exactly what it is that that industry and businesses in that industry need. That is a sign of how committed this government is to ensuring that the red tape

we cut is red tape that is actually going to make a difference. The Minister for Small Business would appreciate just how much cutting red tape really does make a difference for small businesses in our communities.

I have already highlighted the benefits for business, but it is also important to note this this will have benefits for families and communities. As we all know, this government is committed to supporting families and communities. This legislation will allow industry to become more competitive and enable them to operate more freely, and that can only be a good thing. We all appreciate that small business in particular keeps this economy going, and anything that we can do to make business easier for them and to allow them to operate more freely and without encumbrance is a good thing. This amendment legislation includes the establishment of a single Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming, and this means a streamlined decision-making process when it comes to licence applications. Not only will this save people time; it will mean that people have a much clearer idea of where they need to go so they do not go to the wrong department, for example.

We have also removed any impediments in low-risk areas so that we can ease the burden of overregulation. Time and time again we have seen that the former Labor government and the federal Labor government do not understand the burden that regulation, and particularly excessive regulation, places on small business. Anything that we can do that removes excessive regulation is a good thing for business which, of course, in turn is a good thing for our community and a good thing for families.

It is also important to note—and this is particularly something that I am very proud of—that we have made moves to support not-for-profit groups in our communities. Groups such as Rotary, Lions and P&Cs, those people who organise school fetes, country race days or country shows or even sporting events for local sporting clubs will no longer need to apply for community liquor permits. That means that about 4,000 fewer people will have to pay for community liquor permits, 4,000 fewer people will have to go through the arduous task of filling out the paperwork, 4,000 fewer people will have to go through the process of filing the paperwork and 4,000 fewer people will have to go through waiting for that paperwork to be processed and for their permit to come through. That change is going to have a significant effect on community groups right across Queensland.


Community groups that are organising such events just want to organise a fun day for people so that families can come out, so that communities can come together. If we start imposing massive encumbrances on them we are really starting to affect the community feeling and we are really starting to affect the way in which people are able to freely enjoy their lives. The fact that people will be able to organise and easily hold these low-risk events is fantastic, because it means that my local Lions club can hold a fundraiser, such as a trivia night, or the local P&C can put on something at the school. It means that they do not have to worry about it and it means that they can focus on making sure that they have the best event they can to raise the most money for their community.

It is also important to note that this particular exemption also retains safeguards so that we can ensure that people in our community do the right thing. The reality is that a very, very small percentage of people sometimes do the wrong thing. It is a great shame that those people will ruin a good day out for the rest of our community. But police officers, for example, will still be able to ensure that responsible service of alcohol is maintained, that people are not being served alcohol if they are under the age of 18 et cetera. So I think it is important to note, particularly in light of the comments of the opposition leader, that there are important safeguards in this legislation so that people do not do the wrong thing and they do not ruin a good day out for people in our community.

The member for Ipswich touched on the fact that we now have removed the requirement for liquor and gaming applications to be published in local newspapers and in the *Government Gazette*. This will save some applicants up to \$1,500. That is a significant amount of money, particularly for some small businesses where the bottom line is quite tight and there is not always excess money. So \$1,500 is a significant amount of money for them. But importantly, it will save businesses significant time in having to make these applications. Also, low-risk cafes, bottle shops and restaurants will no longer have to advertise for objections when they are seeking a licence. However, it is important to note that the commissioner will retain the discretion in circumstances where he thinks it is appropriate to require advertising—for example, if someone is applying for a licence or a permit near a school or near a church.

As I said at the start of my contribution, the government is committed to making sure that we can cut red tape and that we can cut the regulatory burden that has been hamstringing the people in our communities for far too long and has left small business hamstrung for far too long. As a government, it is incumbent on us to do anything that we can to make it easier for businesses to do well so that they can continue to support their communities.

When I was preparing this speech I thought that what the government is doing is a little akin to Lady Macbeth washing her hands of the blood of Duncan and Lady Macduff and Banquo. We are washing the hands of Queenslanders of unnecessary red tape. We are washing the hands of Queenslanders of unnecessary regulation. We are washing the hands of Queenslanders of the unnecessary burden that has been placed on them for far too long by failed Labor governments that just do not understand what it means when you impose excess regulations and excess burdens. This is good legislation. It is not only good for business but also good for local communities. I support wholeheartedly this legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (4.54 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, introduced into the House by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, the honourable member for Kawana, on 19 March this year. This bill was appropriately referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, which reported back to the House on 14 May.

Since coming into government in March last year, this LNP government has introduced a raft of legislation in line with its commitments to the people of Queensland prior to the election. This bill is yet another example of a government determined to reduce red tape and regulation. As we have heard from a number of honourable members already, we want to get out of the way and out of the pockets of small businesses and let them get on with what they do best: creating jobs and delivering products and services.

The main objectives of the bill are to amend the legislative framework regulating the liquor and gaming industries to reduce the burden on those industries and ensure that the legislature's original policy intent is upheld and that the law is clear and effective. There are also a number of amendments to various fair trading, court and work health and safety legislation to streamline the government's administrative and financial processes. In my short contribution I intend to focus on the changes relating to the liquor and gaming provisions.

Whilst in opposition my colleagues and I were relentless in our criticism of the Labor government for the mountains of red tape that it continually inflicted on Queenslanders. Unfortunately, despite playing such a crucial role in the provision of services for our community and attracting tourism to our great state, those in the liquor and gaming industry were some of the worst affected. It must be noted that, before these initiatives were put to parliament, the Newman government undertook extensive consultation with the industry to find out exactly how to assist them and allow them to get on with business. It is also important to acknowledge that the industry peak bodies, Clubs Queensland and Queensland Hotels Association, support the bill as they see it as a meaningful reduction in red tape for the industry.

As highlighted in the explanatory notes, these changes represent the first of multiple phases of change to address the regulatory inefficiency plaguing these industries. One of the most common aspects of this bill is the exemption of community groups from the requirement to obtain a permit to sell liquor at low-risk events, such as school fetes or Rotary or Lions functions and the like. These fundraising events are simply that—events to help fundraise—and the government should be assisting them in their endeavours, not slugging them with additional fees and regulations. In the Currumbin electorate, local service clubs, P&Cs, Neighbourhood Watches and community groups that host small fundraising events are always out and about in the community holding different functions, and this change gives them the freedom to explore other options without outlaying scarce funds and large amounts of time. In more positive news for these groups, they will also be able to include in raffles alcohol under the value of \$100 without the need to apply for a permit. This gives them greater tools at their disposal to really maximise their fundraising initiatives in the community. This bill also allows for the introduction of some safeguards to ensure that the responsible service of alcohol is

maintained at all times. This will see the sale of liquor limited to eight hours, and any irresponsible sale of alcohol will result in this exemption not applying and that group being required to apply for a permit.

In further evidence that we are serious about assisting small businesses in this state, the requirement for liquor and gaming applications to be advertised in the newspaper and *Government Gazette* will be abolished. This will still be advertised out the front of the premises and online. This change alone will save an applicant around \$1,500 and a significant amount of time, which, as we all know, is invaluable to small business owners.

This bill also provides for a reduction in requirements for low-risk restaurants and cafes. This includes the requirement for them to complete risk assessed management plans and advertise for public objections when applying for a licence. As the Attorney-General highlighted in his introductory speech, these places are not generally the source of alcohol related problems and these changes will see more money stay in those businesses and less time spent filling out onerous paperwork that provides no tangible benefits to the business itself or to the local community.

Other aspects of the bill are: the removal of renewal requirements for clubs and hotels with gaming machine licences; less complex processes for casino operators; and the introduction of ticket-in ticket-out technology, amongst myriad other changes, all focused on easing the regulatory burden. These measures will save industry approximately \$200,000 a year. Queensland's 412,000-plus small businesses have been suffocating under Labor's legacy of 92,000 pages of red tape and regulation. This bill goes some distance in reducing this regulatory burden.

I recently visited Dayboro, Ocean View and Nanango with the honourable members for Pine Rivers and Kallangur and it was made perfectly clear to me the ridiculously high level of compliance that many small restaurants and cafes have to contend with to keep their liquor licence. It is commendable that these members are consulting so closely and so frequently with the small businesses in their electorates. This bill will provide significant relief to these small businesses.

In summary, I would like to acknowledge and thank the Attorney-General for proposing legislation that allows small businesses and community organisations to operate more efficiently while not adversely affecting the critically important safeguards in place to monitor the consumption and potential risks of liquor and gaming that occurs in society. This bill complements the Newman government's commitment to reduce red tape and regulation by 20 per cent by 2018. I very happily commend this bill to the House.



**Mr CHOAT** (Ipswich West—LNP) (5.01 pm): How fitting it is to be here this evening speaking on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill following the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games. This bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, of which I am a member. As part of the consultation process the committee received 14 submissions from various stakeholders and this certainly added to the depth of the deliberations of the committee.

The committee has recommended that this bill be passed. I am very pleased at the opportunities that it will create. The bill addresses a number of diverse matters, including amendments to the Liquor Act 1992, the Gaming Machine Act 1991 and the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997, and provides a legislative basis for the Queensland Sentencing Information Service.

I have a long history of being a member and executive member of various incorporated associations and clubs. That continues to this day. I know this is something that I share with many members in this place. Throughout Ipswich and the Somerset we have many clubs and associations of all descriptions full of people who give of their time and money to help the community. It is worth noting that last week was Volunteer Week. I was very proud to have worn my red 'V', for volunteer, pin.

As the member for Ipswich mentioned earlier, last week ended with the terrific Ipswich Show, where there were so many great volunteers working to make the show great for the people of our region. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mrs Marcia Cruickshank, Ipswich Show Society president; Mr Darren Zanow, vice-president; patron Mr Stan Walker; and, of course, the great team of stewards and workers, most of whom are volunteers, who make the Ipswich Show a great show of and for the people of Ipswich.

**Mr Krause:** What about the Marburg Show?

**Mr CHOAT:** Yes, of course, member for Beaudesert, I do acknowledge the Marburg Show. I was there a couple of weeks ago. The Ipswich Show is just as terrific as the Marburg Show, as is the Lowood Show and the Rosewood Show.

**Mrs Frecklington:** What about the Esk Show?

**Mr CHOAT:** That is a little bit out of my electorate, member for Nanango, but I am sure it will be terrific this weekend. I cannot let the opportunity pass by without giving a plug for the Ipswich and District Poultry Club and the Ipswich Pigeon Specialist Club, which held terrific displays and exhibits at the show and whose members work tirelessly to make sure that the public enjoy viewing some very fine specimens of poultry and pigeons at every show. I was very proud to have put my rare bourbon red turkeys on display at the show. From the feedback; visitors very much enjoyed their antics. I do not believe they understood it was a G-rated show and not an X-rated show. But certainly they were greatly enjoyed. Even though they are bourbon red turkeys, I hope there will be no amendments that will require me to register those turkeys for a permit or liquor licence because of their name.

The amendments put forward today by the Attorney will importantly extend exemptions from permits for the types of smaller country shows that I have just mentioned. I know there are many communities across our great state that will both appreciate and benefit from these amendments. Fundraising is a core function of many of our volunteers who work so hard for our clubs. Raising much needed funds is tough. I doubt there will have been a time in recent history when it was as tough as it has been of late.

One of the most important aspects of this bill, I believe, is to amend the Liquor Act 1992 to exempt low-risk community organisations from requiring community liquor permits for not-for-profit events. This bill represents an opportunity for our local clubs, associations, church groups and P&Cs in particular. One of its main objectives is to minimise the regulatory burden on them when conducting fundraising events such as sausage sizzles, school fetes and trivia nights. These not-for-profit groups would otherwise be required to apply for a permit and pay the application fee of \$57. This cost represents a significant drain on the success of such endeavours, not to mention the stress and hassle associated with making the application itself. Thanks to this LNP government that will now no longer be the case. I do want to dwell on that hassle that I referred to because a lot of people who would normally be having to make such applications during the course of their voluntary work for their not-for-profit organisation also have commitments to business, family and the community in general. This will certainly be something that they will really appreciate and value.

As we heard from the Attorney-General earlier this evening, during the 2012 calendar year alone almost 7,000 community liquor permits were applied for and not one was rejected. Only nine permit applications have been rejected since 2009. With these numbers one would have to ask why the previous Labor government held in such contempt the community groups wanting to have events serving alcohol. I note the presence of my family up in the gallery—my wife, Nicky, and children, Charlotte, Benjamin and our little Eloise, who is celebrating her second birthday today. Happy birthday, Weezy. Try to be quiet for a little bit longer.

The point I want to make is that this LNP government believes in our great community groups. We trust them. The Attorney-General made this point. We know they always do their best to serve and protect our community. But it is no silly requirement for a permit which keeps them this way; it is their integrity and sense of community. The previous Deputy Speaker in the chair would have to forgive my energetic interjection when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking because, as I was talking to the member for Mount Ommaney, one would be forgiven for thinking that the people she was referring to at our country shows all have front teeth missing and shirts hanging out, running around like yokels with cans of VB. It is not the case. It proves to me that it is most likely that the Leader of the Opposition has not visited a country show. The standard of behaviour at our country shows is of the highest calibre because the community would simply not accept any sort of nonsense. I really did take exception to that. I apologise to the previous Deputy Speaker for that.

I know that there are many community groups that would like to host an event where they can serve alcohol. As I mentioned, the complexity of having to apply for a permit and the fear of what might be involved holds them back. This bill will provide a level playing field whereby these groups will be able to host events and functions where they will have an even better chance to raise funds for

some great causes and meet with the needs of their own organisations. Groups like the Lowood Slimmers, which last year raised almost \$30,000 for breast cancer, will now have even more options to raise money available to them. I am confident they will break through that magic \$30,000 ceiling some time soon. Similarly, I look forward to my local Lions and Rotary clubs, like Ipswich North Rotary, and Fernvale, Lowood and Rosewood Lions clubs, hosting some top-notch events raising significant funds for noble courses. This government is saying to them, 'We trust you, we value you and we are taking the shackles off.'

It is anticipated the bill will, as the Attorney-General stated earlier, reduce the required applications for these permits by 60 per cent, or over 4,000 per year. This will free up resources within the department to focus on key areas of risk whilst saving the community thousands of dollars—not to mention the time associated with that. The bill's focus is of course on red-tape reduction and these reductions certainly represent that to the community.

No, we are not just making this a free-for-all. Eligible events must be genuine one-off events conducted between 7 am and 12 midnight with a duration of no more than eight hours on a single day, obviously with the exception of the country shows that we have been referring to this evening. The sale of alcohol must also be secondary to the event and all proceeds must be used for the benefit of the community.


There are also important safeguards to ensure that only appropriate persons and entities are eligible for relevant exemptions. It is expected that events or functions qualifying for exemption would include school fetes, trivia nights, dinner dances, discos, sports events and small shows conducted by not-for-profit associations. The bill will also make way for raffles to include a bottle of wine or spirits or even a carton of beer through provisions for exemptions where our not-for-profit associations are using a raffle to raise funds for promoting their objectives and contributing to causes for the benefit of our community.

It is high time we started treating our community with respect and throwing out the realm of overzealous political correctness and the associated claptrap. The nanny state has had its day and it is time for enshrining confidence in our people and in the law. The agendas of the do-gooders, the apologists and the fun police to the left need to get out of the way and let us make our own well-considered decisions about what is appropriate to do to raise money for just causes in our community.

I am also very pleased about the aspects of the bill which will support business through wide-ranging red-tape reduction and signal a new era of less complication and more trust and self-determination enabling pubs, clubs and other establishments to get on with employing Queenslanders and providing entertainment and enjoyment to our communities.

There is one aspect of this bill that I am most proud of and that is the changes exempting hospitals and nursing homes that sell a limited amount of liquor to patients and residents from requiring a liquor licence and other provisions in the Liquor Act. Organisations such as Ipswich Hospice and Cabanda Care in Rosewood do so much for the elderly and gravely ill in my community and it is right that they should be able to provide a glass of port or a sip of rum to those who are at a vulnerable time in their life, giving them comfort, relief and a bit of enjoyment.

I thank all of those organisations and individuals who took the time to provide submissions to the committee to assist in our deliberations. I commend the Attorney-General, his department and his staff for this great piece of legislation which will greatly improve the lives and lifestyles of the people of this great state with great opportunity. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs SCOTT** (Woodridge—ALP) (5:12 pm): I rise to speak on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. This is a very wide-ranging piece of legislation so I will constrain my comments to a number of issues about which I have some particular concern.

The first set of amendments I would like to address relates to the exemption to be provided to low-risk community groups from requiring a liquor permit for not-for-profit events. I should first of all note that drinking is not generally observed in my area very much at all, other than in clubs and hotels and in private homes. Many community organisations do hold community events which raise much needed funds for some of the most vulnerable citizens of our state. It is certainly my wish to assist those organisations by streamlining approval processes for those events wherever possible.

However, I am not prepared to do so at the expense of proper protection for the community. Both the Police Union and P&C Queensland have recommended that alcohol should only be able to be supplied in a designated area rather than an entire premises for an event. They would like to see

greater protections for children and other community members who attend those events, and I strongly agree with this requirement. A designated area would allow better supervision of people who are consuming alcohol and better supervision of whether they might be trying to supply alcohol to children or to intoxicated persons. A school event can certainly be marred by heavily intoxicated people wandering around amongst children and other patrons.

Safety is also a concern. Discarded bottles and cans can pose a significant risk of injury. The P&Cs would also like to see a person with a responsible service of alcohol qualification required to serve alcohol at events. I know the Logan Liquor Industry Action Group has strongly advocated for the responsible service of alcohol by their members. They have been a very successful group in Logan. The P&Cs said in their submission—

We recommend that the criteria should include the compulsory presence of a Responsible Service of Alcohol ... trained person at all times when alcohol is served in School premises.

The same risks apply for service of alcohol whether a liquor licence is required or not. In fact, the risk for community events where children are present in large numbers would be even higher than for your average licensed premises. Ensuring that people do not consume excessive quantities of alcohol is paramount to ensuring that children are safe at their school fete or other event.

I commend the committee for its diligence in considering this bill as evidenced by the recommendation that guidelines be prepared. Guidelines are a good start, but they have no real sanctions for failure to comply. I would like the Attorney to please explain how he sees the guidelines working in practice and whether community groups that do not adopt the guidelines can be prevented from gaining the exemption in the future or have further restrictions placed on them.

Another concern I have is in relation to the removal of the requirement for a risk assessed management plan and a community impact statement. The RAMP is a handy tool for all licence holders. It is a best-practice tool because it requires applicants to detail such things as the employment of security, the suitability of lighting and noise mitigation on the premises as well as the availability of public transport.

This bill removes the requirement for people applying for restaurant and cafe licences that do not trade after midnight to provide a RAMP with their application. A responsible business owner should, whether they are required to or not, turn their mind to any risk that their business is likely to pose in their local community. Developing strategies for dealing with those risks should be second nature. These documents should exist as part of best practice so the impost of requiring them to be lodged with the licence application as a safeguard should not be too great.

Industry stakeholders have expressed concerns that business operators who do the right thing and apply for a licence in accordance with the proper designation of their business will be disadvantaged by unscrupulous operators who use this provision to apply for a restaurant or cafe licence for what is ostensibly a nightclub or bar. A similar thing could be said about community impact statements. The bill will allow the commissioner to exempt low-risk restaurants and cafes from completing a community impact statement provided they do not trade past midnight, they have no amplified entertainment and they are surrounded by similar businesses and where the sale of alcohol is of secondary significance to the preparation and service of meals during trading hours.

Again, would the Attorney kindly explain why the community impact statement requirement has been removed? I am all for reducing red tape, but removing protections for the community goes beyond red-tape reduction. As restaurants and cafes proliferate in our communities, we welcome the livability and the convenience of such establishments. They improve the amenity of our communities. But this has been because the things like community impact statements and RAMPs have been in place to make sure that businesses are thinking about what impact their business will have on the community and how adverse impacts can best be managed.


The other concern I have is the removal of the need for applicants for a liquor licence to advertise for public objections if they are not applying to trade outside ordinary trading hours, which is after midnight for restaurants and cafes and after 10 pm for bottle shops, and there is no amplified entertainment provided at the venue. This even applies to on-site advertising, which we have all seen on premises, giving notice of the application. Applicants will now only have to advertise on the internet, on the department's website.

Over the years I have consulted with my community and given a negative response to a number of applications for hotels with poker machines and bottle shops. They have not gone ahead, and I believe members should still be consulted. I do not want to see communities in Logan, particularly in Woodridge, surrounded by liquor and gambling outlets. To simply have an online notice

is not at all satisfactory, because most people are alerted to the fact that a business is applying for a licence either by the on-site advertisement or through seeing a notice in their local paper. If you remove these requirements, how will people know?

The department has said that the internet is widely available and this should be sufficient. Not everyone in my electorate has access to the internet. And besides this, how do they know to go and look on the department's website? They would not even suspect a licence had been applied for. You need to know about a licence application before you would look for the advertisement on the website. It just is not a logical argument.

Finally, I turn to the abolition of the Community Investment Fund. This fund collects fees and taxes from various gaming machines, keno and wagering activities and ensures that a designated percentage of these fees, levies and charges is paid into the fund. This fund then distributes money for a variety of reasons, and so many of my organisations have been absolutely enhanced by those funds. I have to say that those funds are so important. I would be very concerned if the abolition of the Community Investment Fund and the payment henceforth of all these moneys into consolidated revenue would mean any reduction in the funds available to my community groups and all those throughout Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr DILLAWAY** (Bulimba—LNP) (5.22 pm): I rise in the chamber today to speak in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I acknowledge the work of my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and thank all who were part of the reporting process. I congratulate the Attorney-General on the introduction of this piece of legislation, which is one of our core election promises—to rid Queensland businesses of the dense regulation that has been built up over time under the previous Labor government like a bad case of dental plaque. It is time for Queensland to visit the dentist for a well-overdue clean.

The purpose of this bill is to implement red-tape reduction initiatives to liquor and gaming as part of the government's six-month action plan, January to June 2013. It amends the Liquor Act 1992 and the gaming acts—the Casino Control Act 1982, the Gaming Machine Act 1991, the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, the Keno Act 1996, the Lotteries Act 1997 and the Wagering Act 1998—to reduce the regulatory burden that has engulfed the liquor and gaming industries across Queensland. After years under Labor governments in Queensland, the liquor and gaming industries have become tangled in a web of red tape and excessive regulation that has severely restricted them and their opportunity. The Newman government has been hard at work digging its fingernails in to unknot these restrictions and allow the industry to maximise their opportunity in our great state.

In 2009, the Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland report indicated that liquor and gaming industries were the most regulated in Queensland. With the introduction of this bill, the Newman government continues to honour our election commitment to reduce red tape and regulation for business by 20 per cent. This bill itself includes 21 red-tape reduction initiatives that bring the total to 28 initiatives that form phase 1 of our reform. The approach undertaken by the Newman government to regulation is one of common sense. We recognise that regulation is necessary, but business in Queensland has been drowned by red tape as a result of long-term Labor governments. Red tape, fees, levies and charges are now costing the business community over \$7 billion a year in Queensland. This represents a 30 per cent increase in just five years.

One of the key reforms that I wish to focus on as it will directly affect many members of the Bulimba electorate is that community groups will be exempted from the requirement to have a community alcohol permit for one-off fundraising events. The bill amends the Liquor Act 1992 to remove this obligation for certain non-profit organisations in certain circumstances. The objective of this reform is to minimise regulatory burden on community organisations when hosting low-risk fundraising events such as the likes of school fetes and trivia nights.

Due to the voluntary nature of these organisations and events, the process of having to lodge an application for a permit is just an unnecessary and difficult speed bump groups must endure in their organising of such events. Currently, if alcohol is to be supplied or sold at a small-scale community event on a temporary or one-off basis, the not-for-profit group must obtain a community liquor permit at a cost of \$57. During 2012, the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation received 6,774 community liquor permits of which none—and I repeat none—were rejected. Since 2009, out of the tens of thousands of applications, there have only been nine that have been rejected. This is clear evidence that these events are deemed as low risk and, since essentially 100 per cent of applications have been successful, this regulation is not only unnecessary but wastes time and money and lacks common sense.

I listen to organisers of events such as these in the Bulimba electorate and can understand that organising them can often feel like running an obstacle course or running a maze. As a government, we should remove the unnecessary obstacles and empower our local communities rather than making them jump through all sorts of hoops.

By removing this requirement, it must not be misconstrued or exaggerated that suddenly community events will become a free-for-all. There is still criteria with which community groups must comply. These are in place to minimise any potential harm to the wider community. I note, however, that this potential harm is not created by these amendments. It was already existent with the liquor permits. Events eligible for exemption must be genuine one-off events, conducted between 7 am and midnight and for no longer than eight hours in a single day, subject to some of the amendments that the Attorney-General raised earlier. The sale of liquor must be secondary to the event and all proceeds must be used for the benefit of the community. It is expected that such events will take the form of school fetes, trivia nights, rodeos and sporting events conducted by non-profit associations.

An association or its executive officers that have a history within the past five years of conducting events which have caused public disturbance or undue offence in the local area or that have not met the rules of compliance will not be deemed eligible for exemption. This safety net will ensure organisations oversee responsible and well-managed events and discourage any negative behaviour.

This exemption will deliver a number of benefits to community groups who will no longer have to apply for a liquor permit, pay the \$57 fee, provide a defined area for the consumption of alcohol, have staff with RSA qualifications, provide security and have any restriction on the type of liquor available to be sold. Despite the release from their regulatory chains, organisers will still have to uphold a number of responsibilities in their conduct of the event. These are common-sense onuses that include that the sale of liquor must be by an adult, consumption must be at the event, sale must not be made to a minor or an unduly intoxicated person, the association does not engage in a practice or promotion that may encourage excessive consumption of liquor, and a safe environment in and around the precinct of the event must be provided and maintained. These are all beyond reasonable expectations that would already be entrenched in the context of a P&C group or a local Rotary Club.

Let this debate not be one of hysteria or hyperbolic arguments. Introducing this reform is not going to make Queensland a permanently drunk state. There are still rules in place that will dictate behaviour at these events and ensure people exercise responsibility. Police will have the ability to cease the sale of liquor if an event is deemed to be getting out of control, an instance that will occur on the very odd occasion. Let us have a little bit more faith in our Queenslanders, give our community groups which benefit from this amendment a bit more credit and not jump to hysterical and irrational conclusions.

There is a risk associated with everything, and these events are very, very low risk which would have been approved to sell alcohol anyway based on past numbers. I came across a statement online that these changes would be 'making alcohol easier to access and more readily available'—a ridiculous statement. How is it hard to access a bottle shop? I am sure most members would agree that alcohol purchased at a fundraising event definitely will not be cheaper either. This initiative has been warmly welcomed by P&C groups and many other community organisations in the Bulimba electorate which greatly look forward to hosting events that will be simpler to coordinate and with more freedom and liberty. Unfortunately, it appears that a couple of my upcoming fetes will not be able to benefit this year, but as a responsible government we are maximising an opportunity for these associations into the future, enabling them to reach their full fundraising potential by allowing them to utilise all honest avenues to raise funds for their honest cause.

To assist associations, the government will also ensure that guidelines to clarify best practice in relation to the service and sale of alcohol at these low-risk community events are prepared and made publicly available online by the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation. I am sure that these fewer restrictions will restore faith and trust and ultimately create further incentive to get more individuals involved in the community. We need to escape from the overload of restricting regulation and save Queensland from the detriment of becoming a nanny state. These are common-sense amendments aimed at helping community organisations raise money with social activities that do not harm the community. It is anticipated two-thirds of events that currently require a community liquor permit will now be exempt. So these amendments will represent a genuine reduction in red tape for the community sector.

I also note that the bill also proposes changes that will affect the liquor and gaming industry in Queensland. The requirement for advertising for certain liquor and gaming applications in the *Government Gazette* and newspapers will be removed, saving businesses \$1,500. This is an overdue change, as I would be interested to see the percentage of Queenslanders who are actually aware of the existence of the *Government Gazette* let alone who read it regularly. I am sure that even a union-led push poll would struggle to get results they would be willing to publish.


I also wish to briefly provide comment on how this bill supports and recognises the benefits that small businesses like restaurants and cafes contribute in our communities. My electorate of Bulimba has a significant number of restaurants and cafes in a number of precincts, particularly the areas in and around Oxford Street, so any opportunity to reduce red tape for small business in my area is welcomed by many existing and future traders. Restaurants and cafes rise and fall on the service of food, and the supply of liquor to patrons in conjunction with their meal complements this service. For those restaurants that do not trade past midnight or provide entertainment and are in commercial areas, the bill sensibly allows them to be exempt from submitting a risk assessed management plan or community impact statement or undertaking public advertising. I note that through the department's information restaurants are the most popular type of licence application. In 2012 alone there were 139 restaurant applications considered. None of these applications were refused. That is right. Again, no application was refused and less than five per cent of those 139 applications attracted an objection that resulted in some conditions being applied to the licence.

Another cost saving for small businesses is that the bill recognises that restaurants in suburban shopping strips and commercial areas away from schools and residential areas do not need to be advertised in their local newspaper. These amendments are at the heart of the government's liquor and gaming red-tape reduction policy—that is, to allow the vast majority of low-risk small businesses to prosper and not be buried under the same burden applied to higher risk venues. It is about time government got out of the way of these important social venues which provide enjoyment and employment to their local communities.

Finally, I would like to discuss the impact that these amendments have on hospitals and nursing homes that sell a limited amount of liquor to patients and residents. If this bill passes, they will be exempt from requiring a liquor licence and other provisions in the Liquor Act. This will mean that up to two standard drinks a day may be provided to residents or patients. This is in line with the conditions currently in place for retirement villages and reduces the regulatory burden of applying for a licence when they are only providing limited amounts of liquor as a subsidiary element.

The most outrageous argument I heard in response to this was one which quoted the number of Queenslanders hospitalised each year because of alcohol related injuries and diseases. I believe we owe our hospitals a bit of credit. If I may be so bold I make the assumption that the service of two standard drinks per patient per day will be exercised with caution and responsibility. As the department stated, the provision of liquor would obviously be subject to the determination of the administering health professionals. While discussing these changes recently with a local constituent, I feel he hit the nail on the head. He said, 'If my 97-year-old grandfather in his nursing home doesn't deserve a drink after the life he has led, I don't know who does.'

I congratulate the Attorney-General on the introduction of this bill. I look forward to seeing the changes implemented across Queensland, and businesses in Bulimba, community groups and the industry benefit from the reduced number of hoops they have to jump through. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (5.35 pm): I rise today in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. It has been interesting listening to the debate. It really comes down to one basic principle: the Labor Party seem to always—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr WATTS:** I have no conflict. I have no investment in the liquor industry, but I take the interjection. I will talk about my experience in the industry later.

I think there is an important principle here. Labor always look for the bad in the community. They are looking to see who is going to do something wrong and then they want to overregulate it. That overregulation stops good people from being volunteers, it stops good people from putting on events, and it stops good people from going into business. The LNP are looking for the good in people. We will be tough on crime. When people do the wrong things, they will be pursued and punished accordingly.

I think there are two fundamentally different ways of looking at society. We believe people are going to do the right thing. We would like to free them up to do the right thing. We would like to give them their individual rights and we trust them to exercise those sensibly. If they do the wrong thing, then we will have legislation in place and police who will enforce the legislation to make sure they are appropriately punished. As I say, since the Liquor Act was changed in 1992 by Labor, it has been a complete and utter debacle. There has been knee-jerk reaction after knee-jerk reaction after knee-jerk reaction. Every time something went wrong, another amendment would be introduced. Good people who were in the industry have left because of the compliance costs and the difficulties associated with running a business involved in the liquor industry. Lots of people just would not bother. The same happened with volunteer organisations such as Rotary, Lions and various P&C groups—people who want to have a wine and cheese night when they first enrol their children at school. They want to get together to have a social wine and cheese and want to charge \$5 at the door for that. Someone had to put in an application and wait for 28 days to get it signed off by the police, to take it to the department to get it stamped, to pay \$57 and to do a security risk assessment. It really just boils down to this being a nanny state. We had a situation where the president of the P&C and the principal of the school could not be trusted to get six bottles of wine and make sure that a few parents could have a drink and a good time while meeting and getting to know each other. It was totally ridiculous legislation and completely unnecessary.

I certainly thank the Attorney-General for proposing these amendments. I look forward to further amendments as we get information back from the group that has been formed to advise on where the red tape can be cut. I thank the Attorney-General for the legislation. I thank the committee for its deliberations. I thank the secretariat for all the work it has done. I thank those who made submissions to the committee as well. I note that one group representing the P&Cs submitted that they are very concerned about this potentially causing a problem. I remind them that if an event is on the school premises the owner of those premises still has all the same controls that they would normally have. If it is an event that they are not happy with, it cannot go ahead without the approval of the person who is in control of the premises. P&Cs and headmasters will be able to make decisions about what is a suitable event under what sort of suitable circumstances and then they will be able to go ahead with that.

I would like to thank the Attorney-General for accepting some of the recommendations of the committee. I think they were well considered. I certainly appreciate the fact that the Attorney-General has taken those on board because I think they will reduce red tape and make sure the act, when it is passed, has better effect. The bottom line is that we trust and value volunteers in our community groups. Certainly in Toowoomba North there are a lot of community groups and a lot of people who want to put on little functions. There are groups that want to raffle a bottle of alcohol at their functions. There are various other community groups that for one reason or another—let's say it is the Toowoomba Basketball Association. They might have a game on and they want to hold a bar. They have to organise to get approval for the bar 28 days in advance. They have to put up restrictive areas. They have to make sure someone in the organisation is trained in the responsible service of alcohol. It has been a very difficult process for volunteer organisations to undertake.

Labor's approach to the Liquor Act since 1992 encompassing the ensuing amendments has been a moving feast. We have had regulation compiled on top of regulation compiled on top of regulation until it was almost unbearable for the industry, and that is where we are at now. I myself have been and am qualified in the responsible service of alcohol. I have been a nominee and a licensee. I have been in control of cafes, nightclubs, bars, pubs and special facility licences. I can honestly say that the amount of regulation and red tape that has been forced upon that industry over the last 20-something years has reached a ridiculous point.

One of these areas where I think it is highly appropriate to have a risk assessed management plan is nightclubs. If someone wants to open a nightclub, it is a good thing to require that. If someone has a cafe that principally sells coffee, cakes and maybe some meals why on earth do they need to have a risk assessed management plan in place in order to serve a bottle of wine to me and my wife at six o'clock on a Friday afternoon? Why do they need a risk assessed management plan in place to ensure that a couple of 40-somethings are not suddenly going to go crazy after two glasses of wine?

**Honourable members:** Ha, ha!

**Mr WATTS:** Okay, 45. I do not think this is necessary where it is a low-risk business. I have consulted with people as they have tried to do a risk assessed management plan. I talk of people who have experience as chefs, they have bought a little cafe and they want to go forward and start a business. They are interested in having a bottle of wine available for people and all of a sudden they

are asking, 'How do I do a risk assessed management plan?' So straight away they get the chequebook out, they hire someone like me to come along and expensively consult and advise them how to do a risk assessed management plan. The whole thing is just ridiculous because at the end of the day you could almost photocopy and submit a previous one because there is no risk from these businesses; the risk is minuscule. Putting together a community impact statement and a risk assessed management plan for a small cafe that wants to sell wines or a Roman coffee late at night is unnecessary. It is complete nonsense to suggest that it was of any benefit, apart from to people who might be writing those plans and charging fees for them. I do note that the commissioner has a discretionary power to require a RAMP. If they feel there is a potential risk they can require one, and I think appropriately so because there may be some circumstances in which it would be necessary. So I think it is certainly a good idea to have that discretionary power.

I have mentioned several parts of the bill, but there are some other aspects of the bill that I think are worth mentioning also. We will be exempting low-risk community organisations from requiring a permit to conduct a not-for-profit event, and I add again these are volunteer type organisations. They will not need those in order to hold an event. In terms of the proposed cessation of advertising relating to certain liquor and gaming applications in the *Government Gazette*, it is my experience that placing a sign on the front door of a premises has pretty well always been the best way to let people know that an application has been submitted. Over the last 20 years I have spent thousands of dollars on advertising in the *Government Gazette* and I do not think anyone has read them apart from the government to check that I spent my money. I certainly endorse removing that requirement. I think it is important that the community has the ability to know that a licence has been applied for, and putting a sign up on the front door and putting the details of that up on the web is very appropriate. That again reduces the burden of regulation for low-risk premises, and I certainly endorse that. The bill will also remove the renewal requirements for clubs and hotels with certain types of gaming machine licences. Again, this is regulation that the businesses have to go through and pay for and I think it is unnecessary.

As we are reducing red tape, there is an area that I think is worth mentioning, and that is the approved managers' register. I have run businesses in which we have had to have an approved manager. There were rules that were written for the CBD talking about distance, time, access and how far away an approved manager has to be. One of those was also the requirement for a register. Just to be clear, I was advised in the past that not only do I have to check the licence of the approved manager, which of course could be out of step with their RSA and their RMLV, the responsible management of licensed venues—so they could actually have a valid qualification for one but the other one could have expired. So first of all you have to check that both of those are valid every time they start a shift by dialling into the net. Then you need to make sure they fill out the book. Then you need to make sure that the book is signed off at the end of the night. I think that that is crazy overregulation. I do not think it has made any venue safer in any way at all. I do not think that having that book in place has done anything at all apart from making sure that a bureaucrat has something to check when they turn up. Has it made the venue safer? No. Has it stopped people getting unduly intoxicated or made them safer? No, I do not think it has had any effect in that area at all. Again, that requirement assumes that the management of the premises and the individual manager will try to do the wrong thing and, therefore, they have to fill out this book and somehow magically that will mean they will do the right thing. Let me tell honourable members that good people will do the right thing, anyway and bad people will not. They are certainly the ones who have not been filling out the book and they have been flouting the law in certain areas. Therefore, I see no benefit at all in having to sign on and sign off.

People have expressed the view that this is potentially weakening some of the legislation. There is an awful amount of common law legislation in this area that will still apply. There is obviously still a fair amount of criminal law that will apply and premises will still have a duty of care. When we are talking about low-risk venues I do not believe at all that this is going to have some detrimental effect on society where people are suddenly going to rush out and cause all the kinds of problems that people have spoken about.

The bill certainly brings us into this century in terms of making sure that we have a sensible way for people to advertise and promote the fact that they have applied for a licence. Reducing some of the costs involved in applying for a minor licence for small premises will help our hospitality industry and will certainly help our tourism industry. People who come here from overseas have an

expectation that they might be able to have a glass of wine with their dinner and do not understand at all that someone may not have wanted to go through all of the regulatory burdens involved to ensure that they can serve that glass of wine. Removing that requirement in relation to low-risk premises is imminently sensible. I look forward to more sensible suggestions coming from the expert panel.

The bill supports and recognises the benefits of restaurants and cafes to our community. Small businesses should be encouraged, and they certainly should not have to jump over the same bar as a nightclub which operates late into the evening. The previous government has created an unnecessary atmosphere of hysteria relating to the distribution of alcohol, and that has been detrimental to people who simply want to enjoy a drink or sell a drink, and I think that is detrimental going forward.

I think it is sensible that there are processes in place to enable businesses to trade past midnight. If a local community group is going to be operating for an extended period of time or over several days, I think it is eminently sensible that there are checks and balances in place. But making your local school jump through the same hoops for a wine and cheese night as you would for a B&S at Thargomindah is crazy and completely unnecessary.

**Mr Johnson:** Hey, come on, Thargomindah B&Ss are all right!

**Mr WATTS:** I am not knocking it. I am just saying that they may have to jump through a few hoops regarding the liquor licence before they are able to go ahead.

**Mr Johnson:** They do after they have a few rums!

**Mr WATTS:** I should imagine they would out at Thargomindah! There are some safeguards in place in this bill. There are some good and sensible reductions of red tape that will not put people in any danger at all, and I think overall the bill will help small businesses involved in the liquor industry. I think it will help tourists enjoy their Queensland experience while they are out at night having dinner.

I would like to quote Clubs Queensland, because this is an example of the some of the things that the industry has had to deal with.

Regulatory interventions in the past decade have introduced more than 100 separate changes to policies, practices, guidelines, standards and compliance requirements. The imposition of these changes has been uncoordinated and at considerable cost to industry, operational efficiency and business certainty. The community clubs industry applauds the government's efforts to eliminate duplication and unnecessary compliance administration through meaningful reforms that can build business confidence without weakening the core harm minimisation requirements or general effectiveness of the Queensland liquor and gaming regulatory framework.

I think it is very important to understand that we are not talking about taking away core requirements. We are talking about my wife and me being able to have a glass of wine on a Friday night at an event at our children's school. The bill has been well thought through. I think the committee's recommendations were good, and I appreciate the Attorney-General taking those on board.


The most important thing to remember is that out of 6,774 community liquor permits in 2012, not one was rejected. In fact, since that requirement was introduced, very few have been rejected. The figure which I have been provided with is that since 2009, nine permits have been rejected. There is a lot of regulatory red tape and bureaucracy that people have to wade through. Volunteers are being stressed because they have to go to the local police station to get documents signed off and then take them to the liquor licensing department.

At the end of the day, since 2009 just nine have been rejected. So why have we been doing all of this paperwork? Someone has to be employed to check it all; someone has to file it all; someone has to make sure it is enforced. The hardworking volunteers of Queensland have been the ones who have had to go forward and run around their community to get all of these things done.

So in essence, I would say that I think this bill is a good start, but there is a lot more work to be done in liquor licensing. From a regulatory point of view, I think there are some serious problems in liquor licensing. Our community must also consider very carefully how we are going to address problems with alcohol consumption. My long experience is that the tighter you try to regulate and the harsher you try and control, the more problems will slip through your fingers. It is like grabbing quicksilver in your hand.

The problem areas are the youth and uncontrolled and unsupervised Facebook parties. I think the on-premise liquor industry is one of best in the world in terms of how it operates here in Queensland. It has been overregulated, which has made it unprofitable in certain circumstances. This bill is a good start in supporting our volunteers and our community groups, and it is a good start for small business and tourism. They should be allowed to distribute alcohol in an appropriate way.

I certainly commend the bill to the House, and I look forward to its follow-up from the specialist panel.

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (5.55 pm): I rise today to contribute to the debate in favour of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. This amendment bill is a significant step forward and a sign of encouragement for community organisations. It is a strong indication of the continued commitment which our government has to reducing red tape, improving efficiency and lowering the cost of living.

The position that community organisations hold within society is one of tradition and respect. From school fetes to sporting club sausage sizzles and community festivals, community organisations form the backbone of many events throughout my electorate of Logan. This amendment bill makes changes to effect red-tape reduction, but I believe the most significant benefit to our local community will be the red-tape reduction for non-profit community organisations.

Nothing beats a warm, sunny Queensland afternoon—especially in the heart of Logan. Picture this: you are having a great afternoon at a community festival such as the 150th anniversary celebration for Logan Village's Settlers Day—which will be on 1 September this year, by the way—and you feel like a nice cold beer of your choice to cap the day off. Prior to this legislation amendment, such opportunities would have been too difficult and expensive for clubs and other organisations to take advantage of.

The current legislation governing community liquor permits imposes a fee of \$57 per day and requires a significant amount of troublesome paperwork. For many clubs, such requirements are too cumbersome and expensive. To encourage the growth and success of community clubs and organisations, we need to make regulations which are basic, user friendly and financially viable. Community events such as festivals and school fetes and organisations like P&Cs and P&Fs should not be disadvantaged by needless bureaucratic requirements. It is nonsensical to impose such unjust regulatory requirements on organisations which are attempting to benefit our community.

The fact that the government has taken steps to rectify this situation shows that we are a government for the community. We recognise the vital role which community organisations play within our electorates; therefore, this amendment bill will change the Liquor Act so that non-profit organisations may sell liquor at low-risk fundraising events without traversing the myriad forms, paperwork and administration required to gain a permit.

This amendment has been well received within my electorate. During my regular meetings with presidents of P&Cs in Logan last week I met with David Walmsley, the president of the St Philomena P&F. He welcomed the greater flexibility for fundraising options that his school—and those like it—will have for planning future events. This amendment was also warmly welcomed by the Logan Village Settlers Day Committee. I have had the privilege of speaking about the Settlers Day event earlier this year. This event is drawing diverse resources together from all aspects of our community as we plan for an unforgettable day.

I am pleased to inform members that once this bill is passed, further opportunities will be opened up for the community and the proper celebration of such historic events will be facilitated. This amendment will allow simple functions and activities from fundraising events to country shows to be conducted if they are low risk due to size and nature, whilst ensuring that larger scale events still require permits.

To be eligible for exemption the organisation must be a genuine not-for-profit organisation where all proceeds are used for the benefit of the community. This regulatory relief does not come without responsibilities, with the requirement that the sale of alcohol be a secondary function and that the function does not turn into a Friday night at the Park Ridge Tavern—which has great steaks, by the way. Provisions will also stipulate that liquor shall not be taken from the area surrounding the event and that it may only be a single-day event, with the sale of liquor being restricted to between 7 am and midnight and for a period no longer than eight hours. As I alluded to earlier, amending clauses allow for small shows in regional areas to be exempted, even if they do not meet these two restrictions, as long as they meet criteria indicating a low risk regarding size and nature as prescribed in a regulation.

I have to say: just because this law comes into effect does not mean you have to sell alcohol. It will not be a case of: 'Hey, what are you doing tonight?' 'I don't know. There's a school fete on. Let's go get wasted.' People do not go to school fetes and community events to have a clubbing experience. If people want to go clubbing they go to clubs. There will still be a duty of care on the part of school principals and organisations. They do not have to sell alcohol. Even though it is allowed, if the P&C and the principal do not want to sell alcohol at a school fete they do not have to. This bill just allows them to. It gives them choice. We trust that they will make the right decisions for their local communities and schools.

To assist organisations, our government will ensure that guidelines to clarify best practices in relation to the service of alcohol at these identified low-risk community events are prepared and made readily available to the public via the office of liquor and gaming. This is yet another common-sense amendment introduced by this government. It is aimed at supporting our community organisations. The financial benefits for them will bring a new era in community involvement and allow those groups to reach their full potential without the needless red tape that is strangling the not-for-profit sector. From community organisations to local businesses, this amendment bill is set to improve the administrative protocols for all Queenslanders by reducing red tape.

My electorate is home to various establishments that are licensed to operate gaming machines. The Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 also sets out to provide the introduction of ticket-in ticket-out systems in casinos, pubs and clubs. The ticket-in ticket-out, TITO, technology allows for a cashless method to collect and insert credit into gaming machines using, as you guessed, tickets. The technology will provide substantial efficiencies for the operators of machines by removing the need for gambling machines to dispense coins or for gaming venue staff to issue vouchers for payment of gaming machine credits.


For large operators such as Treasury Casino or Jupiters Casino, the implementation of such technology will without a doubt improve efficiency. For clubs and pubs like the Park Ridge Tavern, Pub Lane Tavern, Logan Village Hotel and Browns Plains Hotel, just to name a few in my electorate, such implementation of the TITO technology goes beyond improved efficiency. It will drive down operational costs and improve security for patrons and staff alike. I must stress that this technology by no means accentuates gambling for problem gamblers. It merely forms a more secure and efficient means for proprietors to conduct business.

In addition to benefiting business and community organisations, this amendment bill also sets out to improve prospective skills and employment opportunities for the next generation of Queenslanders by further enhancing the vocational education options available for students seeking to gain skills or further their skills in areas such as the responsible service of alcohol and responsible service of gambling. This bill makes amendments to remove trainer approval provisions under the liquor and gaming legislation which now fall under the jurisdiction of the National Vocational Education and Training Regulator.

Currently in Queensland, courses in the responsible service of alcohol, RSA, and the responsible service of gambling, RSG, and the trainers are approved under the Liquor Act and Gaming Machine Act. In 2012 our government passed legislation to refer the power to regulate registered training organisations to the Commonwealth. The current amendments extend the application of the national framework to RSA and RSG by removing the need for trainers and training courses to be approved under state law. Recognising the national competency for RSA and RSG will allow licensees to draw on a wider pool of workers to support our growing entertainment and tourism industries.

Earlier this year I hosted a school principals roundtable with the honourable Minister for Education, Training and Employment. This outstanding event was catered for by students at the host school, Browns Plains High School. These students, who are hoping to embark on a career in the hospitality and tourism industry, will be presented with greater opportunities in our great state as a result of this amendment as well as other initiatives of this government.

The bill also abolishes the Community Investment Fund in order to simplify internal controls, strengthen the line of accountability in relation to government finances and streamline government process in accordance with red-tape reduction principles. Original money collected under such a program was paid into various other funds including the Gambling Community Benefit Fund and the Casino Community Benefit Fund. Money from these funds was then paid out as grants to community charitable groups. As members of parliament we are privileged to bring positive change to our communities. Since being elected I have endorsed many applications for funding from the Gambling Community Benefit Fund submitted by organisations from within my community. The amendments to the Community Investment Fund will not alter the management of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. Being recognised as an entirely beneficial program for the community, the fund will be funded more efficiently and transparently as a result of the consolidation of the CIF. I acknowledge the efforts of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and I proudly commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (6.06 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. What a shining example of what we as a


state and as a government want to achieve. It is a victory for common sense over bureaucratic hurdle jumping, hoop jumping and so on. These are the sorts of things governments can do to make life better for families. Governments can often get side-tracked into thinking that the only way to make positive change is by doing things financially. That is not the case. Often, doing less can be a win for people—less regulation, tying them up less, giving them an opportunity to exercise common sense. If ever you needed proof of why you need less regulation it is the fact that during 2012 not one of the nearly 7,000 community liquor permit applications was refused.

Let us be clear about who is regulated under the 1992 Liquor Act. It is the people who are trying to organise the bar at the local school fete and those organising a trivia night, where you might want to buy a glass of wine or have a shandy. I can also tell you whom I think it is going to help: anyone who ever wants to stage a community event. I have faith in the people who are organising school events in the electorate of Mundingburra—people such as Grammar Juniors P&C President John Ioannou, the Cathedral School's Ange D'Arcy, Cranbrook State School's Bridget Bambrick, Heatley Secondary College's Mick Cutler and all the other community minded, hardworking people who do their bit for schools such as Mundingburra State School, Aitkenvale State School, Annandale State School, Annandale Christian College, Currajong State School, Heatley State School, Holy Spirit Catholic School—they are having their fete this Friday night; if you think the steaks are good in Logan, you should see what we do on the barbecue at the Holy Spirit fete—Ignatius Park College, Townsville Community Learning Centre, Riverside Adventist Christian School, Vincent State School, William Ross State High and Southern Cross Catholic College.

I want those people and the many more good citizens throughout Queensland to spend less time filling in forms. That is what this government is about. The P&Cs of these schools previously had to apply for a \$57 community liquor permit if they wanted to offer supporters and parents a drink at a community fundraiser. It is not just about the money; it is about the message it sends, that we want to regulate everything you do, everything you say or any fun you have.

This bill changes that in that it does not just cut the red tape; it saves them money, and that is another imperative of our government. It is not just schools but the Lions Club of Townsville Central or Centrals ASA Junior Rugby League—which are both in my electorate, the latter of which suffered severely through the tornado which tore through the area prior to the election—that are hosting their next fundraiser or any other community group that forms the foundation of my electorate. They will not need to go through the extra paperwork and the cost of applying for a community liquor permit. It is a win not just for the people of Mundingburra but for people around the state who are yearning for a sensible, smart and common-sense solution to the mess, to the regulations, to the bureaucratic nightmare that they have endured for far too long.

I want to speak briefly on the amendment to country shows that my good friend the Attorney has put forward. If ever one needs an example of listening and taking a common-sense approach, here it is. I had the great pleasure of going to the Blackbutt Show the other day with the member for Nanango, and there I saw everything that was right about our great country communities. I do not believe that a permit for alcohol would stop that wonderful community from enjoying itself. I do not believe for one moment that that is not the sort of place where people could come together and regulate themselves. Of course they can. That is what country communities do. This gives them the ability to just get on with life, and that is what this place needs to be more about—that is, more of allowing the individual the right to get on with life and less about making laws to try to penalise everyone to pick up the minority. Finally we are cutting the cords that bind all Queenslanders. Are we doing it fast enough? The answer is that we are moving as fast as we can, but it is changes in bills like this that reflect a common-sense approach to government, and I support it wholeheartedly.

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (6.11 pm): Today I rise to offer a short contribution in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. As the title of the bill suggests, the overarching purpose of this legislation is to reduce red tape. It has certainly been one of the hallmarks of the Newman government in its first 14 months that we have unapologetically sought out ways to reduce red tape right across government—whether it is unnecessary red tape that is choking businesses or households or individuals or community groups—and again we see that as a key purpose of the bill before us today.

This bill in focusing on the liquor and gaming industry seeks to streamline processes across the industry. I note that the Attorney-General intends to implement red-tape reduction across this industry in multiple phases and that this is the first significant phase in that process. Some of the areas of red-tape reduction addressed by this bill are exempting low-risk community organisations from requiring a permit to conduct not-for-profit events; reducing the regulatory burden for low-risk

premises; removing renewal requirements for clubs and hotels with gaming machine licences; removing state approvals for trainers of responsible service of alcohol and responsible service of gambling courses; as well as a number of other issues pertaining to casinos and gaming machine operators. I note and certainly commend the Attorney-General for the extensive background work that has been undertaken on liquor and gaming reforms prior to this legislation being introduced into the parliament, and certainly since then as well. This includes the appointment of an expert panel in late 2012 comprising business and community representatives to review liquor licensing and gaming laws and red tape. We also saw the issuing of a paper titled 'Red-tape reduction and other reform proposals for regulation of liquor and gaming—discussion paper' in early 2013 calling for community and industry input. It is always refreshing to see such genuine consultation and engagement taking place on such important issues.


In my brief contribution to this debate I want to concentrate on two aspects of this legislation that have a direct impact on the Pine Rivers electorate. The first is the removal of the requirement for certain not-for-profit organisations to apply for a community liquor permit in certain circumstances. The objective of this change is to repeal the rather onerous legislative requirements that are too often placed on community organisations when they are conducting low-risk activities such as school fetes, trivia nights and sausage sizzles. It was interesting to read some of the background statistics about community liquor permits. As some of my colleagues have already mentioned, during the 2012 calendar year 6,774 community liquor permits were applied for and not a single one was rejected. In fact, the statistics show that only nine applications have been rejected in total since 2009. The department anticipates that this amendment alone will reduce the required applications by around 4,000 per year, meaning a significant saving of time for each of those 4,000 community event organisers as well as a saving of \$57 each in not having to pay the permit application fee for each of those community organisations and events. I have no doubt that the P&Cs, the Rotary clubs and the sporting clubs in the Pine Rivers electorate will be pleased at both the time saving as well as the extra \$57 staying in their bank accounts.

Importantly, though, this legislative change will not mean that it is open slather for community groups to organise alcohol charged community events. Whilst qualifying events will now be exempt from things such as having to apply for a permit, pay the \$57 fee, provide a defined area for the consumption of alcohol, have staff trained in the responsible service of alcohol, provide security or have restrictions on the type of liquor able to be sold, there are still responsibilities imposed on event organisers. These responsibilities include ensuring that the sale is made by an adult, that the sale is for consumption at the event, that the sale is not to a minor or to an excessively intoxicated person, that the organisation does not encourage excessive consumption of alcohol, and that the organisation is providing a safe environment in and around the event. Once again, as is the common theme through all of the legislation that the Newman government puts through this parliament, these are common-sense amendments aimed at assisting community organisations with lowering their overheads and minimising the time spent in unnecessary administrative processes.

The second aspect of this legislation that I want to touch on briefly is the red-tape reduction this bill provides to clubs and hotels. One element of these changes is that there are currently arbitrary time limits in place for the installation of gaming machines in hotels and clubs. Legislation mandates that gaming machines must be installed within two years from when a gaming machine licence is granted and, if the licensee has not installed the approved number of gaming machines within that time frame, the approval lapses and any surplus gaming machine entitlements are forfeited to the state with no recourse for compensation for the licensee. Given the involved and often lengthy processes involved once a licensee receives approval, removing these arbitrary time limits for installing gaming machines will provide licensees with a greater level of certainty and flexibility as they seek to acquire and install gaming machines. It will also allow licensees to undertake the necessary preparatory work such as renovating premises to accommodate new gaming machines without fear of that time frame expiring.

There are numerous other benefits for clubs and hotels as well, all of which will provide significant red-tape reduction for these businesses, allowing them to focus on their core business rather than wading through excessive red tape. Whilst I am certainly on record as being not a massive fan of the one-arm bandits and particular gaming machines or the impact that they can have on individuals in our society who have a tendency to have gambling addictions, I certainly am a fan of reducing red tape for businesses and community groups, and anything we can do to reduce that burden on businesses and community groups is certainly beneficial. As I said earlier in my contribution, these are common-sense amendments that will provide significant red-tape reduction to

clubs and hotels as well as many local community organisations. Dare I say that these changes are about freedom—freedom from red tape for businesses and freedom from red tape for community organisations. I think it is vitally important that we remove the red-tape foot on the throat that for too long has been choking many community organisations. It is a struggle for many small local community organisations to find and retain volunteers, so anything that we can do to lessen the administrative workload for our committed community volunteers is a step in the right direction. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CAVALLUCCI** (Brisbane Central—LNP) (6.18 pm): Tonight I rise in the House to make a contribution to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. As an inner-city MP, I am delighted to be able to speak on this bill and am quite excited about how this will be welcome news for many of my P&Cs, clubs, pubs and community groups in Brisbane Central. The Newman government was elected with a mandate to clean up Labor's mess and to take the burden off businesses and community organisations that were drowning in Labor's red-tape regulatory nightmare. I am proud to be a member of this government—a government that is determined to implement real red-tape reduction initiatives for liquor and gaming as part of our six-month action plan. Primarily, this bill centres on removing the requirement for certain low-risk, non-profit organisations to have to complete a community liquor permit when organising one-off fundraising events that include the supply of alcohol such as school fetes, trivia nights and golf days.

It is great news for fundraising efforts for schools and community hubs in the Brisbane Central electorate. I am proud to say that I have very close working relationships with the P&Cs in my electorate and I am thrilled that at their next meeting I will be able to give them more good news about the Newman government and advise that, as a result of this legislation, organisations such as P&Cs will be exempt from permit requirements when holding fundraising events. This amendment addresses areas that have been overregulated for years by successive dud Labor governments.

This bill is focused on obvious and immediately achievable areas for regulatory red-tape reduction. The exemptions mean that eligible functions are not subject to the requirements of applying for a community liquor permit, paying the \$57 fee, providing a defined area for consumption of alcohol, having staff trained in RSA, providing security and having a restriction on the type of liquor able to be sold. Once again, it is our side of politics that is leading the way and getting government off people's back and out of their pocket. I am also looking forward to discussing with various community groups in my electorate savings of approximately \$1,500 dollars for liquor licence applicants, as the requirement to advertise in newspapers and the *Queensland Government Gazette* will be removed. Once again, that means less red tape, less paperwork and nonsense, enabling groups to return to their primary function of serving community members, working together, helping out their neighbours and friends and building a better future for the community of the Brisbane Central electorate. This is exciting news for my electorate.

I am pleased that this bill provides significant red-tape reduction benefits for clubs and hotels. Among other things, this bill will remove the requirement for gaming machine licensees to install gaming machines within a specific period after a licence is initially granted or when an application for an increase in the number of gaming machines has been approved. For clubs and pubs in my electorate, this bill will provide benefits in the way of removing arbitrary time limits for installing gaming machines, which will provide venues with a greater level of certainty regarding their ability to acquire and operate gaming machines. It will also allow licensees to undertake preparatory work that suits their business. For pubs, clubs and hotels in my electorate, this will enable them to focus their resources on their business activities rather than jumping through regulatory hoops set up by Labor.

Particularly welcome news is that this bill contains significant operational benefits for casinos, clubs and hotels, of which there are many in the inner city with more on the way, thanks to the Newman government. Our legislation provides for the introduction of ticket-in, ticket-out systems in casinos, pubs and clubs. TITO allows for a cashless method by which to collect and insert credit into gaming machines using tickets. Before I continue, I note that the industry has been calling for this new technology for some time now and that the Newman government is committed to removing any barriers to industry development and innovation—barriers that were typical of what was delivered by those Labor members opposite when they were last in government. The introduction of TITO is in line with the government's commitment to support the development of a vibrant entertainment and tourism industry. The bill also makes amendments to remove trainer approval provisions under the liquor and


gaming legislation, which now fall under the jurisdiction of the national VET regulator. In 2012, the Queensland parliament passed legislation to refer the power to regulate registered training organisations to the Commonwealth. The current amendments extend the application of the national framework to RSA and RSG by removing the necessity for trainers and training courses to be approved under state law.

As a proud inner-city resident for all of my life and as a person who enjoys the amenity of many of the cafes and small businesses in some of the beautiful suburbs of my electorate such as New Farm, Teneriffe or Windsor, I am delighted to be able to advise small business owners and operators in the Brisbane Central electorate that as a result of this legislation there will be a significant reduction in the regulatory burden faced by applicants for liquor licences for low-risk cafes and restaurants, of which there are so many in the Brisbane Central electorate. These fine small businesses and regular hangouts for many of my constituents as well as some of the soy chai latte set visiting from neighbouring electorates will now be exempt from completing risk assessed management plans and community impact statements.

I am delighted with the news of considerable industry savings of approximately \$200,000 a year as the requirement to renew a gaming machine licence every five years will be removed. That is another positive development for economic growth in Queensland. This bill brings the advertising of all liquor licensing applications and some gaming applications into the 21st century and reduces unnecessary costs. Applications will no longer have to be advertised in the *Government Gazette*—a publication that most potential objectors would never have even heard of. Applications will no longer require notices to be placed in a local paper. Instead, the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation will advertise all relevant applications online, which is a more common and progressive means of communication. It will be welcome news for the many businesses across my electorate that these simple and sensible changes could save applicants up to \$2,000 per licence application.

Currently, all liquor licence applications for cafes and restaurants are required to be accompanied by a risk assessed management plan and a community impact statement. Risk assessed management plans are primarily focused on high community impact venues and must include detailed information concerning the operation of the premises. Typical cafes and restaurants are low-risk operations and are generally not known as a source of alcohol related disturbances or public disorder. As such, they have a minimal impact on the amenity of their local area. These amendments allow the vast majority of low-risk small businesses to prosper and to not be buried under the same burden that is applied to higher risk venues.

This bill is a great piece of legislation. I am proud to say that our government is making it easier for small business owners to run their business, to provide their services to the local community and to get the government off their back. We are making it easier for clubs, pubs and hotels to run a business and provide a service. Importantly, we are making it easier for school P&Cs, sporting clubs, charities and community organisations to hold events, fundraise and give back to the community, which is the true Queensland way. We all know—we on this side of the chamber, anyway—that small business is the engine room of the local community and the economy. As a former small business owner myself, working in business for 15 years, I am determined to make it easier for businesses in my electorate to operate, grow and prosper. This legislation does exactly that. I commend the Attorney-General for this bill. I am proud to support it. I know it will be welcomed by the business and community sectors across my electorate of Brisbane Central. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr SYMES** (Lytton—LNP) (6.25 pm): I rise tonight to make a contribution to the debate on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 and to speak in support of the Attorney-General's amendments. As part of its six-month action plan, the Newman government outlined its commitment to reducing red tape, which was affecting local community groups in terms of regulating liquor and gaming. This bill focuses on numerous issues that have been raised in relation to the current legislation, which disadvantaged so-called low-risk areas of liquor premises and gambling operations, such as local school P&Cs and social gatherings of community groups, from serving alcohol or establishing cash bars at specific fundraising events for their respective organisations. This amendment bill was rigorously evaluated through public consultation through the parliamentary committee process. For example, the amendments contained in clause 152 of this bill were informed through public submissions to the Legal, Constitutional and Administrative Review Committee. Other legislative changes to the liquor and gaming machine acts did not require additional public consultation, as the changes were consistent with the policy objectives and intent of the original bill.

Since entering the Queensland parliament, I have attended numerous P&C meetings and P&C fundraisers where, owing to the legislative powers in the current act, community groups were forced to apply for a liquor permit or to not allow alcohol at those functions. Under this amendment bill, there will be a 33 per cent annual reduction in the number of community liquor permit applications that will be needed to be lodged with the department. That will assist groups such as the Wynnum State School P&C, or the Bayside Nashos, which would be deemed to be small community groups, from having to fill out paperwork just to allow alcohol to be on their premises or sold at an annual trivia night or school fete, as is the case in September for Wynnum State School's first school fete. The Wynnum State School P&C welcomes this decision of the Newman government with open arms. Under this bill, for low-risk cafes and restaurants there will be savings of up to \$1,500 and the lifting of the burden of going over tedious regularity hurdles when applying for their licence. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General has identified that these changes will create industry savings of up to \$200,000 a year, which will be welcomed by the liquor and gaming industry.

I digress for a moment. I brought with me to the Mackay summit the hotel operator and licensee of the Manly Hotel, Mr Sandy McDonald, as a delegate from the Lytton electorate representing the business sector and the liquor and gaming industry. I think operators of such venues are sometimes portrayed somewhat negatively. But Sandy is a well-respected businessman who assists various community groups in the Wynnum-Manly region, such as CODA, the Darling Point Special School and the Manly Chamber of Commerce, to name a few.

This amendment bill will also seek to abolish the Community Investment Fund—the CIF—and transfer those funds from gaming taxes to the Consolidated Fund. But casino and other community funds, which provide grants to community clubs, will remain, as will funding allocations for harm minimisation services. For example, the last round of allocations from the Gambling Community Benefit Fund gave various local community groups in the Lytton electorate nearly \$180,000 for upgrades, such as the mighty Wynnum Vikings AFL club for club seating and the Bayside United Football Club at Lota, which received \$44,000 for field and lighting upgrades. As parliamentarians we must assist the liquor and gaming industry to be a viable industry in Queensland whilst also establishing safeguards and regulating, where efficient, to make gaming and liquor precincts safe for all Queenslanders but, more specifically, young people.


Debate, on motion of Mr Symes, adjourned.


Sitting suspended from 6.29 pm to 7.30 pm.

## LIQUOR AND GAMING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr SYMES:** As I was saying before the dinner break, as parliamentarians we must assist the liquor and gaming industry to be a viable industry in Queensland whilst also establishing safeguards and regulating where appropriate to make gaming and liquor precincts safe for all Queenslanders, in particular young people. This amendment does not strip away a licensee's obligation to ensure their staff recognise responsible service of alcohol to the public or the obligation to provide patrons with a safe and friendly atmosphere for social gatherings. This amendment finally brings some common sense to the ability of community groups to provide further fundraising opportunities at school fetes or trivia nights. For too long community groups have wanted to serve alcohol to raise money at their annual trivia nights, such as Brisbane Bayside State College, Wynnum High or any other school P&C in the Lytton electorate or throughout the other 88 electorates in Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (7.31 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I will confine my comments primarily to the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011. This bill amends the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 to defer a number of 'uncommenced' amendments to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 that will harmonise Queensland's act with the national model. The 'uncommenced' amendments to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 were postponed by regulation for a period of two years and are now due to automatically commence on 7 June 2013. As a result of the amendments in this bill, the changes to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 will also be deferred until 1 January 2014.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has endorsed further deferral of these provisions and states on page 29 of its report on this legislation—

Based on information available to the Committee, this decision has been made to ensure consistency between the Act and pending (and presently unknown) changes to the Electrical Safety Regulation 2002. This regulation is due to expire on 1 September 2013 and the Government is in the process of considering whether this regulation ought to be remade or replaced. Essentially, the Government has foreshadowed that changes to the Regulation may impact upon key concepts and terminology within the Act.

These statements indicate three things: firstly, that the LNP cares so little for worker safety that it wants to further defer provisions that will help protect people from electrical incidents; secondly, that further weakening of our electrical safety laws are obviously on the cards given the heads up from the committee that the government is expecting changes to come out of the Electrical Safety Regulation review; and, thirdly, that the government intends rushing these weaker electrical safety laws through parliament this year and have them in operation by 1 January 2014.

Once again the LNP Newman government is attacking the rights and protections of workers. This is Work Choices in safety. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General is currently conducting a review of the Electrical Safety Regulation 2002 which the Electrical Trades Union is concerned will reduce safety protections. I am also deeply concerned about these matters. The government wants to delay the 'uncommenced' provisions until this review is completed. There is already growing disquiet amongst the electrical trades community about the government's review of the Electrical Safety Regulation 2002. Among the options being considered by the LNP as part of this review is the significant watering down of safety provisions relating to electrical work. For example, the government is proposing winding back testing and tagging provisions for some circumstances. This Newman government is also proposing less training for trainees, putting lives at risk unnecessarily for the sake of saving a few bucks. This is the callous disregard that this Newman government holds for workers in Queensland.

I am very concerned that the government's rationale for delaying the 'uncommenced' provisions of the Work Health and Safety Act is related to the review of the Electrical Safety Regulation. It appears that the government believes that electrical safety is no longer an issue in Queensland. While I acknowledge that the rate of electrocutions has thankfully been dropping in the past decade, the reality is that people still die every year from electrical incidents. We should be doing more, not less, to protect people. The government should be adopting its own Zero Harm at Work principles and doing everything it can to protect workers and also protect the community from electrical safety incidents.

This is not red tape. It is not red tape at all. These are practical, sensible provisions to ensure that people who go to work can return to their families and loved ones safely each and every night. Clearly and sadly it appears that the government is intent on winding back electrical safety provisions in Queensland. Last year the Newman government abolished the position of Electrical Safety Commissioner. It abolished it without warning, without consultation and without any consideration of the importance of this role. Now we have the government further delaying provisions of the Work Health and Safety Act and the winding back of safety provisions of the Electrical Safety Regulation are on the horizon. This is clearly unacceptable to the people of Queensland.

The opposition does not support delaying the commencement of these provisions. The amendments should commence on the date that they are scheduled to commence. Should the review seek to wind back protections under the national model, there should be separate legislation doing so. We oppose any measures that seek to reduce protection for electrical safety on behalf of the workers in the state of Queensland and on behalf of electrical contractors and electrical businesses. David Wilson of Springfield Test and Tag, all electricians across the state and all members of the ETU deserve to be heard and taken notice of by this tory government. In fact, a lot of people who are involved in the electrical industry have contacted me in relation to this matter and they all seem at one in relation to electrical safety issues.

I also want to talk briefly about part 2 clause 4 of the bill which relates to QCAT. I want to mention the training of JPs for QCAT. I place on the record tonight that I know that JPs who are to go into the QCAT arena had one week's training, they had role-plays which were assessed by peer review, there were no exams like there are for JP qualified, they were not told if they passed or failed, they did not receive a letter to say whether they passed or failed and they were given no certificate of attainment—nothing. It was an absolute shemozzle.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In order to assist the member for Bundamba, it might help to say that those comments would have been best attributed to the debate we had on the JP QCAT bill two weeks ago and not this bill which has nothing to do with that.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! I remind the member for Bundamba to stay relevant to this bill.

**Mrs MILLER:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am talking about the amendment to section 74B of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I advise the Attorney-General that if I want his advice I will seek it. In conclusion, I would just like to table, for the minister's benefit, a letter from the Justices Association Gold Coast branch which talks about JP QCAT. I will table the document.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What is your point of order, Attorney?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The matter the member refers to has nothing to do with this bill. She forgot to say it in the debate on the bill two weeks ago. She cannot do it now just because she forgot to do it two weeks ago due to her own incompetence.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, I will ask you to stay relevant to this bill.

**Mrs MILLER:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I table that document for the benefit of the Attorney-General who actually came into this parliament back then and quoted parts of that particular letter. I would also like to talk about electrical safety.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Bundamba, take your seat. What is your point of order, Attorney-General?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Pursuant to the standing orders, the member is participating in repetition. You have ruled on my point of order. I ask for a ruling on relevance. If she has nothing further to contribute to this debate, I ask for her to be shown the door.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Bundamba, I require you to stay relevant to this bill or I will ask you to take your seat. Please continue.

**Mrs MILLER:** I have two minutes remaining for my contribution and I will quote from a letter that I received from David Wilson from Springfield Test and Tag. Springfield Test and Tag is in my electorate and does a lot of electrical safety work. David Wilson said—

It has come to my attention that options being considered by the Attorney-General's department, who administers the Electrical Safety Office, in relation to the current Queensland Electrical Safety Regulations 2002 review will put, in my opinion many Queensland workers in danger in their workplaces.

Currently there is a strict regime of appliance testing and tagging requirements, based on the nature of the workplace—


**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Bundamba, please take your seat. What is your point of order, Attorney?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It relates to relevance. The member is referring to test and tag requirements and keeps quoting a regulation review we are doing. It has nothing to do with the bill before the House that we are debating. The bill deals with workplace health and safety, not the electrical safety test and tag regulation the member is referring to.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Attorney. Member for Bundamba, this will be your last opportunity to be relevant to this bill.

**Mrs MILLER:** Thank you for your advice, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am referring to part 15 which is the amendment of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011. As I have very little time left on the clock, I would like to table this document from David Wilson for the benefit of everybody in the House.

 **Dr FLEGG** (Moggill—LNP) (7.44 pm): Just as we have learnt in this state that throwing money at a problem does not necessarily solve it, having people bound up in red tape does not always guarantee you the good outcome or the good practice that you might want. This particular bill addresses some of the very insidious and annoying aspects of red tape that confront particularly our small business operators, microbusiness operators and not-for-profit organisations.

It has provisions to simplify some of the procedures for clubs in relation to poker machine licences—procedures that will not have any impact on the level of gambling but will simply make life a bit easier for these operators. Our small liquor licensees and our small suburban restaurants, which are very low-risk licensed venues, will have a significantly reduced burden when it comes to advertising and the like to obtain licences. There were around 139 such licences issued in the last year. Small restaurants will no longer need to conduct a risk assessment management plan or a community impact statement. There is a saving in fees for them there and obviously a saving in time. It just makes sense. These are very low-risk licensed venues. There is a provision that under circumstances where the risk is perceived to be higher the requirement can be reinstated.

Probably the most important part of the bill—and certainly from the point of view of members in this place—is its impact on not-for-profit organisations. We all have them in our electorates. We have our Rotary clubs that do sausage sizzles at the local hardware store. We have our P&Cs that conduct school fetes or trivia nights. There is a whole array of not-for-profit community organisations that conduct one-off community events which are very low-risk events.

There were around 6,774 community liquor permits issued last year and all of them were approved. There was not a single rejection out of 6,774 applications. This is testament to the fact that these are very low-risk events. As the Attorney-General has correctly identified, it raises the question why we are making 6,774 organisations jump through the hoops of obtaining a community liquor permit when in fact it is almost a rubber stamp situation.

The Moggill State School, which is a very large state school in my electorate, has a carnival of rides every year. For their one-off event they had to have a petitioned area with hessian around it, they had to employ a security guard and people were confined in a pen environment. This was all for something that was an extremely low-risk event. If they want to recover the cost of alcohol at a trivia night or want to conduct a raffle that has alcohol as a prize, these are not things that necessarily need the heavy dead hand of government sitting on them.

Of the 6,700-odd community liquor permits granted last year, around 4,000 of them would not have needed to obtain a permit under the provisions of this bill. There are certainly safeguards built into the bill for the very rare occasions where there may be a problem. The police or the appropriate authorities can require compliance or can in fact close an event. Such an example would be if alcohol were being supplied to minors.


For the thousands of Queensland community groups that provide these sorts of one-off social events, the provisions in this bill save them from having to make an application for a permit, having to pay an application fee, having to have a defined area, having to have their volunteers do RSA courses and having to have a security guard. That is a very significant saving that makes it much more realistic for many of our community groups to put on these types of community events, which I think everybody here would agree are great events where you not only support a good cause like a local school or a Rotary Club but they bring people from your community together in a social environment. In this day and age I think the more of that we get the better off we are.

It is with pleasure that I speak about gaming and alcohol in this place. I think the Attorney-General has done a fabulous job in removing some absolutely unnecessary red tape in a way that will not add to alcohol fuelled violence, under-age drinking or gambling. I congratulate him on the bill and commend the bill to the House.

### **Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Tabling of Documents**

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! Honourable members, before I call the next Speaker, the member for Bundamba in the last moment of her speech purported to table documents regarding justices of the peace and changes to the electrical safety regulations. Pursuant to Madam Speaker's rulings last sitting week, the tabled documents need to be relevant to the matter. I rule the documents as not relevant to the matter or tabled and have asked the Clerk to return the documents to the member. I suggest the member table the documents during another appropriate debate.

**Mrs Miller:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (7.51 pm): It is a pleasure to speak to this bill tonight. I congratulate the Attorney-General for bringing this important reform forward. When I was campaigning to be elected to this place, it struck me that one of the overriding themes which shone through from all of the feedback about the previous government was that the bureaucracy which was associated with the former government was heavy-handed and was completely out of touch with what

the community's aspirations were and was unable to respond to even legitimate concerns about their wellbeing or the way they wanted to do things in their community. You do not need to look any further than at a bill like this to see us winding back some of those ridiculous bureaucratic provisions.

I want to talk about one of them tonight, and that is the liquor and gaming amendments in this bill, particularly as they relate to reducing red tape for community events at which alcohol is served. As the member for Moggill has said, we all have Rotary clubs and Lions clubs in our electorate who, on occasion, want to run functions where they serve alcohol. In my electorate we have probably nearly 100 service clubs including the Rotary clubs of Boonah, Beaudesert, Fassifern Valley and Jimboomba; the Lions clubs of Boonah, Fassifern and Tamborine Mountain; Quota clubs; Inner Wheel clubs; and Zonta. In addition, we have P&C and P&F associations at 25 state schools from Jimboomba to the New South Wales border and several independent schools as well. They all run functions, fetes and fairs where they can serve a glass of wine or a few beers to people. They are very low-risk events. People at those events are responsible in the main.

As the member for Moggill referred to, it is not an ideal situation where a process needs to be gone through for a permit to be obtained when it is just a rubber stamp process. They only pay \$57; it is not a huge amount of money. But it is the fact that we require a permit and a designated area for such a low-risk activity which is an insult to the sense of responsibility and ownership in the community. People do not need to be told how to run these events. They know how to run them. They know how to run them responsibly—at least in the Beaudesert electorate we do. We should trust them to be able to run these events. Having spent some time overseas like a lot of members here probably have, I know that Australia does have a very regulated environment when it comes to alcohol. I think with this bill and the provisions relating to reducing red tape for community events we are taking a step which puts us in line with a lot of other parts of the world.

There are important conditions placed on this regime and they are set out: the supply of alcohol needs to be by an adult, the supply of alcohol needs to be for immediate consumption and we need to make sure that minors are not being served alcohol. But these are all things that community organisations do anyway.

Recently I had a fundraising day in my electorate called the Pink Stumps Day. It was run by the Fassifern Bushrangers Cricket Club. There were a lot of different cricket teams from all around the community. I and the federal member for Wright, Scott Buchholz, played.

**Mr Choat:** What a champion!

**Mr KRAUSE:** He is a champion. He is a good federal member and hopefully he will be re-elected shortly. Hopefully the LNP candidate for Blair will be elected as well to replace the terrible Labor member we have there at the moment. But I digress.

The Pink Stumps Day was a great day. We were raising money for the Jane McGrath Foundation, supporting research into the causes of breast cancer. We had, I think, 17 teams of six playing cricket that day including me, playing five-over matches. It was a great day. But in terms of having a beer during the day and at the end of the day, we had a demarcated area where people could not digress from. If you stepped over to the wrong side of the rope, you would be in breach of the law and subject to fines if the police came along or the liquor licensing people came along and found you on the wrong side of the fence. It is absolutely ridiculous that community events need to be regulated to that degree. To see a bill come into this House to get rid of that is a mighty fine thing.

I refer also to events like the Kalbar Country Day, where Kalbar puts on a show of its heritage. We have street parade, hay-baling contests, pumpkin-rolling contests and all those sorts of things. Of course they have a beer and a glass of wine. We also have raffles which might include prizes of bottles of wine. You do not need a permit or regulation for that sort of activity, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am glad to see that we are getting rid of it.

Coming up on 29 June will be the Winter Harvest Festival at Aratula, an activity run by the Scenic Rim Regional council as part of Eat Local Week. Eat Local Week is a spectacular event run by the council which encourages all people in our Scenic Rim regional area to eat local and to promote our local fruit and vegetable and other primary producers including wine producers—and might I say there are some fair home brewers in our electorate as well. At the Winter Harvest Festival no doubt they will be serving wine and beer, so I hope this red-tape reduction measure will apply to that festival as well.


The other good thing about this bill is that it removes the regulatory burden for low-risk premises such as cafes and restaurants. There are many low-risk venues like this around the state. We get a lot of tourists visiting my neck of the woods. We have people visiting from Brisbane, from

the Gold Coast and from all over the world on the weekends. In fact, we get a lot of people riding their motorcycles through the electorate on the weekends as well. They are responsible people who come to contribute to the economy and to see the wonderful Scenic Rim. They come to ride on good roads. They do not want to ride all the way sometimes. Sometimes they need to have a break from some of the potholes which are around and need to be fixed, Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Again, I digress.

**Mr Cripps:** That's irrelevant to the bill.

**Mr KRAUSE:** No. It is not irrelevant to the bill, Minister Cripps, because we are talking about restaurants and cafes, and a lot of business for my restaurants and cafes comes from tourists driving down the Mount Lindesay Highway and the Boonah-Ipswich Road. I am talking about cafes like Cafe 17, Art and Soul, Harry's, The Story Tree and Flavours in Boonah; Everydays and Tart'n Caps in Beaudesert; and Hillbilly and DeliVino on Tamborine Mountain. They are all low-risk venues who should have red tape reduced from their operating costs as much as possible. They do not need to justify to the community through a risk assessed management plan why they should be able to serve beer and wine each day because the residents of the community are responsible residents. The tourists who come there to spend money and to see the community are responsible tourists. There are barely ever, if ever, any incidents at these premises. So removing this burden of regulation from them is a good move.

It is great to see this government measure to free up business, small business in particular, from another aspect of the dead hand of regulation—from the dead hand of bureaucracy which was relayed to me so much during the campaign before last year's election. We have a lot of work to do in this space in removing unnecessary legislation, but bit by bit we will do it. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (8.00 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I welcome the changes proposed by these amendments. If there is one thing that Labor has done well, it is to leave us a wonderful legacy of red tape. The changes proposed by this legislation free up community and volunteer groups, and that is important.

I would like to talk about a typical committee meeting with a volunteer group or a school P&C, because my wife and I over the years have been to many. Typically, they start like this: I think we might do something to raise some money for the school or for a charity or for a sporting group. How about we put on a do, we organise an esky with a few beers and some wine and we run a raffle? Then somebody says, 'Hang on a second, there could be some problems with that. We might need some permits. We do not know whether we need public liability insurance.' So then they say, 'Okay, we will do something simpler. Maybe we will run a trivia night or put on a dinner dance or hold a big raffle at the school.' Then the conversation ends with, 'We will probably need a community liquor permit. We will have to organise designated drinking areas. We will have to find out how to get this permit. Who is going to pay for the permit because there is no money in the account at the moment?' It just goes on and on. Today I heard the opposition talking about the need for security risk assessments.

**Mr Johnson:** That's the Labor way of red tape.

**Mr MOLHOEK:** I take that interjection from the member for Gregory. That is exactly what Labor do. They load us up with more layers of red tape, more rules and more regulation—more layers than a Sara Lee pastry. I am showing my age, I know. Those ads about Sara Lee pastries were a few years ago—layer upon layer upon layer. It is these layers that are making it more and more difficult.

From my experience, trying to find volunteers on a committee or trying to get people to help out with a fundraiser or a fete is getting harder because people are frustrated with all the rules and all the regulations. I have seen it all in the last decade, I can assure honourable members. Earlier this evening we heard the member for Mulgrave using terms like 'safeguards' and 'proper designations'. Then he spoke about the need to protect children at these community events. There are some valid concerns there, but I for one am tired of Labor's nanny state view of the world because under Labor we have become more and more regulated.

**Mr Krause:** They've got to take responsibility.

**Mr MOLHOEK:** That is right. Labor's approach to the community and volunteers has been typically to shoot first and ask questions later. Its approach has always been the presumption of guilt. Let's focus on what could go wrong. Let's focus on systems and process and how we can control all these things. Its approach has always been about assuming the worst. Let's create as many rules as we can. Let's cover every possible risk. Let's use all means possible for control and when we have

done everything we can to demoralise well-meaning, hard-working volunteers with as much needless paperwork and regulation as possible then let's bring in some more rules. Who knows, had the previous Labor reign continued we probably would have seen them regulating family gatherings in our backyards, parks and beaches.

I am pleased we are stripping away these onerous red-tape burdens. I can speak with a little authority in this respect because my wife and I have personally been confronted with these on many occasions through our involvement with the school P&Cs and some of the local charities we have been involved with. It is these sorts of rules that really suck the life out of enthusiastic, well-meaning volunteers and community groups. I have heard many parents on many occasions say, 'It's all too hard. I really don't need this much grief in my life. I can't be bothered.' So you end up with the same two or three battle hardened, battle weary people on P&Fs, committees and sporting groups carrying the load because they are persistent and tenacious. But why do we have to make it so hard for people to get on with these things?

On a more positive note I want to talk this evening about the great work of the Gold Coast Community Fund. In the late nineties I was approached in a former career as a radio station manager to join with a whole bunch of other businesspeople and community people, and we decided that we would create an approach that would get around some of this unnecessary red tape, and that is that we went out and got a master permit. We created a particular Art Union process that lots and lots of groups could get involved in. Over the years I am proud to say that the Gold Coast Community Fund as an umbrella organisation has helped many groups on the Gold Coast. Over the past 10 years it has raised and given away some \$1½ million to individual groups on the Gold Coast such as Riding for the Disabled, Paradise Kids, AEIOU, Hopewell Hospice, ACT for Kids, Rosies, the Gold Coast Project for Homeless Youth and the Musgrave Hill Early Childhood Development Unit. It has also provided personal support for many families and individuals in financial and practical terms for children with cerebral palsy, epilepsy, autism and many other families connected with the Southport Special School.

I want to pay tribute to some of the people who said, 'Even though Labor are making it really difficult for us, we are going to persist.' We had one of the best lawyers on the Gold Coast volunteer his time. He has been the chairman of that board for the last seven or eight years—Mr Simon Bennett from OMB Solicitors. Ian Cousins, who was the vice chairman right from the start some 10 years ago and who used to work for the Macquarie Radio Network, continues to be on the board of the Gold Coast Community Fund. Every year Steve Cavalier and Rutland Smith from Harvey Norman have donated the major prize that has enabled us to raise the dollars. John Applegate and Jim and Suzy Kinsel from Surfers Inkspot have printed the tickets, made sure they met the permit requirements and had the right numbering, the right colour code and the right font size. The regulation in this space has been ridiculous. I want to pay tribute to all the people on that committee: Roy Miller, the former managing director of the *Gold Coast Bulletin*—

**Mr Stevens:** Rocky.

**Mr MOLHOEK:** I take that interjection. Joe Condon, the dual vice chairman; Troy Niebling, the treasurer of the fund; Kate McFarlane, who has been the secretary for many years; Michael Thorburn; Corey Bell; Nicholas Scott; Colette Gallagher—all of these people have worked really hard in spite of the red tape that the former government has overlayed to find a way to work with local community groups and charities, run some great functions and raise hundreds of thousands of dollars.


It would be remiss of me to not acknowledge Col Torrington, one of the most outstanding volunteers you will ever meet on the Gold Coast. He is someone who is patient and persistent. He has sat with all these other school groups and charity groups and walked them through the complications. He has coordinated appeals, organised raffle tickets and prizes, and then sat out the front of Harvey Norman Bundall nearly every Saturday and Sunday for the last eight years selling tickets to raise money for some of these groups. I need to also mention Karen Phillips, who is one of the board members. It is her 50th birthday today. It is all over Facebook and Twitter.

**Mr Stevens:** Fifty is the new 40.

**Mr MOLHOEK:** It is the new 40, apparently. She does not seem to be too concerned about us knowing her age. Karen, through the Early Risers events, has raised a million dollars or more for Gold Coast charities. It is these sorts of people that these changes to the legislation will help. It is these sorts of people who will benefit as they go out there and roll up their sleeves with a genuine desire to make a real difference.

It is ironic that our colleagues across the chamber, who love to beat their chests about the battlers and the workers, have done so much to make it difficult for people and for community groups to help themselves. I am surprised because I am not sure they really get the concept of community, because community is actually about giving back. We need to have legislation that gets out of the way of community and makes it easier for these people to continue to work and achieve great things for the many community groups, schools and sporting clubs in society. Our job as a government is to get out of the way and to encourage community, to foster a society where people can get involved without onerous burdens. Our job is to encourage initiative and to release our thousands of community organisations to do what they do best.

This is great legislation. It is not just good for the many small charity groups and organisations out there; it is also good for small business, it is great for tourism, it is good for the events industry and, more importantly, it is very good for our communities. I am proud to stand here tonight and to commend this bill to the House. I congratulate the Attorney-General on the excellent work that he has done in drafting these changes. I also congratulate the committee on their work in reviewing the legislation. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (8.10 pm): I rise tonight to speak on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I would like to join with all the speakers in commending the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice for his innovative and cut-through approach towards red tape regarding part of the industry and for coming up with amendments that are very much appropriate and suitable to protect those small operators in our communities that need assistance to keep them going in a very difficult climate.

As I travelled throughout the state when in opposition, all I ever heard were complaints from community groups about the red tape and the rigmarole they had to pass through in order to get small functions going that were to raise funds for the community. It was just amazing to me how any government could have put in place all those fees, hurdles, regulations et cetera to obliterate the small organisations, particularly in a lot of the country towns, and prevent them from getting together as communities—and country towns are the best place for community because everybody knows each other. By their very nature they do a wonderful job in punching above their weight and supporting themselves through the many community functions from schools right through to little tiny race clubs, picnic race clubs, amateur rodeos and farm fests. All of these organisations will benefit greatly from the Attorney-General's changes to the legislation.

I congratulate the Attorney-General on leading the way for the Campbell Newman LNP government in reducing red tape. This is only the first instalment; we will see many more provisions come from the Attorney-General, who has been the busiest minister in this House in terms of legislation. He has almost worn out the Premier's seat. As the Premier has mentioned to me, it is always warm from the Attorney-General sitting in it. In our first term it is very important that we get all of these legislative matters in place and organised so we can prosper during the terms ahead that we hope to enjoy as the LNP government with the good agreement of the great community of Queensland.

This is moving away from the nanny state, which is an absolute imperative in all facets; this is just one part in liquor licensing. Previously, in answer to any problem that was raised through media circles, there had to be a new legislative regime that you could not jump over and that affects all of the smaller groups and smaller people in the community. The big companies can handle legislation. They have big profits and it is not a problem for them. However, the smaller community groups are the ones that are seriously affected by the amount of red tape and legislation that was introduced by the Labor Party over almost 20 years in their nanny-state mentality.

However, there are a couple of matters I would like to raise in relation to reducing red tape in terms of liquor licensing. One in particular is exemplified in my area, the lovely area of Mermaid Beach. I have to be very careful in my community perspective of protecting the residential amenities in some areas where people are opening up restaurants per se and turning them, quite obviously and with little difficulty, into bars. Unfortunately, the people who are using these 'restaurants' as bars and watering holes in a residential community sometimes make it unpleasant to deal with the matters that evolve when some people—not everybody—sometimes drink too much liquor and have an effect on the community as they leave, or indulge in, bar areas. I am talking about some particularly small areas, and the member for Burleigh and I had meetings in a wonderful little area of Mermaid Beach and Burleigh that we share together. We share Nobby's Beach.

**Mr Cripps:** There wouldn't be much room!

**Mr STEVENS:** I take the interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. I am sorry, but there is certainly not room for us to invite the member for Hinchinbrook down as well; the member for Burleigh and the member for Mermaid Beach will be occupying Nobby's Beach!

There is a new establishment opening at Nobby's Beach in my electorate that the Gold Coast City Council has approved as a cafe/restaurant. It is on the beachfront. It is very much in a residential area. The Gold Coast City Council has licensed it from 10 am to 10 pm to restrict the bar trade, and that is the important part. As Mr Deputy Speaker mentioned, no-one has any problems with him and his wife having a bottle of wine or a glass or two—not as well as, just a glass or two or a bottle of wine—at these lovely little cafes and experiencing the ambiance. I can see the moon rising and a wonderful night ahead.

**Mr Bleijie:** Sing us a song!

**Mr STEVENS:** I will shortly. I do requests. We have to ensure that they do not turn into the sort of thing that makes it unpleasant for the residential amenity in terms of there being only bars. I think we should look at enforcing food being served as part of those restaurant type approvals. Restaurants are for eating, not just for drinking. That is the issue and I would like to see that any further review of liquor licensing and red-tape reduction will not impact upon that. That is the important part. I am quite sure the Attorney-General shares those views as well.

Something that has been brought to my attention—not through the Attorney-General—is also a corollary of liquor licensing, reduction of red tape and the ease of converting establishments into places that sell liquor. Previously, the Labor government relaxed the requirement for toilet amenities in terms of approvals for restaurants. Through the planning schemes the local councils adopted the state government directives through the SPA, the state planning agreement or whatever it was. It has led to a shortage of toilet facilities in large clusters of restaurants which, as I alluded to earlier, particularly in an area like Broadbeach, are doing enormous bar trade.


**A government member** interjected.

**Mr Bleijie:** Don't take interjections.

**Mr STEVENS:** No, I will not take the interjection about bushes out the front. That is part and parcel of the problem: when people have to go, they have to go. If there are insufficient numbers of toilets in these very heavily utilised areas, the bar trade is flowing and lots of wine and liquor is being consumed, the obvious response to that there is a high demand for toilets. Whilst the queues at the ladies' are not as long as we would normally expect them to be, the men's toilets are always in heavy demand. I think that should be looked at from a planning point of view as a corollary of liquor licensing issues. I would hope that, as part of our future review of all of the matters that the Labor Party got wrong, we revisit the issue of the provision of amenities in these dining areas rather than relying on single amenities servicing many of them.

I am very pleased to support the minister in his reduction of red tape, removing the requirement for liquor and gaming applications to be gazetted, and the other issues that will circumvent unfair imposts on smaller community groups in our area. I also support the bill and commend the bill to the House.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Just before I call the member for Gladstone, I would like to recognise the Morningside and Mount Bruce Scout groups here in the gallery.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (8.20 pm): I rise to speak to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. Before I move to the two prime subjects that have been the subject of many comments here tonight, I would like to ask a question of the Attorney-General.

There are some changes to the Gaming Machine Act in relation to gaming machines and keno. I would ask the minister to clarify that the changes do not make it less stringent for gaming machine operators to comply with necessary requirements for them to act in accordance with the law and to protect their premises from being used potentially for illegal practices. It is unclear in the amendments, and I have not read anything that gives some clarity on that section of the bill. Most of the discussion has dealt with the deregulation of the consumption of alcohol at small activities and the consumption of alcohol at hospitals. Those are two items that I would like to address.

I do not think that there is a person in this chamber who would argue with the fact that the abuse of alcohol is destructive. In our electorates we have seen people whose relationships or health have suffered as a result of alcohol abuse. But that is not what this bill deals with. From my reading of it, this bill deals with the ability of small, not-for-profit organisations to offer the sale of wine or beer as an ancillary activity at their fundraising functions. On that basis, I do not think that anyone in my electorate would have a single concern.

There are many small organisations, and not all of them are formally structured, that for altruistic reasons raise money for organisations in our community. These include the previously mentioned P&Cs and other small, not-for-profit organisations. I know each of the communities in my electorate who have been affected by floods and other things have got together to organise small fundraising activities. From my reading of this bill, those small groups will also be able to have a glass of wine or beer for sale in the context of fundraising for their local community. Correct me if I am wrong, but that is the way that the bill appears to me.

For many of these small groups, they would balk at holding those sorts of small fundraising functions because of the prospect of having to get a limited liquor licence. It is not the \$57 that is the problem; it is all the paperwork that goes with it. The prospect of having to jump through those hoops is more than a small fundraising event would justify. For many small organisations, their fundraising ability has been limited because they have not had the volunteers available to deal with the minutiae of the paperwork which has been attached to getting a short-term evening's liquor licence.

I think it is a very telling statistic that since 2009, only nine applications for this type of fundraising liquor licence have been rejected. The week before we came to Brisbane we had Volunteers Week, which was a celebration of volunteers. We should not lose sight of the fact that these amendments are targeting precisely those people: the volunteers who give freely of their time, their energy and their expertise for the betterment of others. I applaud the Attorney-General for addressing that sector of the community. They may not have massive fundraisers, but they certainly have fundraisers that make a difference.

I also commend the minister for the inclusion of small shows. Country shows maintain an ethos in our rural communities which needs to be protected and encouraged. We all have the orchid and foliage societies, the stitches groups and hobby groups who work tirelessly for our community. These groups will be able to utilise this new regime to improve the environments of their fundraising activities.

I think one of the benefits is that this bill does not impinge on those organisations that do not want to include alcohol as part of their fundraising activities. There are a number of church schools that would not want to be involved in an activity that included alcohol. This in no way affects them. These are positive and remedial changes to the legislation, and again I commend the minister for that.

There are significant constraints. The operation of the proposed activity has to be between 7 am and 12 pm and for a maximum of eight hours. There are the usual responsibilities for those running the organisation regarding the responsible service of alcohol, although it is not a requirement to hold that certification.

There has been a reference by previous speakers to some correspondence from certain organisations who deal with alcohol abuse which I think most of us have received. This correspondence indicates that allowing the consumption of alcohol in hospitals—and this is my terminology, not theirs—creates a conflict that is difficult to understand. Most state hospitals will not take up this opportunity because that is not the environment that they offer. But for a lot of private hospitals, offering a glass of wine with a meal is part of the environment and the opportunity that they want to offer their hospital guests.

I recall that in the early 2000s I went to Newcastle and Wollongong to have a look at an industrial transport system that was going to be replicated in my electorate. I wanted to see how Wollongong handled their industrial transport network throughout that region. In the week that I was there—and I intended to only be there for the weekend—I had the privilege of transitioning my aunty from a hospital to a palliative care unit. That palliative care unit offered an evening alcohol service, and her favourite alcoholic drink was a Fluffy Duck. It took me a little while to get the recipe for a Fluffy Duck.


**A government member:** Can you share it with us?

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** No, because I had to ring up a pub in my electorate to get the recipe to tell the people who ran the palliative care unit. These people in that unit were at the end stages of their lives. That palliative care hospice wanted to provide its patients with the most beneficial, comfortable and collegial environment available. For my aunty, it turned out to be one week of her life; for others it was slightly longer.

The changes to this legislation will enable places such as hospices and palliative care units—if they are so minded—to offer a little bit of comfort, relaxation and collegiality without the onerous paperwork that would be involved in providing alcohol. For the palliative care unit, the service of alcohol is a minor matter; but I know that for my auntie, it was like the icing on the cake.

For those people who say that it is counterproductive to introduce alcohol into hospitals, I do not believe that any unit at a major hospital which deals with addictive behaviour will introduce an evening alcohol run. I do not believe that that will happen. Major hospitals will not be seeking to utilise this legislation, but for those organisations that provide end-of-life care and a lifestyle opportunity for the people in their facility, it will mean that they can offer this opportunity with a minimal amount of red tape, to use the current terminology.

There will still be the requirement for the responsible service of alcohol, and there will still be obligations in terms of not serving people who are intoxicated, but these proposed amendments will improve the quality of life for those people who reside in facilities such as these. I commend the Attorney-General and I support the legislation.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (8.30 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I would particularly like to address the issue of the abolition of the Community Investment Fund. The Community Investment Fund is established under the Gaming Machine Act 1991, and the minister is required to pay into the fund a percentage, which is set by regulation, of all gaming machine tax paid to the commissioner by all licensees. The moneys paid into this fund have been used for worthwhile purposes over the years, and I have proudly supported the initiatives of the government in the disbursement of moneys from this fund.

The act also establishes the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. Under the act, the minister is authorised to make payments from the Community Investment Fund for a number of things including gambling research and dealing with social issues arising from gambling, the gambling and casino community benefit funds, major public sporting facilities, major cultural facilities, infrastructure for those facilities and capital works for the racing industry.

One of the reasons this fund was established was to distribute a designated percentage of the revenue collected from specific gaming taxes to provide grants to community groups. This bill abolishes the Community Investment Fund and transfers any money in that fund to consolidated revenue. The section that allows the minister to make payments from the Community Investment Fund for the purposes that I mentioned earlier will be omitted by this bill. Instead, all payments received by way of gaming machine tax, health services levy, a penalty imposed under section 319 of the act, and other fees and charges under the act will now be paid directly into consolidated revenue. Also, even if the Treasurer or a minister has decided to pay funds to someone, such as a community group, out of that fund and it has not been paid before it is closed, there is no requirement that the Treasurer pay that money to the group. The bill says that the minister 'may' pay the amount to the group. The explanatory notes state—

Upon its abolition all existing CIF commitments will be funded from the Consolidated Fund, including: grant payments to the Racing Industry Capital Development Scheme; funding for the liquor and gaming regulatory and harm minimisation operations of the Office of Regulatory Policy (ORP) and the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation (OLGR); and grant payments to the gambling and casino community benefit funds.

Whilst it is reassuring to be told that, I would hate to think the Queensland people are being lulled into a false sense of security. There is nothing in this bill that requires any set percentage of the funds paid into consolidated revenue from the taxes, fees, levies and charges that were previously paid into the Community Investment Fund to be spent in the way it was previously. Without any statutory guarantee such as existed before, I am not prepared to trust this government. They have shown that they cannot be trusted to act impartially where the allocation of funding is concerned, and they cannot be trusted to continue the same allocation of funds. I am happy to be proven wrong.

I, for one, echo the concerns expressed by industry stakeholders during consultation on the bill by the committee. By abolishing the fund and making payments directly into consolidated revenue these payments will now be 'left to the vagaries of whole-of-government budgetary considerations'. Once money is absorbed into consolidated revenue there can be no guarantee that it can continue to be quarantined for the purposes intended. In fact, by its very nature the money becomes available to government for its general purposes, and community groups and the office of liquor and gaming must compete with all other claims on the public purse.

Yesterday morning the Auditor-General had tabled in the parliament his report titled *Community benefit funds: grant management*. That report identified that about \$50 million annually is distributed to community organisations through the gambling and casino community benefit funds. The Auditor-General commented on the undoubtedly positive impact on the community benefits and social capital. However, he also identified some concerns in relation to the administration of the funds. I wait with interest to see the government's response to this report; however, improvements to administration of the funds can be achieved without abolishing the Community Investment Fund. The concerns need to be addressed irrespective of where the moneys are held. In fact, the Auditor-General has made nine recommendations in his report, and abolishing the Community Investment Fund is not one of those recommendations.

As a regional member of parliament I particularly value the important contribution to community amenity that grants from the gambling and casino community benefit funds can provide. Sometimes this is in the absence of corporate sponsorship being available to some of our communities. For example, earlier this year Streets Movement boxing at Bentley Park received a grant of \$30,000 from the Gambling Community Benefit Fund to renovate their facility and to purchase equipment. In round 71 of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund distribution in 2012, groups in my electorate received over \$89,000 in grants. I want to ensure that regional community groups will still benefit to the same extent from these grants.

Locally, the committees have had representation from the local communities. The various casino community benefit funds and the Gambling Community Benefit Fund all have representatives from regional areas—people who know and have an understanding of the needs of local communities and how different matters pose different challenges for different localities or groups. The needs of every community group will never be the same, and the diversity of these committees is invaluable to their decision making. One of the other important features of the committees is that they are bipartisan. They allocate funds based on identifiable need and have no regard for electoral boundaries or the political persuasions of members of the community organisations. My real concern is that any attempt to remove decision making from these committees may mean that this fairness is lost.

The bill provides that an amount may be paid into the Gambling Community Benefit Fund from the Consolidated Fund. There is no designated percentage of receipts from the fees and levies that currently exists. Also, the minister may pay an amount from the fund to an entity for the benefit of the community. There is no reporting requirement on the part of the relevant minister to ensure that Queenslanders and this House are informed whether the same proportion of funds is going to these worthy causes under this bill. These types of guarantees and safeguards should be included in the legislation to quarantine these resources for the purposes for which Queenslanders were told they would be used. This is a sneaky, tricky government that is using purported 'red-tape reduction' to mask a blatant attempt to take funds from Queensland community organisations and to use funds that rightly belong to those groups for their own base political means.


I want to finish with some observations about the amendment foreshadowed by the Attorney-General that includes small regional shows in the community organisations that will be exempt from applying for licences. Because this amendment was introduced at such a late stage, I have not had the opportunity to ask my local show societies and associations how they feel about the amendment. I am not sure which shows in my electorate, if any, are likely to be covered. The definition of 'small regional show' really does not give us any guidance as to what is intended by this amendment. 'Small regional show' apparently means a show held at a rural place. The words 'rural' and 'regional' are not interchangeable, so we have no guidance as to which it refers to.

The amendment does not have a real definition. In fact, it provides that the definition will be prescribed by regulation. This is legislation by regulation and is a breach of fundamental legislative principles. This section sets out examples of criteria that may be prescribed under the regulation. This can include the maximum number of persons expected to attend the event, but there is no guidance as to the parameters for the maximum number. Will the Attorney-General perhaps give some round figure of what would be the maximum number of people he might anticipate would be prescribed by a regulation?

The maximum duration of the show is something else that can be considered but, again, there is no guidance as to the maximum number of days envisaged that might be so prescribed. Will the Attorney-General please indicate what he might envisage is the anticipated number of days that might be prescribed?

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** I am asking questions about the bill and I hope they will be taken seriously by the Attorney-General. I am asking about the spirit of the legislation. I am sure he will respond in his summing-up.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (8.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

**A government member:** Do you support your shows being exempt?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I do support my shows. What we just heard from the opposition member is typical of the nanny state the Labor Party expect us to enjoy. They want prescription. They want more guidance. Now the Labor Party is saying to us, 'No, no, no. We cannot have any common sense.' I congratulate the Attorney-General for his hard work and efforts in reducing red tape in Queensland.

I am very pleased to be the Assistant Minister for Regulatory Reform and also grateful that the Attorney-General will remove more than 16 unnecessary regulatory obligations and requirements with this bill, directly taking the burden of unnecessary paperwork away from businesses like clubs, hotels, restaurants and cafes and our always very busy community groups and volunteers. This bill will also help nursing homes because it exempts hospitals and nursing homes that sell a limited amount of liquor—say, two glasses of wine per day per person—for people who at this stage of their lives should be able to enjoy a glass of wine before they go to bed. The Labor Party prescribed that nursing homes not only had to apply for a commercial licence for two standard drinks—

**Mr Rickuss:** It was a money grab.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** It was an absolute money grab—a \$500 annual fee for them to provide patients and our elderly—the most important people in our community—

**Mr Costigan:** Joy killers!

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Yes, joy killers; that is absolutely right. I very much support the removal of unnecessary regulations because it is the community and the Queensland economy that ultimately benefit from lower regulatory costs. This improves the ability of businesses to start up, to survive, to compete and to grow. Businesses then have more time to focus on innovation and improving the competitiveness and resilience of their business to make their offerings more attractive to tourists and customers. This can only be a positive for our local economies.

I want to focus on one of the key changes in this bill—that is, the exemption of community groups from the requirement to apply for a community liquor permit for low-risk events like trivia nights, school concerts, fetes, sausage sizzles or other similar fundraising events. The permits were previously required by non-profit organisations such as P&Cs which generally do not hold a liquor licence but who wished to sell a small amount of liquor on a temporary or one-off occasion. The application fee, which has been mentioned many times today in this House, may seem trivial to those listening—\$57. However it is not trivial because imagine how many glasses of wine or show bags you have to sell to make that \$57, and it is the paperwork that volunteers have to put their time and effort into filling out. If you are new to a committee you would not understand the regulations around the paperwork because it is not just one piece of paper. It is just absolutely ludicrous.

**Mr Johnson:** And if you don't get it right, you find yourself liable.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I take that interjection: if you do not get it right, then all of a sudden you become liable. Thank you, member for Gregory. The removal of this obligation is a win for common sense and a win for our busy community volunteers, who really do not need another form to fill out. It gives them more time to focus on fundraising events and enhances their ability to continue to provide their services and increases their fundraising opportunities. It is certainly not anticipated that these amendments will lead to an increase in the consumption of alcohol at community events. That is because we trust the parents and community members who organise and run these types of events. They are sensible, community-minded people who know right from wrong. Indeed, it is intended that non-profit organisations will no longer need to fill out the paperwork and fork out the \$57. The reason we know we can trust these good people is that only nine applications of the 6,774 permits issued in 2012 were rejected.

**Mr Rickuss:** How many?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Only nine applications were rejected out of the 6,774 permits that were issued. That is incredible. It is anticipated that these changes will reduce the required applications by 60 per cent or over 4,000 per year.

Although the exemption does not limit the type of event that is eligible, criteria will be in place to minimise any potential harm to the community. Eligible events are genuine one-off events conducted between 7 am and 12 midnight and for no longer than eight hours on a single day. The sale of liquor must also be secondary to the event and all proceeds must be used to the benefit of the community. On this point I can talk about amazing events in my electorate like the Burrum Heads race day or the Yarraman Bowling Club, which runs the Rosalie Fours, or the Kumbia Brain Drain, which is a great trivia night run by the Kumbia State School.

**Mr Rickuss:** The Moore art show.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** The Moore art show; I take that interjection from the member for Lockyer. The Moore art show is a fabulous event. There is also the Crows Nest Bowls Club.

**A government member** interjected.


**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** If it is not for profit, that would be correct. The South Burnett Young Leaders is a fantastic group of young leaders within the South Burnett that is now trying to set up these community events.

**Mr Rickuss:** Are they over 18?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** They are over 18. The exemption means that eligible functions are not subject to the requirements of paying this fee, of applying for the community liquor permit and—and this is a really good point, and I congratulate the Attorney-General for adding this—they do not need to provide a defined area for the consumption of alcohol. This is common sense. Say we are talking about a fete at the Kingaroy netball club. Previously it would have to apply and go through all of the paperwork, which it would not bother to do so it would not bother having alcohol at events in the past. These organisations do not have to map out the area of the community event, and I do congratulate the Attorney-General because there is also no need to provide security. That is a massive cost to these organisations. I note that there is no restriction on the type of liquor able to be sold, and that is wonderful. Whilst the South Burnett provides fantastic wines, this is a great advantage in that these organisations can also sell beer or other liquor such as Bundaberg Rum.

Large scale events are not directly excluded from the operation of the exemption. However, it is considered that larger events such as music festivals are generally commercial operations, so we are looking for events that are run by these wonderful community members. I note that earlier in the House a member mentioned Volunteers Week last week. These people are the backbone of our society, so this government is pleased to do anything we can to get out of their way to enable our communities to enjoy these types of events. I am proud to be part of a government that is getting out of the way of these organisations running wonderful events. We do not want to be a nanny state.

These reforms are not about cutting regulation for the sake of cutting regulation. They are considered measures and risk appropriate. Many of the requirements being removed in this bill were set over a decade ago when gaming was first introduced. With the benefit of regulatory experience and technological advancements, we are now able to make a considered assessment of the risks and adjust our framework. I again note that this bill provides clarity, even though I have not had the opportunity to talk about advantages to the small rural shows like Blackbutt and all of the wonderful shows that I am a part of. I again congratulate the Attorney-General for introducing this bill before the House that will reduce regulation. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs RICE** (Mount Coot-tha—LNP) (8.48 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. As we have heard throughout this debate, this bill seeks to do a number of things, and as the title of the bill notes, all of which are largely designed to reduce red tape and regulation. The aspect of the bill that I am particularly interested in highlighting, as many of my colleagues have done, is the amendment to the Liquor Act 1992 to remove the requirement for certain non-profit organisations to apply for a community liquor permit in certain circumstances. I commend the Attorney-General on his commitment to continuing to slash red tape by removing this requirement for community or not-for-profit organisations. I can certainly attest that this is music to the ears of community organisations in the electorate of Mount Coot-tha, many of whom provided me with feedback in relation to this very issue and which I relayed to the Attorney-General previously.

When the Attorney-General proposed the changes earlier this year I wrote to a number of schools and community groups in the electorate of Mount Coot-tha to inform them of this proposal and the feedback that I received was unanimously positive. One P&F welcomed the news and in their words said—


This was a common sense approach and from our perspective it would reduce the time, effort and moneys necessary to apply for the licence.

As the Attorney-General and my colleagues have stated, this amendment is about making it easier for community organisations to fundraise and hold low-risk events such as sausage sizzles, fairs and other celebrations. Of course, the necessary precautions will be implemented to ensure that community safety and expectations are upheld. Eligible events must be genuine one-off events conducted between 7 am and 12 midnight and for no longer than eight hours on a single day. The sale of alcohol must also be secondary to the event and all proceeds must be used for the benefit of the community. Thankfully, it is expected that eligible events for the exemption would include school fetes, trivia nights, rodeos and sporting events conducted by non-profit organisations—very much like the fantastic Bardon kindy fete that I attended last weekend and the Bardon State School Mayfair this weekend as well as other annual events such as the Toowong State School trivia night.

All legitimate non-profit groups will be eligible for the exemption. Strict criteria are in place to ensure that any potential risk to the community from potential unscrupulous operators is minimised. For example, the exemption will not apply to an association or its executive officers that have a record within the previous five years of conducting events that have caused public disturbance or undue offence in the local area or which have contravened the Liquor Act by supplying liquor illegally.

The Attorney-General has advised that it is not anticipated that these amendments will lead to an increase in the consumption of alcohol at community events. Instead common sense has prevailed and, owing to the low-risk nature of the events, through the removal of the requirement for these organisations to complete, submit and pay for a community liquor permit they will be able to get on with other tasks without having the burden of extra paperwork. However, event organisers are still subject to a number of responsibilities relating to the conduct of the event, including that the sale of liquor is by an adult, it is not for takeaway, it is not sold to a minor or somebody already intoxicated and that a safe environment must be maintained in and around the area. Of course, penalties are in place if organisations do not do the right thing but, as the Attorney-General stated when he introduced the bill to the House, it is estimated that the amendment will reduce the required applications by 60 per cent, or over 4,000 per year.

This bill is a bill for common sense. It is a bill that removes the unnecessary burdens of bureaucracy and cost on organisations that do so much in our community. I congratulate the Attorney-General on these common-sense measures and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (8.52 pm): I rise this evening to speak in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. May I start by saying that the Newman government delivers. Red-tape reduction was an election commitment and this bill delivers a red-tape reduction. This bill also delivers on something else: it highlights the style of this government and that is consultation. The idea of consultation was sadly lacking in the previous government, which simply went on its merry way with scant regard for the needs of the community or businesses and it was even less interested in hearing or responding to the concerns of those community groups. But on this side of the House we have this novel idea that if we consult with individuals, groups, the community, businesses and our constituents, we will have a better understanding of what is important to the people of Queensland. We certainly did so in the lead-up to the election and we heard that the proliferation of bureaucratic rules and regulations was stifling and strangling businesses, especially small businesses. As a former small business owner, I can vouch for that. We heard that clubs and community groups were struggling with overly restrictive and overly stringent requirements and that this was suffocating initiative and creativity and diverting time and energy away from the work that these community groups wanted to do to engage families, individuals and groups in their activities and to work on behalf of others in the community, for their community, to build the community.

How did the Newman government respond to this need? One way we responded was to establish the liquor and gaming red-tape reduction expert panel. This panel appointed representatives from business and the community to review licensing and gaming laws. This expert panel helped the government to identify a range of red tape and, most importantly, to identify opportunities to reduce red tape in line with our election commitments.

Of course, there is good reason for having sensible requirements and, where appropriate, restrictions. As a government, we have a responsibility to ensure that our laws encourage behaviour that is in the best interests of the community and in line with community standards and expectations. We must ensure that we protect those who need safeguarding—our young and our very vulnerable. But equally, we need to foster an environment of encouraging initiative and energy, because it is that initiative and energy that will grow our economy and build our communities.


We have in this bill provisions that simply make good sense. For example, this bill will amend the Liquor Act to remove the requirement for community liquor permits for low-risk fundraising events. Let us consider that for a moment. The bill will ease restrictions for eligible community entities working to strict criteria such as that the supply or sale of liquor is by an adult, the supply or sale is not in a restricted area, the liquor is for immediate consumption, the liquor is not sold or supplied to a minor or anyone unduly intoxicated or disorderly and the non-proprietary club or association does not engage in a practice or promotion that may encourage the rapid or excessive consumption of liquor. These criteria as well as others will enable groups to hold a fundraiser for their new barbecue trailer or to add new sporting equipment to local schools, or to purchase goods for charitable organisations. It is a sensible solution that will make life easier for the hardworking officials and volunteers of these organisations. That can only be a good thing.

This amendment also has strict qualifying rules that preclude an organisation from receiving the exemption if the organisation or member of its executive has within the last five years been convicted of engaging in a practice or promotion that encourages the rapid or excessive consumption of liquor as a licensee, been convicted of not maintaining a safe environment in and around a licensed premises as a licensee, been convicted of supplying liquor to a minor, or been convicted of supplying liquor to an unduly intoxicated person on licensed premises. Along with a range of other prudent conditions, they provide a sensible, balanced approach that is expected of this government and that this government will deliver.

Those conditions and the legislation itself ensure that community social and fundraising events will be held safely, within the legal requirements and, in most cases, with additional volunteers who have not exhausted themselves by jumping through bureaucratic hoops and spending all of their time getting permits and getting forms written up, ticked off, signed on the dotted line and everything else that goes with it.

This government is about reducing red tape and the burden on businesses and organisations. Ultimately, the Newman government is about less interference from government in business, in communities and in individuals' lives so that they can, 'Do what they want to do, be what they want to be, yeah.' This amendment to the Liquor Act will enable our P&Cs, our service clubs and our community groups to get on with what they do best: providing support and raising money for all the worthwhile causes that we as Queenslanders depend upon.

This government is finding practical ways to streamline and encourage excellence without compromising on standards or safety or watering down relevant compliance. Through legislation such as this we will deliver service and financial benefits to the community and the people of Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (8.59 pm): In speaking to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, I acknowledge that this bill is about removing red tape. Being the member for two different electorates, the former electorate of Charters Towers, which had 32 communities, and now Dalrymple, which has 52 communities, I witnessed and saw for myself the difficulty that small groups, such as P&Cs, the Royal Flying Doctor Service, country shows and Lions clubs, had in relation to getting a permit to be able to sell liquor at a low-risk fundraising event. I believe this is good legislation.

A small place like Forsyth in the middle of nowhere that wants to sell a small amount of alcohol in their community at a low-risk event has been tied up with red tape and there are cost factors when trying to get a licence. Schools hold fetes to raise funds to send their kids to Canberra or trips away. That is important for those small communities. Lions clubs raise funds for the local ambulance station for a defibrillator or wheelchair access or disabled support to get out of a swimming pool. The Minister for Local Government mentioned going to country shows and seeing the difficulty they had participating in fundraising. They support the Royal Flying Doctor Service. It has a flow-on effect. It does benefit the community. This will be beneficial for rural and regional Queensland.

One area that needs to be addressed, which is improving but still needs to be finetuned, is the issue of security when there is liquor to be sold, especially at race meetings in rural and regional Queensland. Mount Garnet is an example where there is an upfront cost of \$9,000 for security. When

a race is put on and there is a \$9,000 security cost at the start it can become a non-event. They are working hard to raise those funds to keep those events alive. I will be speaking to the Minister for Police to see if we can resolve this, especially for Mount Garnet as it is an iconic race meeting. It could come to an end as a result of the cost of security. The explanatory notes state—

Applications for low risk premises (restaurants, cafes and bottle shops) will be exempted, through legislative amendments in the Bill, from having to advertise for public objections if they are not applying to trade outside ordinary trading hours (after midnight for restaurants and cafes; after 10pm for bottle shops)

I feel that that is a good thing. I feel that this is a big issue. This will be addressed further down the track in regard to submissions. I do not want to be a person that is pushing for more grog to be sold in supermarkets. It has to be acknowledged, and there were quite a number of submissions put in, that the liquor market is a highly competitive market. The vast majority of bottle shops in Queensland are owned by Coles and Woolworths or subsidiaries of the supermarket duopoly. I feel that it is a big concern that those selling eggs, tomatoes and natural foods have entered into the liquor market. Red tape and regulations extensively disadvantage small grocers. Under the current act small grocers are excluded from selling liquor unless they own a licensed premises. If the small IGAs, Foodworks and SPAs want to sell alcohol they have to buy an hotel. It is sad that we are seeing massive supermarket giants, such as Woolworths and Coles, take over the chemist. They basically want to take over all small business. Now they are starting to take over the alcohol industry.

The minister knows where I am coming from here. I believe there needs to be some sort of level playing field by allowing them to possibly sell packaged beer and wine in a very controlled way. It would be a fairer distribution of this market and give smaller grocers an even, level playing field. Small independent grocers do not have the financial resources to invest in hotels for the sole purpose of alcohol sales. They do not have the financial resources to absorb losses like Woolworths and Coles. Under the current act the duopoly can offer online customers heavily discounted alcohol along with their bread, milk and general groceries. How are small grocery retailers expected to compete with this? The act enables them to advertise alcohol along with household grocery items. How is this fair on small independent traders? The reality is that Coles and Woolworths are dominating this market which is directly impacting the viability and profitability of small grocers who supply and service small rural communities. There needs to be some form of mechanism that will allow small grocers the opportunity to provide the same level of service that the large dominating supermarket duopoly currently have almost complete control of. We need to establish regulations that enable fair competition and a level playing field so that all industry participants can equitably participate in the packaged liquor sales market at appropriate licensing time. I do not want to suggest that these supermarkets sell alcohol.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order. Not wanting to stop the member for Dalrymple, he is actually speaking about matters that have no relevance to the bill. For everyone's sake, as it is getting late, I suggest he get back to the bill and debate those issues at a more appropriate time when it is more relevant.

**Mr KNUTH:** I do believe it relates to the bill.


**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order. The bill does not deal with liquor sales in supermarkets at all.

**Mr KNUTH:** That is true, but this relates to the Liquor Act and this is an opportunity to bring this up.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order. Despite the fact the Liquor Act might be in the title, it does not mean everything about liquor is actually here for debate. We are debating 28 specific initiatives, not one of which the member is referring to. Mr Deputy Speaker, I would respectfully suggest you deal with the matter on relevance.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Berry):** In the long title of the bill it is for particular purposes. You are talking about matters irrelevant for the present purpose. If I could, for the remaining two minutes, direct you back to the purposes of the bill, it would be appreciated.

**Mr KNUTH:** Fetes, school fundraising, Lions club events, country shows and activities of not-for-profit organisations are all low-risk activities. I fully support this legislation. I believe this is a great initiative. Hopefully, we can further discuss the bigger picture with regard to liquor licensing. I support the bill and commend it to the House.

 **Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (9.09 pm):** I rise in the House to make a brief contribution in support of the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 which I must say delivers some common-sense reforms as part of a very strong commitment by

the Newman government to cut red tape in Queensland. The bill achieves many outcomes. Some common sense in terms of liquor and gaming licensing processing comes to mind straight away. It will provide small businesses, such as restaurants and cafes, with some much needed relief from choking on paperwork.

Restaurants and cafes in my beloved Whitsundays are a very important part of the fabric of the iconic tourist town of Airlie Beach. I am sure I speak on behalf of the proprietors of restaurants in that beautiful part of the world—establishments such as La Tabella, Capers, Fish Divine and Shipwrecked; the list goes on—when I say that they would welcome these reforms very warmly this evening.

The bill supports and recognises the benefits of restaurants and cafes in our communities as small businesses that should be engaged not buried in harm and violence analysis as if they were nightclubs. For those restaurants that do not trade past midnight or provide entertainment and are in commercial areas, the bill sensibly allows them to be exempt from submitting a risk assessed management plan or community impact statement or from undertaking public advertising. In the words of many people in small business, 'bureaucracy gone mad'.

Perhaps the best outcome out of all this tonight is that the bill will provide for substantial red-tape reduction for our non-profit sector whose organisations simply want to sell liquor at local fundraising events within their local communities. As the Attorney-General has already remarked, along with other honourable members in the House tonight, there were something like 6,700 community liquor permits issued in 2012 and not a single application was rejected in that time frame. If these reforms had been in place previously, around 4½ thousand of those permits would never have seen the light of day, nor would the \$57 fee per day have been seen or the so-called designated drinking areas been seen.

For community groups like P&Cs and P&Fs, it is wonderful news. I am sure hardworking people from P&Cs right across my electorate—people like Sue Spreadborough who does a wonderful job for Calen District State College in the heart of my electorate—would be thinking this is long overdue. She would not be alone in thinking that. I look forward to joining Sue and the P&C at the Calen District State College next Friday for their school fete. It is something that I will not be missing.

Fiona Van Blarcom is the new president of the P&F at St Catherine's Catholic College in the Whitsundays. She welcomes these much-needed and much-anticipated reforms. I had the good fortune of speaking with Fiona earlier this evening from her home in Jubilee Pocket. She said, in her words, 'I'm thrilled.' St Catherine's is a great school. I have a bit of a biased view as my eldest daughter, Brianna, happens to go to school there. It was great to be at the school last year for their school fete where they sold enough alcohol to make a few dollars thanks to a community liquor permit. I was dunked in the water by the students for a very good cause.

The member for Logan made a very good point in his contribution to this debate. People do not go to schools to drink like a fish. If they want to have a few beers and get on it, they will go somewhere else. A school fete is a place to have a few beers or a glass of chardy, to chew the fat with your mates and to perhaps relive sporting glories.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I am not sure whether the Premier will be indulging in that conversation, but there would be plenty in my electorate who would. These reforms also mean that our country shows, as has been noted by previous speakers, will no longer need permits to sell booze. That is terrific news especially with the showies currently on their way to my beautiful part of the world.

Pioneer Valley Show is not held in my electorate, but many of my constituents go to it every year. This year in fact marks the 50th Pioneer Valley Show at scenic Finch Hatton in the foothills of the Eungella Range. As a life member of the show society, I am looking forward to having a beer there in the middle of next month. Less than a week later we have the Proserpine Show. I am sure the likes of Tony Large, Donna Rogers and Sue Quantock would welcome these reforms. It should make their life a little bit easier. I acknowledge the nodding of the Minister for Education. He should know this well having been to Proserpine Show himself.


It is not just the P&Cs, the P&Fs and the show societies throughout my electorate that are the big winners here, it is all sorts of community groups such as our hardworking Rotary and Lions clubs, our Quota clubs, the girl guides, the scouts, the VMR and our progress associations at places like Seaforth, Midge Point and Hydeaway Bay. In fact any non-profit local community organisation will be a winner.

Local sporting clubs will also especially welcome these reforms, and that too is important. After all, sport and recreation is part of the social fabric of this great state and so many communities around this great state. I note the minister responsible is over there smiling. He should smile because it is so true. It is particularly pertinent in the small regional communities to the north of our state where so many of our sporting champions first get involved in their chosen sport.

In my electorate it could be rugby league at Glenella, the Northern Beaches Dolphin Soccer Club at Bucasia, it could be the pony club at Balnagowan, it might even be the lifesavers at Eimeo, it could be the tennis club at Calen where Nicole Pratt started her tennis career, it might be motor racing at Goorganga, campdrafting in Proserpine or even AFL in Airlie Beach. Whatever the sport, whatever the code, these reforms will be warmly welcomed by our various local sporting bodies.

Last week was National Volunteer Week. It was noted earlier tonight by a couple of honourable members. Let us not forget that we would be lost without our volunteers. But let us also not kid ourselves that volunteers have had it up to here with red tape and bureaucracy. They had a gutful. Something had to give. I am delighted that the Attorney has brought about these reforms. People can now get on with the job of enjoying themselves and being responsible and we can get away from a nanny state that seemed to thrive under successive Labor governments. It was something that members opposite thrived on. They loved it. We do not. We believe people should be given the opportunity to run their own race.

In summing up, I would like to quote the words of a fellow North Queenslander in his contribution to debate here this evening. The Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience said, 'This is a victory for common sense.' I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory—LNP) (9.17 pm): The Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 is a piece of legislation that is going to allow many smaller communities to come back together. It is a piece of legislation that will stop small communities being strangled and allow small communities to again act as communities and enjoy a drink at a show or race meeting. That is what this is all about. It is not about alcohol; it is about people enjoying themselves in the presence of their friends and relatives in a community environment which was taken away from them by the former administration. Its policies were written by bureaucrats who wanted to create jobs for themselves and lock down industries involved in people having a good time.

I interjected on the Attorney-General this afternoon in relation to the Longreach show. A couple of years ago they built a Weldmesh steel enclosure about five foot high right around the bar area within which people had to drink. You would swear that you were locking up a mob of cattle to keep them confined in that area. People would have their families there, their kids there. Shows are about community. They are about small kids, pony clubs and people exhibiting goods, whatever. People enjoy having a drink, catching up with friends, relaxing in that environment and generally having a good time.

I have heard members here this afternoon ask: who is going to police this? What is the security situation? In regional areas—and I know full well that the Attorney-General represents a regional area too—in these small country areas we never have that trouble because we have our own community policing. If you have two or three police on duty and somebody is playing up, one of the patrons always makes certain that the night is not going to be spoiled or the afternoon is not going to be spoiled because of somebody who has had a few too many. At the end of the day, with this red tape that has been strangling these community events, people have not been attending these events and meetings. At the end of the day, who are the losers? The wider community is the loser.

I say to the Attorney tonight that this is a good piece of legislation. This is not about opening the gates and letting people act like idiots willy-nilly. This is about letting people manage themselves and understanding that the situation has to be managed by the guidelines in the legislation in question.

A few years ago at the Boulia Camel Races—and I always quote this as it is a classic example—and it is a bigger event than most I suppose, but because of the regulations set down by the licensing commission, they had to bring security in over and above the local police. What that meant was bringing those people in from Mount Isa and that cost the Boulia Camel Races committee something like \$6,000 to manage the process of a weekend carnival event where people could have a good time. What that meant in real terms was that that was \$6,000 that the Royal Flying Doctor Service did not get. As a result—


**Mr Newman:** How ridiculous!

**Mr JOHNSON:** Absolutely, Premier. I take that interjection from the honourable Premier. That is exactly what has happened in a lot of these small communities where people look after their own needs, where people support their police and where people are very responsible about making certain that everything is square and above board.

So I say here tonight that this is a very good piece of legislation. This is about bringing communities out, bringing families out and bringing communities together. Whether it is a school fete or some small event in a country town or whatever, this is a very, very good piece of legislation and one that is really going to be embraced by everybody around this state.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition make her contribution here this afternoon. I was somewhat amazed in many ways to think that it was only a little over 12 months ago when Labor were in government and they were the ones who made these callous, cold and draconian pieces of legislation and put them in place to tighten up and lock down community events. But I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition and her team are supporting this piece of legislation. Finally they have seen the error of their ways with some of the former legislation that they introduced.

On that note, I have much pleasure in supporting this piece of legislation and I recommend that everybody in this House supports it. I congratulate the Attorney and his legal people on making this a reality.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (9.23 pm): I rise to make a small contribution to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I congratulate the Attorney-General here tonight on showing some common sense in his approach to liquor laws. Over my 20 years in public life I have seen some pretty stupid things. I will give the House a couple of examples of some of the stupidity I have seen.

Brad Roderick, who was one of the main organisers of the Torbanlea Picnic Races, got fined \$350 one afternoon for a simple mistake he made. He was cleaning up and emptying the eskies and he handed a sixpack of beer over to the ambulance driver because the ambulance driver had stayed an extra half an hour for no reason at all other than to help out. But, because he had handed the sixpack over to the ambulance driver from within the defined area, the officer who was there hit him with a \$350 fine. That to me was plain stupidity. So in my role as the mayor I called the liquor and gaming officers in and said to them, 'How can we make this area bigger?' They said, 'You can make the whole area a defined area.' I said, 'How much is that going to cost?' They said, 'No more.' So we could make the whole area of the picnic races a defined area where we could sell alcohol and people could drink alcohol.


**Mrs Frecklington:** And enjoy themselves.

**Mr SORENSEN:** And enjoy themselves. The women could sit around a table and drink wine and it just went on from there. But to me that was just plain crazy that one of the organisers had to pay a \$350 fine for no reason at all as far as I was concerned. That was some of the stupidity that was going on.

**Mr Rickuss:** You would have chipped in and given him a hand with the fine, wouldn't you?

**Mr SORENSEN:** Yeah, but I really felt sorry for him—it irked me so much. Another piece of legislation that was brought in affected a retirement village where a group of residents had a happy hour every Thursday afternoon. The legislation was passed and that meant they then had to train the people who were serving the alcohol. It was going to cost them somewhere between \$500 and \$1,000 just to train these people to serve alcohol, which sometimes was home-brew which some residents from the retirement home had made. But it was a pleasure for this small group of people to all get together on a Thursday afternoon for happy hour and raise a little bit of money. At least the government of the day did back off on that and made it a bit more sensible. But that is some of the stupidity I have seen over the years relating to selling alcohol.

This legislation does show a lot of common sense, I must admit. The people who run not-for-profit clubs really do not want to be filling out forms and waiting for weeks to hear whether they can have a permit or not and pay their \$57 fee. It just goes on and on. People just want to organise small events and raise money so they can give to charitable organisations. You have the Rotary clubs, the Lions clubs and even the arts society where they just want to have a few drinks and be able to sell those drinks, and they have not been able to. They have to pay \$57 to sell about \$20 worth of wine. What is the point of doing that? This legislation is common sense. I congratulate the Attorney-General for showing some common sense in this place.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.27 pm), in reply: I acknowledge and thank all honourable members for their contributions in the debate this evening to the Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. As I said in my contribution earlier this evening, as vegetation management was the enthusiasm of the honourable Minister Cripps last night, so too is this bill for me this evening, because this is common sense for our communities and common sense for our community groups right around Queensland. I note the honourable Treasurer is in the room this evening. The honourable Treasurer set up with the assistant minister this office of best regulatory practice, the best practice regulatory office, the office of best—that office that the Treasurer set up, that great office—

**Mr Nicholls:** If you ever used it, you'd know what it was called!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** That office that the honourable Treasurer set up, and he will be happy because what I am holding here, colleagues, is the community liquor permit—nine pages of the community liquor permit. Madam Deputy Speaker, no more—no more! We have saved the Queensland people 40,000 pages of regulation each year.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Lockyer, you have been in this House long enough to know that you must be in your seat to interject. I call the Attorney.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** As I was saying, the Treasurer and his office of regulation—

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Gregory, you also have been in this House long enough to know that you must be in your seat to interject. I call the Attorney.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** This is a good start. We will be here all night. That piece of paper, that Labor Party regulation that I ripped up, was nine pages. In 2011-12 we had about 6½ thousand community groups filling out that document. This legislation will save 4½ thousand community groups times by nine approximately not having to fill that document out in one year. The Treasurer will do the maths, but it is about 41,000 pages of regulation that the community will not have to fill out. That should be added to my discount of regulation that I have reduced in this state—41,000 pages per year.

I thank all honourable members for their great contributions. This government is serious about change in Queensland. The difference between the opposition when they were in government and this government is that when we say we are going to do something we get on and we do it. It has taken us just over a year to get this important legislation through. We believe in the industry and our community clubs right across our electorates.

While talking about community clubs, I draw the attention of honourable members to the latest edition of *Club Insight* that came out today. Honourable members will not be able to see from afar but *Club Insight* has the honourable Premier not as its centrefold—the burlesque girls are its centrefold—but on its title page. What is more interesting in *Club Insight* is the comments of Don Seccombe, the President of Clubs Queensland. He welcomed the Premier and the Attorney to the awards celebration recently and he said this, 'For the record this was the first time in the event's history that a Queensland Premier has attended our awards ceremony.' It is the first time in the history of the Clubs Queensland awards ceremony the Premier—

**Ms Palaszczuk:** I was there.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** But you are not the Premier; you are the opposition leader. I did not say it was the first time an opposition leader attended. I said it was the first time a Premier has attended. I know that the opposition leader has ambitions but she was there in an opposition leader's capacity, not as Premier. The Hon. Campbell Newman was there as Premier.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I do take the interjection from the honourable member for Lockyer, who I note is in his seat. The honourable member for Gaven was not there. He said yesterday that he will be the next Premier of Queensland. But this is because this government supported an industry that employs about 40,000 people right across the state. We have great sporting groups and great surf clubs right across Queensland and they contribute most vitally to our economy. Funnily enough, another magazine came out today which I appear in: the *QHA Review*.

**Ms Davis:** Are you the centrefold?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I am not the centrefold but I am on page 17. The headline which they chose and only released today is 'Changes for the future' and it has a picture of a pair of scissors cutting through red tape. The industry understands this government is reducing red tape. We are cutting through the Labor Party bureaucracy of red tape. For the benefit of the honourable opposition leader and her six colleagues, I have copies of this article of the red-tape reduction strategy. When we talk about who supports this type of legislative response to the issues of liquor licensing in this state, this government certainly does. The opposition when in government had 20 years to cut red tape in this state and it did not. I note the honourable opposition leader says that they support the bill, but when the opposition left the chamber all her members essentially spoke out against the bill and against some of these reforms. I table a copy for the honourable opposition leader and her six members.

*Tabled paper.* Document titled 'Changes for the Future: message from Hon. Jarrod Bleijie MP, the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice' [\[2670\]](#).

This government is serious about red tape. We have the *QHA Review*, Clubs Queensland and P&Cs singing the praises of local LNP members because we are doing what we said we were going to do in a timely manner and cutting through the bureaucracy and the red tape. No-one believes members of the Labor Party anymore even when they come in here and they say they support the legislation because they had 20 years to do this. It is only that they have been forced in a position now to either oppose it or support it. They know if they oppose it tonight they will have press releases in all their electorates saying they oppose P&Cs. I remember once before when the opposition team introduced changes to empower independent public schools and to empower P&Cs and we gave maintenance money to schools. What did they say about the P&Cs? They said that they are not responsible enough to manage the money in the schools. The P&Cs will waste it. The principals will waste it. We have confidence and faith in our community members. We do not hold the hands of community members and walk them through legislative reform in this state because we understand and we want to ensure capacity. We want to be the enabler for communities to participate in this debate. We are not the socialists. The socialists believe they have to hold the hands of Queenslanders every step of the way because Queenslanders cannot be trusted to get it right. We do not hold that view of Queenslanders. We put an enormous amount of trust and respect in Queenslanders.

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I hear the opposition leader interjecting. The opposition leader had 20 years to cut regulation and red tape for community groups.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** I have only been a member since 2006.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I note the opposition leader now says it was not her fault because she has only been in parliament since 2006. How long was the member a minister in the government? We have only been in government for 12 months and we can get rid of 40,000 pages of regulation in 12 months. The opposition leader had six years in parliament but the Labor Party was in power for essentially 20 years. The Labor Party did nothing because it does not trust Queenslanders, P&Cs or anyone to have a drink responsibly. It does not trust our local show societies, local fishing clubs, local sporting clubs or local Rotary clubs to have an event or a show where the community can participate. The Labor Party does not trust them to do any of this.

This is a common-sense approach to the issue of reducing liquor licensing regulation and red tape in Queensland because people will not have to fill out a nine-page form. A few weeks ago I had an opportunity to attend the P&C meeting where my daughters go to school at the Meridan State College, a great school in the Kawana electorate. As I said before, they have their fete coming up. I also went to the Pacific Lutheran College, which has its fete coming up. The Pacific Lutheran College was particularly interested to know when this bill would be passed because it is going to responsibly sell alcohol at its fete.

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I say to the honourable opposition leader: I need no encouragement from the member for Gympie. I need no encouragement from the opposition leader.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order! Leader of the Opposition, I would ask that you not shout interjections at other members across the chamber. If you wish to have a debate, you and the member for Gympie can perhaps take it outside. The Attorney has the call.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I did need the break to have a sip of water.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I rise to a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I was merely saying that all of the members here were encouraging—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, that is not a point of order. I would ask that you resume your seat. The Attorney has the call.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The honourable members on this side and a large fraction on that side are encouraged by this bill because they know when they go out to their electorates from tomorrow they have a message to sell. The message to sell is: we trust Queenslanders and we are going to break through this regulation of red tape and start calling it the Labor Party red tape because that is all it is. It is Labor Party red tape because they did not trust people to get it right.

To turn to the elements of the bill and some of the contributions tonight, as I said, the honourable opposition leader supported the bill but most of her members opposed it, which will be interesting in consideration in detail. I thank honourable members on this side of the chamber in particular for supporting the most essential elements of the bill. I do thank them for all of their contributions. It is testament to a legislative response to see the number of speakers on a bill, because it really enlivens passion amongst members who have been looking at these issues.

My mother is the coordinator of the Melanoma Patients Foundation on the Sunshine Coast. We are lucky to have my mother, because had she not been diagnosed with a melanoma cancer she would not be with us today. In the last 10 years she has become actively engaged in fundraising events. I can recall particular Melanoma Patients Foundation fundraising events that are held at home or at local sporting clubs. You have to go through the process, pay an application fee of \$57, fill out nine pages of documents, wait for the documents to be approved or not approved—and we have seen the statistics; not many were not approved. It is just a bureaucratic mess that is not necessary in this state when we actually believe in individual responsibility. I might add in this debate that, if people go to these events which do not have community liquor permits because they are exempt and they muck up, they do the wrong thing and they break the law, they will be held responsible. The police will involve themselves—and we still have liquor inspectors. If anyone has done the wrong thing, they will be held responsible for their actions according to law in this great state.

I thank the member for Broadwater for her great contribution and her contribution in the Deputy Speaker's chair at the moment. The member for Broadwater talked about honouring the government commitment to reduce and cut red tape. The member for Broadwater raised an interesting proposition, which I have not explained to the House. Having 18 minutes remaining, I thought I might take the opportunity to do that. It is about the government's overall plan for setting a path for red-tape reduction for the liquor industry in this state.

The first thing we did when we were elected was to look at the low-hanging fruit—the low-hanging non-controversial fruit—in the liquor industry that we could chop off, and we have done that; we have achieved that. The honourable the Premier set up the expert panel on liquor licensing red-tape reduction and that panel has been going exceptionally well. They are reviewing the entire Liquor Act with particular focus on the elements of the Liquor Act that we had in our discussion paper. We got some of the low-hanging fruit sorted out. We set up an expert panel. We issued a discussion paper on reform in Queensland.

Honourable members will recall that included in the discussion paper were some controversial issues on which the Queensland community have had a chance to have a say. I am happy to say that we have had over 300 submissions to the discussion paper. Over 300 responses to the discussion paper have now been sent back to the expert panel that the Premier and I set up to help and advise us on future reforms in this state. The expert panel looked at this bill and looked at these issues. After having dealt with these 28 initiatives through this bill the expert panel, with the 300 submissions on controversial matters and some non-controversial matters, will be in phase 2. We will have another debate with the Queensland community in terms of what the government response to that expert panel will be.

We have a clear plan. We have set out a clear path for the future direction of liquor licensing in this state. It is not just a review that we do in-house and then we just do what we want to do; we are actually engaging with the Queensland community—having a chat and conversation with the Queensland community—and we will get it right. We will get it right because we have engaged the public and we have taken on board their views, hence why it is exciting that this bill we are debating tonight deals with a lot of those matters. This bill deals with so many matters—things like no longer having to advertise for some low-risk permits, saving Queensland businesses \$1,500; only having to advertise in the online *Government Gazette*, not having to put it in the published gazette. It is all about practical solutions to help small businesses in this state.

People, particularly members on this side of the House, will know that business is still struggling in Queensland; they are not out of the woods yet. If there is anything the government can do to assist small businesses, particularly in this industry such as the local cafe or corner restaurant that is struggling for clientele, such as a reduction in fees—for instance the licensing fees—and a bit of red-tape reduction, I think they would be very happy.

The Minister for Tourism, the member for Currumbin, talked about how we are engaging with the stakeholders. I think this is the message that the Queensland community are hearing at the moment. Having released the discussion paper, the government believes the Queensland community will really have input into the future direction and reform of these issues in the state.

The member for Ipswich West talked about 14 submissions from the various stakeholders and gave a good history of the licensing provisions in this state. The member for Woodridge said that not many people in her electorate drink but had an issue—

**Mrs Scott:** I didn't say that.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** You did. The other thing the member for Woodridge talked about is the guidelines and how we see those working in practice. What we have come up with are guidelines for community groups that will no longer be subject to the Liquor Act; they will be exempt from the Liquor Act. Therefore the Liquor Act will not apply to these community groups. Following the commencement on 1 July 2013, we will have guidelines. These guidelines are all about local members going to their P&C meetings, for instance, and saying, 'Look, if you have a school fete, you don't have to have your community liquor permits anymore, but here are the guidelines. This is a suggested approach to these sorts of events.' Honourable members may find that a school fete still wants to have restrictions on where the alcohol may be sold or where people can walk around. That is empowering the actual group to come up with that and plan their own event. They would have to do a risk assessment for themselves. They take on board that consideration.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Where is the community safety?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the opposition, 'Where is the community safety?' Here we go, back to the regulation and red tape in this state—nanny state! But they support it, saying 'Where's the community safety?'

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Nanango, if you wish to interject please return to your seat.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Here we go. We have had the opposition leader stand in here and say, 'We support it. For political purposes we support it,' but then they just cannot get away from the nanny state. They just cannot understand. They do not get it.

**Mr Newman:** It's in their DNA.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the Premier. It is in their DNA to hold people's hands as they progress in life. We do not do that. We want to empower the individual to take responsibility for their actions. Then the opposition leader, after the seven hours of debate we have had, at the 11th hour, says, 'What about community safety?' As I just said, it will be the responsibility of the people concerned and the community groups to ensure that they have the adequate environment in place to protect whomever they want to protect, but government will not be engaged in that process. Government will be out of that process and the community will be better off for it.

The member for Gregory would know, his electorate having a lot of the shows, and the Deputy Premier would know, his electorate having 17 rural shows—those great country shows.

**A government member:** He has a drink at them, too.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I would imagine. I have been to the electorate of the honourable member for Gregory. I have had a beer in the pub there—

**A government member:** Ha, ha!

**Mr BLEIJIE:**—or it might have been a Midori.

**A government member:** I bet it was a shandy.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It was not a shandy, it was not a Midori, it was—

**Mr Newman** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I did. I met the future King in Longreach. I had a beer up in Longreach as well at the community barbecue.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I did. It was a real beer for a real man.

**Mr Stevens:** With an umbrella in the top!

**An honourable member:** It's getting worse.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It is like when you dig that hole and you keep digging and digging. I enjoyed the company of the honourable member for Gregory out in his rough-and-tough electorate of Gregory. Suffice to say the honourable Deputy Premier has about 17 shows that are held in his electorate. This is all about saying to these local show societies, who were doing this long before government intervened and regulated how they should do it—they were doing it long before politicians and government got involved and regulators got involved because they just knew how to do it. For the record, can I just say that the regional and rural members of this government fight for their shows. Can I put on record how the Deputy Premier fought to make sure that rural shows and their local show societies had the proper protection under this legislation and that as many were made exempt from this legislation as he could. We do recognise the fact that for large events, high-risk events or medium-risk events, certain protections still need to be in place. That is why with the amendment that I will be moving in relation to small shows—and this will be through regulation at a later date—we will make sure that we can get as many of those rural shows into the exemption as possible so they can go about their business. Therefore, if a rural show society wants to have a hessioned off area, that is their business. We will not regulate it. We do not tell them they have to do it. However, if they want an environment where the mother, the father and the children can watch the fireworks at night and the father can have a beer with the children while watching the fireworks, then that is a matter for them. Government does not regulate that space; they should not regulate that space. The Labor Party do, because that is all they ever knew how to do: introduce regulation and red tape because they do not trust Queenslanders to drink responsibly.

**Mr Seeney:** That is the Monto show amendment.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the Honourable Deputy Premier, who has named this amendment the Monto show amendment. I will ensure that the Monto show is exempt in this amendment. That is why we are doing this. It is because of great places like those. We went out recently—I think it was during the Melbourne Cup—to the Kumbia races where we had the community cabinet. There are great atmospheres at these local shows, races and rodeos. This is what we are trying to achieve. The Leader of the House has spoken about mateship and the spirit of camaraderie that is established by going to these—

**Mr Stevens:** I'd love to have a beer with Jarrod!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The honourable Leader of the House will not be singing, and I will not be taking that interjection. The member for Toowoomba North, who did not disclose his bias towards the club industry tonight, having owned and operated nightclubs in the past, made a great contribution. Thank you too for your support for this type of industry and for your common sense.

I grew up at the Ettamogah Pub. My uncle was the owner of the Ettamogah Pub, both in New South Wales and Queensland, so I understand this industry. I understand local pubs. I remember attending football games at the—

**A government member:** Are you serious?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Yes, my Uncle Coop was the original owner of the Ettamogah Pub. I grew up at a pub in Albury, and then we moved here in the late eighties and built the Ettamogah Pub up here—or my uncle did—so I know this industry. I know the struggles, and I have seen the regulation and the red tape. Whenever we talk about alcohol related violence, everyone always blames the operators without trying to instill a sense of responsibility in people and actually getting them to own up and take account of their own actions. That is what we will do.

Over the years, particularly at the Albury Ettamogah Pub where we lived, I have seen the football games. It used to be an environment where you could go with your family on a weekend and just have a great day out without, as the member for Gregory said, being boxed in by a cage at the local show or the races, and people were free to move around responsibly and do what they wished at those shows. So that is where we are going back to: common sense.

The member for Logan made a great contribution. I was worried, considering his American background, that he was going to get into the issue of the drinking age in Australia and Queensland, but he did not go that far. The member for Mundingburra, who represents a great regional area in Queensland which is so important to the economy of Queensland, really hit the nail on the head when he spoke about the fact that this is a shining example of what the government is trying to achieve in this state.

In a couple of years, people may not remember this government for this and they may not thank us, but they will know—and we will know—that they will not have to fill out nine pages for a liquor permit when they want to have a local P&C trivia night or a show day. That is the sort of stuff that we want to be remembered for.

Thank you for your contribution, member for Lytton. He spoke about this being a public campaign and a public drive, and he took those issues into account. The member for Bundamba, in one of her normal interesting—

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** There was not much coherence in the member for Bundamba tonight. For the honourable members who were not in the chamber at the time when I pulled a few interjections and points of order on the member for Bundamba, she tried to get into this debate what she could not get in two weeks ago during the parliamentary sittings on another bill which was completely different. She tried to table documents which she forgot to table two weeks ago in another parliamentary debate on a completely separate matter. Thankfully, the Deputy Speaker pulled her up and said that that debate is done and dusted; it has probably had royal assent; and it is a bit too late to be debating that matter in parliament because we are talking about a completely different bill. So the member for Bundamba has made an interesting contribution tonight which was totally irrelevant, as usual.

The member for Beaudesert and the member for Southport, thank you for your contributions. The member for Mermaid Beach talked about a couple of local issues, as always, in terms of restaurants turning into bars at 10 o'clock at night, toilets, and all that sort of thing.

The member for Mulgrave talked about the amendments I am moving with respect to small regional shows. As I said when I introduced it—and we will talk about it in the amendments—we will make sure that we have the regulation in place at 1 July or just after when we look at who we target in terms of small shows and what the real definition of that will be in terms of the rural communities. It could be based on the number of patrons or other things, but it will certainly not be the number of show bags that one sells at these show days.

**Mr Seeney:** Monto will qualify, let me assure you.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Monto will qualify, because I have said it, Deputy Premier, in my contribution. We will ensure Monto qualifies. Can I say in conclusion, bearing in mind time is quickly approaching and the hour is near, that I thank all honourable members for their contribution. I know I have talked a lot about community liquor permits tonight.

In fact, honourable members may like to know that I offered the opportunity for the Leader of the House to move an extension of time for me because I have got so many other matters, but he said he would have to vote against his own motion. So I will take that total rejection. I do not want to be put in that no confidence position by my own team.

In conclusion, this bill also does a lot for the local club industries such as the surf lifesavers. It will get rid of the managers registers. Can I give another example of regulation in this state by the Labor Party. We used to have licensees who were responsible for pubs and clubs in Queensland. When the Labor Party came along, they said, 'Maybe you should not just have licensees; you should have approved managers.' So then not only do you have to have approved managers; you then have to have a register of approved managers. When an approved manager left the building or went down to do the banking, particularly in rural and regional Queensland, they had to sign in and out. This bill will get rid of the register. The approved manager will remain, but the bureaucracy and the red tape behind it will go.

That is a practical example of what this government is trying to achieve. The Labor Party had so many years to do it. We talked about the position void over there from the opposition. They have one policy, Premier: they are going to bring back Labour Day in May. That is their big policy. That is their stump speech. The next policy that they have, which they will probably announce tomorrow, is 'Do not worry! We are going to reintroduce all of this legislation that the LNP deleted tonight.' That is what the Labor Party will do because they do not trust Queenslanders to get it right.

This is a great state with great opportunities. We want to supercharge the economy right across Queensland. We want to supercharge the economy in every electorate across this great state, and this is the first step.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.58 pm): I move the following amendment—

**1 Clause 2 (Commencement)**

Page 14, line 17, after 'area'—

*insert—*

*, small regional show*

I table the explanatory notes to the amendments.

*Tabled paper:* Liquor and Gaming (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes for Hon. Bleijie's amendments [2671].

Amendment No. 1 amends clause 2. This is a minor amendment to the commencement provisions so that amendments moved during consideration in detail relating to exemptions from the Liquor Act for low-risk fundraising events will commence on 1 July consistent with the amendments in the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.59 pm): I move the following amendment—

**2 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 47B (Adjustment of contribution schedule for particular schemes by order of specialist adjudicator or QCAT))**

Page 16, lines 3 to 15—

*omit, insert—*

- (b) there has been a change to the contribution schedule lot entitlements for the lots included in the scheme because of the formal acquisition; and
- (c) the owner of a lot included in the scheme believes that, because of the change, the contribution schedule lot entitlements for the lots included in the scheme—
  - (i) are not consistent with the deciding principle for the lot entitlements, or are not just and equitable to the extent the deciding principle allows; or
  - (ii) if there is no apparent deciding principle for the lot entitlements, are not just and equitable.

Amendment No. 2 is necessary to implement a recommendation of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee that is supported by the government. The amendment clarifies that the ground for making an application under section 47B(2A) is limited to circumstances where a lot owner believes that, as a result of changes made to the contribution schedule lot entitlements to reflect a formal acquisition, the lot entitlements are not consistent with the deciding principle for the lot entitlements for the scheme or, if there is no deciding principle for the lot, entitlements are not just and equitable.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.00 pm): I move the following amendment—

**3 Clause 5 (Amendment of s 51 (Limited adjustment of lot entitlement schedule—after formal acquisition of part of scheme land))**

Page 18, lines 33 to 35 and page 19, lines 1 to 6—

*omit, insert—*

- (a) if the body corporate has given the constructing authority a written notice under subsection (5)(b)—includes the changes requested by the body corporate, and is different to the proposed new community management statement mentioned in subsection (1)(b)(iii) only to the extent it includes those changes and changes of no substance (if any); or
- (b) if paragraph (a) does not apply—is the same as the proposed new community management statement mentioned in subsection (1)(b)(iii), or is different only to the extent that it includes changes of no substance.

The explanatory notes sufficiently detail why I move this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.01 pm): I move the following amendment—

**4 Clause 6 (Amendment of s 51A (Limited adjustment of lot entitlement schedule for specified two-lot scheme—after formal acquisition of part of scheme land))**

Page 22, lines 30 to 36, and page 23, lines 1 and 2—

*omit, insert—*

- (a) if the body corporate has given the constructing authority a written notice under subsection (4)(b)—includes the changes requested by the body corporate, and is different to the proposed new community management statement mentioned in subsection (1)(b)(iii) only to the extent it includes those changes and changes of no substance (if any); or
- (b) if paragraph (a) does not apply—is the same as the proposed new community management statement mentioned in subsection (1)(b)(iii), or is different only to the extent that it includes changes of no substance.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—

**Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.01 pm): The amendment repeals section 51A of the Casino Control Act which requires the minister to pay into the Community Investment Fund a percentage of all amounts received by the chief executive by way of casino tax. The opposition will not be supporting this clause.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The government notes the opposition is not supporting it and is not surprised.

Division: Question put—That clause 13, as read, stand part of the bill.


**AYES, 70—**Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gullely, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Sorensen

**NOES, 12—**Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Hopper, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.13 pm): Essentially, this clause says that money will now be paid into the Casino Community Benefit Fund from consolidated revenue. The minister may make such payments and there is no prescription as to how much, if any, is paid because the previous clause repealed the designated percentage. Therefore, the opposition will be voting against this clause.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** Under the Labor government the amount paid through the casino fund was reduced significantly. It is offensive that it is being reduced even further. Both sides in the party political spectrum have a lot to answer in terms of the community benefit from gambling. It was proposed that there would be a significant win to the community when gambling was introduced into this state. The Labor government reduced the amount that went into the community, and these clauses appear to reduce that even more. It is on that basis that I oppose it.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Member for Gladstone, one of the reasons the community benefit fund fluctuates from time to time is of course the more gambling that occurs, the more taxes paid and the more that money can be distributed, because we distribute about \$50 million a year. What essentially happened under the Labor government was that this fund was set up. There was not a clear delineation between departments as to who was responsible for it. There was all of this money going in. A lot of it was going in from consolidated revenue in any event. By abolishing the Community Investment Fund, it will now be through consolidated revenue by appropriation. It is a far more transparent system. Finally, I say that if anyone has any doubt as to why we ought to do this, one only has to pick up the Auditor-General's report that was tabled in the parliament yesterday to find that for the last three years \$500,000 was being paid out—double-ups—to community groups. So we have some fundamental restructures that this government was left with that we will fix because we have been handed it. We will fix it and we will have a more transparent process, and a part of that important transparent process is to have this sorted out.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** I think the Attorney-General is trying to make a point in saying, 'This will all be okay. You can trust us.' The reality is we cannot trust governments, and certainly we cannot trust them with regard to gambling moneys. The reality is that the Labor Party did not do the right thing on this fund—there is no doubt about that—and this will take the last of the half and transfer it back to consolidated revenue. I do not accept the explanation given by the Attorney-General and he may wish to clarify that over time. It may be even that members on the other side of the House are not clear on this point. From my reading of it, and I have read a lot of bills in my time—

**A government member** interjected.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** For those who pretend that they know something about it, they need to keep quiet.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order, members! I am struggling to hear the member for Gaven. He is entitled to be heard in silence. I ask that you accord him that respect. The member for Gaven has the call.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** Thanks, Madam Deputy Speaker. From my reading of this, it is critical that at least clauses 12 to 14 but certainly 13 and 14 would guarantee that those funds go across to that Community Investment Fund and those funds are then distributed back to the community and there would be no capacity for the government to squirrel those funds back into its own revenue pocket and then say, 'We can't afford to pay those out,' or 'We'll use whatever funds are paid selectively out to whomever we choose.'

The thing is the system is working, whether people like it or not. I hear explanations saying that it can be improved, but for many years, certainly when we were on the other side—and there are many members over there who are now on the government benches—we used to get moneys out of that, and I am looking at the Deputy Premier. I know that in his electorate they received moneys from that investment fund for varied purposes because, in fact, my brother-in-law lives in that electorate. I know where they went. I know about those funds and little amounts of money. You know where they went, Deputy Premier. They were tiny, humble amounts of money and they went to organised groups that needed those funds, and they are very critical amounts. They only got \$2,000 or maybe \$1,500, but when it came they needed it. In fact, it goes to groups that might not otherwise in certain circumstances get those funds. So this is a miserable step. The Attorney-General needs to confront it. We are not all equal in different parts; we are not. When you are in urban environments, it is a lot easier than it is when you are outside major metropolitan cities. These amounts of moneys are distributed very fairly and we need to look at this very carefully. I think this is a mistake in this legislation and certainly think the Attorney should address it.

**Ms Trad:** It's a disgrace!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the member for South Brisbane. What is a disgrace in this place is the member for Gaven and the Labor Party. Nothing will change with this. Community groups will get the same amount of money. We are committed to a neutral transition. What is going to happen though is that there will be better processes in place. No money is being cut from these

amendments. No money is being cut from these amendments to say that community groups will not continue to get the money that they ought to have had. With regard to trust, the member for Gaven was the one in here saying, if I recall correctly, that he is going to be the next Premier of Queensland. I saw him do the press conference today when his leader rocked up out the front of Parliament House in the shiny Rolls Royce.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Gaven and the member for Condamine, I am struggling to hear the Attorney-General. Member for Gaven, I asked members to let you be heard in silence. It is only right that you afford the Attorney-General the same respect.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Let me also tell the member for Gaven why he is misleading the House by speaking to these clauses tonight. The system will be retained subject to the recommendations of the Auditor-General, which we will employ. The money will be distributed. There will be an independent board. Nothing changes. So the misrepresentation that the member makes by saying that somehow this is the Treasurer or anyone in the Treasury office now deciding who gets what grant is a complete fabrication of what the clause is all about. The board will be there. We will fix the administrative and financial arrangements of the board to ensure that the Auditor-General's recommendations are implemented fully and we can sort out the mess where \$500,000 of taxpayers' money is not doubled up to community groups.

We all support community groups and I take particular objection to the member coming into this place and saying that the government is cutting funds. We have given \$750,000 to the Women's Legal Service. We have given \$2 million to victims of crime in this state through other revenue—more than the Labor Party ever did. The Labor Party underfunded community legal services in this state. We have given an additional \$2 million to victims of crime support services.

**Ms Trad** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I hear the interjection from the member for South Brisbane. She says that it is a disgrace that the Women's Legal Service gets \$750,000 in additional funds. She says that it is a disgrace that victims of crime in this state get \$2 million.

**Ms Trad:** You are a disgrace.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Here she goes. She says I am a disgrace because we have given \$2 million to victims of crime, including—

**Ms Trad:** You're verballing.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Can members believe it? Two million dollars has been given to the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group and the member has the hide to come in here and act with that type of arrogance.

**Ms Trad** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for South Brisbane, you are not in your seat. If you wish to interject, could you please return to it. I have also asked you to stop interjecting. I am struggling to hear the Attorney-General.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** In conclusion, if the member for South Brisbane wants to complete those comments, I suggest she says them to the Women's Legal Service, to the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group and other groups that support women victims of crime and women victims of domestic violence in this state, which she just opposed through her arrogant interjections.

**Mr HOPPER:** Clause 14(2) states—

Subject to any necessary appropriation, an amount may be paid into the fund from the consolidated fund.

We have heard the Attorney-General talk about \$500,000 that had to be cleaned up. We may understand that. But what this—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr HOPPER:** It is interesting to hear the comments from the members who will not be here at the next election.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Gregory!

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lockyer, I have made it very clear tonight that if members want to interject they need to return to their seats as in the standing orders. The member for Condamine has the right to be heard in silence. Please allow him to do so.

**Mr HOPPER:** The member for Gregory might interject, but he might tell the House the last time he spoke to Rob Nioa.

Let me say that, once this bill is passed, it will open up the door for this government to take any extra money or even touch these funds as they could go back into consolidated revenue. That is the problem that the member for Gaven was trying to explain to the House.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Condamine, there is too much audible noise. If people wish to have conversations, please take them outside and I would ask that members please return to their seats. It is very difficult to hear the member for Condamine and he has the right to be heard. Can I ask members to please not stand in the gangways. They can return to their seats or take their conversations outside the chamber.

**Mr HOPPER:** Such disregard for the chair. The Casino Community Benefit Fund is something that every community relies upon. People trust that fund and they trust the government that controls that fund. This clause allows the government to touch that fund. That is the point that has been brought forward to this House tonight. If this clause is agreed to, clause 14(2) allows the government to touch this fund. That is the danger of this clause. That is what—

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Lockyer!

**Mr HOPPER:** The cabbage patch kid.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr HOPPER:** I hope you have a big hall, because Bob is coming to Gatton. I tell you what—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Condamine, please direct your comments through the chair.

**Mr HOPPER:** Let me just say that this clause, once passed, will allow the government to dig its fingers into this community benefit fund, which we are trying to protect tonight. This is a bad clause and we will be voting against it.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I know the member for Condamine might find it a little hard to understand what is said.

**Mr Hopper:** Don't start the abuse.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** No, I will start, member for Condamine, because you did not get it the first time, you did not get it the second time so I will give it to you a third time. We are abolishing the Community Investment Fund where the money goes in. It will be a neutral transition for the money for the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. There will be a board. It will be independently assessed. They will put out the money. We are going to fix the issues that the Auditor-General has advised of. Interestingly, I note that we have this concoction of incompetence up here. The member for Gaven was down—

**Mr HOPPER:** I rise to a point of order. I find that totally offensive and this poor little man should withdraw it.

**Mr Bleijie:** It was not about him. It was not personal.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Condamine, I did not hear a personal reflection in the Attorney-General's comments.

**Mr Hopper** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Condamine, you are now warned under standing order 253A.

**Mr Byrne** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Keppel!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The member for Condamine is right. I did not identify anyone. But I will now. The member for Condamine's incompetence in this place—

**Mr HOPPER:** I rise to a point of order. I find those comments totally offensive and I ask for them to be withdrawn.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Mr Attorney-General, will you withdraw?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I will withdraw and I will start on another subject while we are on the member for Condamine and his fearless leader down there, the man with the big hat, the leader of the party—the Katter man. Just as the Labor Party is skimming the superannuation funds of all Australians, the Katter party sits in here in shame because their leader could have done the honourable and right thing by the Australian and the Queensland people and got rid of that incompetent federal government.

While we are on incompetence when we are talking about the member for Condamine and the member for Gaven, honourable members may not have seen the member for Gaven, a member of PUP, getting advice from the opposition leader's adviser on this bill. Have we got an opposition or have we got a concoction of incompetents that cannot work out what is going on? They cannot read five words in a clause of a bill.

**Mr HOPPER:** I rise to a point of order. The minister has made another offensive comment.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr HOPPER:** I find it offensive and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have already ruled that is not a point of order. Please resume your seat.

**Mr HOPPER:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I dissent from your ruling.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you wish to issue a formal dissent to my ruling I suggest that you put it in writing.

**Mr HOPPER:** I will put it in writing. I will issue a formal dissent from your ruling. I was totally disgraced by the minister and I did not have the opportunity to raise a point of order.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Condamine, I have asked that you put it in writing. Member for Condamine, I would ask that you now leave the chamber under 253A for one hour.

**Mr Crandon:** By the way, you can't have a fuel card and a car.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Coomera, I warn you under 253A. Will the member for Condamine please leave as ordered.

**Mr Hopper:** Why don't you kick him out?

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Condamine!

*Whereupon the honourable member for Condamine withdrew from the chamber at 10.31 pm.*

Interruption.

## NAMING OF MEMBER

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I now name the member for Condamine.

## MOTION

### Suspension of Member for Condamine

**Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (10.31 pm): I move—

That the member for Condamine be suspended from the services of the House for seven days.

Division: Question put—That the member for Condamine be suspended from the services of the House for seven days.

**AYES, 71**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Blejje, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Sorensen

**NOES, 10**—Byrne, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

## LIQUOR AND GAMING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Consideration in Detail

Resumed from p. 1737.

Resumed on Clause 14—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.39 pm): Dignity and respect having been restored to this great place, can I categorically for the record explain to the honourable members left in the chamber what we are actually doing with this clause. There has been a perception tonight through the representations that somehow we are abolishing the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. We are not. What we are doing is abolishing the Community Investment Fund that the Labor Party set up and threw an enormous amount of money into, guised it as some sort of new form of money and handed it out to all different community groups. It is not just the Gambling Community Benefit Fund that goes through these processes; there are about four or five departments that go through this process. What we have seen from the Auditor-General's report is that there is confusion in the scheme. It is not clear who is responsible for it. Now the honourable the Treasurer will be responsible for making sure that the money that gets invested through appropriation is dealt with properly. The Gambling Community Benefit Fund will have a neutral transition. It will increase by CPI. The funding will be there.

I can assure honourable members that when they go back to their electorates, if they are asked, because of the misinformation tonight, are community groups worse off, they can categorically say no because no money will be different. The board structure will remain. The money will be distributed. You can continue to write references for your local community groups. We are ensuring that we have a proper transparent process in place and the money will have a neutral transition through an appropriation. That is the best way. For many years there has been a problem with the Community Investment Fund in terms of its structure and its administration.

**Mr Nicholls:** It was always propped up out of consolidated funds.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the Treasurer. It was always propped up from the Consolidated fund in any event. When I said that the guise was that they set up this Community Investment Fund, that the government is investing all this new money, essentially what was happening was it was rubbish because they were just pumping money from consolidated revenue into this fund and then distributing it. Through the same consolidation process, through the appropriation, money will be distributed to these groups through the new arrangements. It is a much better way to do it. That is why we are not going to be making any changes to this particular clause because it is trying to sort out an issue. I refer again to the Auditor-General's report that said over the last three years we have had major issues with the administration of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. We cannot have situations where \$500,000 is being doubled up and paid out. We will make sure community groups will continue to get their money. It will increase by CPI. No community group in Queensland will be worse off under this arrangement.

Division: Question put—That clause 14, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 71**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens


**NOES, 10**—Byrne, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 47, as read, agreed to.

Clause 48—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.50 pm): I just want to raise a point here. As I mentioned earlier in my speech, the opposition will not be dividing on this clause. However, we do have concerns that it removes the requirement for 'Advertisement of application of significant community impact'. Where a gaming machine licence is being applied for, or additional gaming machines are being applied for, or the size of premises is to be increased there will be no requirement to advertise this in local newspapers. As I said earlier, we have real concerns about any removal of advertising for these applications being notified to local community members through their newspapers.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** This provision is about removing unnecessary red tape. Technology has advanced and we do not think it is necessary for these types of businesses to advertise in government gazettes and newspapers. There are technological advances and online abilities. The advertisements will be advertised on the Department of Justice and Attorney-General website through the relevant office in my department. We believe that Queenslanders are big enough and smart enough to go online and check out what is happening in their local communities.

Clause 48, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 49 to 88, as read, agreed to.

Clause 89—

**Ms PALASZCZUK (10.52 pm):** This amendment replaces the obligations under the act to make payments from the Community Investment Fund and replaces this with payments directly from the Consolidated Fund to an entity for the benefit of the community. Because payments are no longer linked to the Community Investment Fund, which had a designated percentage of taxes, fees, levies and fines required to be paid into it, there is no longer any protection for those funds to be allocated to the purpose originally intended under the act. Therefore, the opposition will be opposing this clause.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It is ditto. This is in relation to the same debate we had before. More protection is provided in clause 89 because it says that 'the minister must consider any relevant recommendations given by the Gambling Community Benefit Committee'. It is actually getting the advice from the very committee established to distribute the money.

Division: Question put—That clause 89, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 70—**Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seene, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

**NOES, 11—**Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 89, as read, agreed to.

Clause 90—

**Ms PALASZCZUK (11.02 pm):** The opposition opposes this clause because it removes section 322 from the Gaming Machine Act. Subsection (5) of that section allowed the minister to make payments from the Community Investment Fund for the following purposes: gambling research and dealing with social issues arising from gambling, including research into the effectiveness of responsible gambling initiatives; the Gambling Community Benefit Fund; the Casino Community Benefit Fund continued in existence under the Casino Control Act 1982, section 52(1); major public sporting facilities of state-wide significance; major cultural facilities of state-wide significance; infrastructure for sporting and cultural facilities of state-wide significance; a scheme for providing capital works for the racing industry; funding that part of the department through which this act is administered; and programs of state-wide significance, including job creation, community renewal and crime prevention. Those programs should continue to be funded from the Community Investment Fund. The opposition will be opposing this clause.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It is the same issue that has been raised before. We have had the debate sufficiently in the House I think. Just to make a parting comment in this respect, this is in fact Responsible Gambling Awareness Week. I was very pleased this week to go to the Regatta Hotel and launch the online ATM gambling awareness campaign where people are now trying to break the cycle from gambling, from poker machines. When they walk outside and they want to get more cash out, hopefully in every pub and club across Queensland there will be flashing gambling awareness campaign slogans: 'What about the family?' and 'Thinking about it'. They are the sorts of things we are investing in. We will continue to invest in these anti-gambling campaign messages.

Division: Question put—That clause 90, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 70—**Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seene, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

**NOES, 11—**Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 90, as read, agreed to.

Clause 91, as read, agreed to.

Clause 92—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.11 pm): I move the following amendment—

**5 Clause 92 (Amendment of s 349 (Cheating))**

Page 63, line 24, after 'TITO'—

*insert—*

system

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 92, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 93 to 95, as read, agreed to.

Clause 96—



**Ms PALASZCZUK** (11.12 pm): The opposition does not support this amendment to the extent that it abolishes the Community Investment Fund. This was an important mechanism for ensuring that the money quarantined from fees, levies, taxes, fines and other sources specifically is used for the purposes designated in the act. Once the fund is abolished and all of these fees are paid into the Consolidated Fund, there can be no guarantee as to how much will be spent on gambling research or enforcement activities by the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation and the Gambling Community Benefit Fund and the Casino Community Benefit Fund. The grants to community groups in all electorates are integral for their continued operation. I and many other members here have written many supporting submissions in relation to these worthwhile projects over many years, and these facilities have enhanced the amenity of the whole community. The opposition cannot support the abolition of these funds and payment into the Consolidated Fund.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I have sat here and listened to the comments made by the opposition in relation to the Community Investment Fund and the gaming machine fund in relation to the payments that are to be made from the Consolidated Fund to those funds to fund the various activities that are undertaken on the recommendations of the various boards. Let us be clear. There was not enough money in those funds for them to carry out that work. Those funds run at a deficit. They are already supported by the Consolidated Fund each and every year because the Labor Party, when they were in government, kept putting increasing demands on those funds. So they ended up supporting Stadiums Queensland; they ended up supporting the department of national parks and racing; they ended up funding all sorts of things that were never intended to be funded in the first place. The money was going out the door faster than it was coming in. All that is simply occurring, on the recommendation of the officers of Queensland Treasury and Trade, is stopping the fiction under which the Labor Party continued to operate, that it was all being funded by the community fund—it was not. It was being funded by the general revenue that was being received into the Consolidated Fund.

Let us put an end to the nonsense that is going on that shows the complete inability of those opposite to understand the proposals that are being put forward. The fund was in deficit. It required supplementation from the Consolidated Fund. The funds that are going to be paid will be paid from the Consolidated Fund as they always have in the past. It will not be raided for pet projects like the Labor Party used to raid it for all their pet projects. Members will be able to write to those various funds asking for support for their local community groups to deliver them. If memory serves me correctly, in the last full year the fund was in deficit to the tune of \$25 million. It was supported by the Consolidated Fund. The Consolidated Fund will continue to supply it. Members will be able to support their community groups. Community groups will continue to receive the funding, as they always have, and in fact it will be increased by CPI. It is a clear, simple, transparent process—all of the things that we know the Labor Party opposes.

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

**AYES, 72**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Guley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

**NOES, 10**—Byrne, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 96, as read, agreed to.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Honourable members, by leave of the House I intend to order that the division bells for the remaining questions in consideration in detail be rung for one minute.

Leave granted.

Clauses 97 to 102, as read, agreed to.

Clause 103—

**Ms PALASZCZUK** (11.22 pm): Clause 103 removes section 116 of the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, which requires the minister to pay a certain percentage of the interactive gambling tax received by the commissioner into the Community Investment Fund. Instead of being paid into the fund, it will now go straight into the Consolidated Fund.

The opposition will oppose this amendment for the reasons that we have stated at length in this debate. We want that money to continue to be guaranteed. I listened to the Treasurer when he said that we have nothing to fear; that we should trust him; and that of course the moneys are still going to be paid. I remember a certain Premier saying to public servants when he was the Leader of the Opposition that they had nothing to fear, and then we saw 14,000 workers who ended up being sacked. We also had a commitment from this government that they would not wind back the tree-clearing laws in this state. What did they do? They wound back the tree-clearing laws in this state. Then we had the education minister, who said that he would not close schools in Queensland. What did he do? He closed ten schools in this—

**A government member** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! Order!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** And now they want to propose a big new tax on families—

**Mr STEVENS:** I rise to a point of order.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** They do not like it—

**Mr STEVENS:** There was no relevance whatsoever in those points brought by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Just to conclude, I cannot trust what the Treasurer has to say. In fact, I am even more concerned that this is a cash grab by this government to try and prop up the budget, which is due to be delivered in less than two weeks. But the fundamental and core question of this government is: are they going to impose a big new tax on families as part of this budget? A big new tax on families to raise—

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, I would ask that you come back to the question.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I am speaking about the Consolidated Fund and budget measures—

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:**—in response to the Treasurer saying that we must trust him on this issue. How can we trust the Treasurer when we cannot trust this government? That is fundamental, and that is why the opposition will be opposing this clause lock, stock and barrel.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr NICHOLLS:** As usual, I listened with a degree of apprehension to what the Leader of the Opposition was going to say on the basis that some of it might make sense at some stage. But my fears were unjustified because, as usual, none of it made sense.

To sit here and to listen to the Leader of the Opposition—one of the team of the great betrayers of public trust—lecture this side of the House in relation to keeping our commitments is an exercise in restraint, because we all remember what happened the last time the people of Queensland gave their trust to the members opposite when they came into government in 2009.

Within three months, they had already put on the chopping block everything that they thought they could get rid of. They did not even tell the then transport minister on 15 May, as I recall—who was sitting where the Minister for Energy and Water Supply is—whether they would be selling Queensland Rail. We all remember her answer, do we not? ‘Colleagues, no way will it be sold.’ Twenty four hours later it was on the chopping block ready to go. We all remember them saying, ‘Make no mistake about it, there will be a fuel levy here in Queensland.’ Within three months the fuel levy was gone.

So when it comes to questions of trust, you cannot rely on what the Labor Party says; you can only rely on what it does. What did they do? They put it all on the table—

**Mr Pitt** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, member for Mulgrave!

**Mr NICHOLLS:**—as opposed to the LNP government. What did we promise? We promised to cut the cost of living; we promised to reinstate the principal place of residence concession; we promised to freeze car registration; we promised to lift the payroll tax. We halved the increase in public transport fares. All of this was delivered within the first two months of the LNP Newman government. When it comes down to it on questions of trust, the people of Queensland made their decision at the last election, and that decision was pretty clear.

Going to the clauses themselves, let us go back to the issue of what they actually say. The abolition of the Community Investment Fund will not lead to any changes in funding, because the funding of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund and the Casino Community Benefit Fund were matters of policy. They were matters of policy under the old government, and they are matters of policy under this government. We have committed to a neutral transition on the funding allocated. That means that the same amount of funding will be provided. But better than that—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It is always good to have the backup of the honourable the Treasurer when we are talking about these types of matters. The honourable the Treasurer is the one who has to arrest the decline in the state budget. Had we a competent former Labor government in power—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Had we had a government in power for the past 20 years that paid down the debt and decreased the cost of living for Queenslanders, we would not have to do the things we are doing. But Queenslanders love what we are doing. We gave water rebates and we cut the cost of electricity. The honourable transport minister halved the price increase for public transport that the opposition leader imposed on Queenslanders when she was transport minister. In terms of the question the opposition has put tonight—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr Mulherin** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! I cannot hear the Attorney-General. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would like to interject, I suggest he return to his seat.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** In terms of what opposition members have been talking about, this clause ensures that the Office of Regulatory Policy in my department is actually funded out of consolidated revenue. At the moment it is funded out of the Community Investment Fund. It is a government body—there are public servants in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General running the regulatory office—being funded out of the Community Investment Fund. We are proposing that they be appropriately funded out of consolidated revenue, as you would expect for a government department.

We are doing this because the Labor Party had no idea how to arrest the debt and deficit, because they are debt and deficit deniers. We know that they misrepresented the situation to the people of Queensland. For the last three years in opposition I sat where the member for South Brisbane now sits. I remember Rachel Nolan sitting opposite. I remember when she was asked by the opposition, ‘Is Queensland Rail for sale?’ She had a surprised look on her face as if to say, ‘What a stupid question. Where did that come from? Queensland Rail is not for sale.’

**Mr Nicholls:** I don’t think the member for Mackay knew, either.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I am not sure whether the member for Mackay knew, whether the member for Mulgrave knew or whether the member for Inala knew, but Rachel Nolan said, 'Queensland Rail is not for sale.' 'How stupid you were to ask the question,' she said. Of course, the then Treasurer, Andrew Fraser, was sitting there thinking, 'Oh, no. What has she done?'

**Mr Nicholls:** Well, that was every day.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** That was every day. But then he thought, 'We had better tell cabinet what we have decided to do. We had better tell the minister directly responsible what we have decided to do.'

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! I cannot hear the Attorney-General. I remind the Attorney-General that he should remain relevant to the clause.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Indeed. The clause I am specifically referring to follows the contribution in consideration in detail from the opposition leader, who talked about all things cost of living, for which they can take no credit. They can take no credit for decreasing the cost of living to Queenslanders. All they can take credit for over the past 20 years is higher taxes, higher Queensland debt and no plan to pay it back. They had no plan to arrest the decline in the Queensland budget. It was a case of spend, spend, spend.

What else would we expect from the state Labor Party when the federal Labor Party is exactly the same? Just as Rachel Nolan stood here a few years ago and said, 'Queensland Rail is not for sale,' we had Julia Gillard saying, 'There will be no carbon tax under the government I lead.' They are the same—whether they be state Labor, federal Labor or the member for South Brisbane, who as the deputy state secretary signed the policies to increase cost-of-living pressures and signed the policies to increase debt in Queensland. I bet members one thing: I bet the member for South Brisbane knew that Queensland Rail was for sale even though the minister did not know. I bet Peel Street knew, because I suspect—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! I cannot hear the Attorney-General.

**Mr Stevens:** Anna told her.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Anna told the member for South Brisbane in Peel Street what was coming but did not tell the minister.

We have made the necessary improvements to the state budget. In a few weeks time the Treasurer will bring down a budget. We are making the necessary improvements. Queenslanders will understand. Looking back at just the past 12 months, they have \$7,000 back in their bank account when they invest in a family home in Queensland; we have the construction Great Start Grant of \$15,000, getting investment in construction; and we have the four pillars of the Queensland economy—agriculture, resources, construction and tourism. We are getting on with the job. Queenslanders understand that we are easing the pressures of the cost of living.

Through this grants process nothing will change. Community groups will get all the money. In fact, they will get a little more with CPI. In fact, I give a guarantee: if we sort out the mess that the Auditor-General has advised of then I suspect there might be a little more money for community groups than is being distributed at the moment. If we get rid of the duplication, the inefficiencies and so on then we will have more money.

I confirm for all honourable members, who have shown a keen interest in this debate tonight, that, consistent with the current policy—I make it categorically clear—the following conditions will be retained to ensure future grant funding to communities is not impacted by the transition to the Consolidated Fund. First, the fund amounts will be adjusted annually to allow for consumer price indexing. They will go up! Secondly, interest calculated by Queensland Treasury Corporation will continue to be earned on the cash balances of the gambling and casino community benefit funds and will be available for allocation as grant funding. Finally, any unallocated grant funding as at 30 June each year will be made available for future allocation as grant funding. That is a little different from the opposition leader saying that the Treasurer is going to take all the money. That is the commitment we make to community groups right around the state that help drive this economy and create opportunities to make this state great.

**Ms TRAD:** We are talking about clause 103. We are talking about removing the requirement that the minister pay a certain percentage of the interactive gambling tax received by the commissioner into the Community Investment Fund. We are talking about taking away the mandated percentage required by the minister to pay into the Community Investment Fund to disburse to

community organisations—to not-for-profit organisations, to volunteers—to do the very important work they do in our community. This is nothing short of this LNP government fiddling the till—pure and simple. It is an absolute con from people opposite—

**Mr Berry** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If the member for Ipswich wishes to interject, he should return to his seat.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you, Madam Chair, for your protection, but I find the interjections from the member for Ipswich irrelevant.

**Mr Mulherin:** Lord Lamington?

**Ms TRAD:** It was actually Lady Lamington, Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Treasurer is correct: this is ultimately an issue of trust. Those opposite want us to believe that they are to be held in high regard when it comes to issues of trust.

**Mr Berry:** Hear, hear!

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have asked the member for Ipswich to return to his seat if he wishes to interject. I will not ask you to do so again. If you continue to interject out of your seat I will warn you. The member for South Brisbane has the call.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair, for your protection. Let us assess this group opposite on their word. Let us inspect their claim to have the trust of Queenslanders. Let us inspect if they are to be believed when they say that no public servant should fear an LNP government. At least 14,000 fear you—

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order. Clause 103 omits section 116, which provides for the minister to pay a percentage of interactive gambling taxes into the CIF. I fail to see any relevance in the argument that the member for South Brisbane now pursues. I ask you to pull her up on relevance.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am trying to hear the Attorney-General's point of order. Could you please allow me to hear him.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I pulled up the member for South Brisbane on relevance. At the outset she did say that she was speaking specifically to clause 103. She has now directed her comments away from clause 103 and I ask that she be directed back to be relevant.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order! I would ask the member for South Brisbane to remain relevant to clause 103 in her remaining time.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am addressing comments made by the Attorney-General himself and the Treasurer himself in relation to issues of trust. I make the point: when it comes to whether or not public servants are to trust this government, they cannot. When it comes to whether or not Queenslanders can believe its word on front-line services, they cannot. When it comes to believing its word on maintaining the ban on uranium mining, it is not to be believed. When it comes to believing the Queensland Premier when he says that the statutory protection for native vegetation will remain in Queensland, he is not to be believed. There are countless examples of where the LNP and the Premier are not to be believed when it comes to commitments given to the people of Queensland. This is another—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr BLEIJIE:** If Queenslanders want to know who to trust, they know they cannot trust the Labor Party. What the member for South Brisbane is advocating is this: the Treasurer has told the House tonight that there was not enough money coming into the Community Investment Fund to pay the grants out, so it was being propped up by consolidated revenue in any event. What the member for South Brisbane is advocating is that the money that goes in from gambling taxes should be the only money available to go out to community groups. Therefore, tonight she is pronouncing that she believes there should be a cut in community grants across the state. That is what she is advocating for—a cut in—

**An opposition member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Yes, she did. She did because the member for South Brisbane is talking about the community grant funds and the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. If we take her view of the world—and I understand it is hard to accept, honourable members, because there is no reality on that side—and if we try to accept it, the member for South Brisbane's analogy is this: there is the Community Investment Fund and the money going into it. As part of the process of the Community Investment

Fund, gambling money comes in—so does consolidated revenue—and then money goes out. If we take away the current consolidated revenue that already goes into the community benefit fund, there is less money for community groups in her own electorate. So what the member for South Brisbane is advocating for is a cut in community services across this state. What we are advocating for is to retain the status quo. The money will be there and will be appropriated through consolidated revenue and the money will be there. We will not cut those community services, as the member for South Brisbane is advocating.

Division: Question put—That clause 103, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 71**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

**NOES, 11**—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 103, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 104 to 111, as read, agreed to.

Clause 112—

**Ms PALASZCZUK (11.46 pm):** I will be brief in relation to this clause. Once again, this clause removes section 113 of the Keno Act 1996, which requires the minister to pay a certain percentage of the keno tax received by the commissioner into the Community Investment Fund. Once again, for the reasons I have outlined previously in this House, the opposition will be opposing this clause.

Division: Question put—That clause 112, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 71**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

**NOES, 11**—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 112, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 113 to 120, as read, agreed to.

Clause 121—



**Mr BLEIJIE (11.50 pm):** I move the following amendments—

**6 Clause 121 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))**

Page 80, after line 23—

*insert—*

**approved arrangement** means a lease, sublease, franchise agreement or management agreement entered into by the holder of a commercial special facility licence if the commissioner has approved the lease or sublease or the entering into of the agreement for the purposes of section 153(3).

**7 Clause 121 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))**

Page 81, lines 16 and 17—

*omit, insert—*

- (b) that is a one-off event or occasion—
  - (i) that is a small regional show; or
  - (ii) otherwise—that starts and ends on the same day.

**8 Clause 121 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))**

Page 81, after line 25—

*insert—*

**small regional show** means a function that is an agricultural, horticultural, industrial or pastoral show or exhibition, held at a rural place in Queensland, if the show or exhibition meets criteria prescribed under a regulation for this definition relevant to minimising adverse effects on—

- (a) the health or safety of members of the public; and

(b) the amenity of the community.

*Examples of criteria that may be prescribed under a regulation—*

- the maximum number of persons expected to attend the show or exhibition having regard to attendance at the show or exhibition in previous years
- the maximum period during which liquor is to be sold at the show or exhibition
- the maximum duration of the show or exhibition

These are technical amendments and, particularly amendment Nos 7 and 8, they are going to be dubbed the Monto show amendments. I am very pleased to move these Monto show amendments.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** My comments will be relatively brief. In relation to amendment No. 8, as I said, the opposition will not be opposing this amendment, but I ask the Attorney-General to address the concerns we have in relation to community safety and the safeguards that he envisages to be put in place where alcohol will be available in the presence of children. In relation to those provisions, I ask the Attorney-General how he foresees that families attending the shows can do so in peace and quiet with no fear of alcohol related violence.

Although I acknowledge that the majority of families going to the show are doing the right thing, there may be on one or two occasions the example of someone doing the wrong thing, which then could cause issues for parents and their children.

**An opposition member:** And security.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** And security issues as well. We believe the family is paramount. So I ask if the Attorney-General could address those issues briefly. That would be appreciated.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** This is not question time. If the member wants to ask questions, she can put forward a view as the opposition. That is fine. I make the point that the opposition leader acknowledges that the majority of families do the right thing. That is the problem with the Labor Party. If the minority does the wrong thing, they legislate against the majority. That is what the Labor Party always did. One person mucks up—

**Mr Johnson:** Everybody pays.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection. Everybody else pays for someone else's mistake. We do not legislate in that regard. We legislate for the majority of well-behaved Queenslanders. If there are issues—and I have said this countless times in the debate tonight; I spoke for half an hour in my summing-up tonight and I said this on many, many occasions—if someone breaks the ordinary course of law, if anyone assaults anyone, if anyone breaches any other provisions of any other legislation, then we have a Police Service and the Police Service is charged with the responsibility to make sure that those people are held accountable. Then we have a court process if people are charged. There are safeguards in place with the current legislation. If anyone misbehaves, they will be dealt with according to the laws of Queensland.

We do not legislate because a few people muck up. That is the Labor Party's problem. They come here and, because they were such a reactive government, if anyone mucks up everyone else suffers for it. I will use as an example the Monto show. I am not sure of the history of the Monto show. I do not know the drinking culture of the Monto show. If we were the Labor Party—

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** A dry show? I take that interjection. I do not know about that.

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I am told by the Treasurer that the only drinking that happens at the Monto show is a Devonshire tea or something like that. So there will no issues.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members, I am struggling to hear the Attorney-General and he has the right to be heard.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I see the member for South Brisbane up there counselling the PUPs and the KAPs up there with respect to what they should be doing in this place. The member for South Brisbane and the other members of the Labor Party are the problem in Queensland. That is—

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection from the Leader of the House. I have watched this all night. They have gone backwards and forwards and counselled each other and negotiated outcomes and 'You talk to this clause and I'll talk to that clause.'

**Dr Douglas** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Gaven, if you wish to interject, please return to your seat.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I suspect that the high-level negotiations are occurring because the seven opposite have realised that the crossbench in the corner outnumber them and could form an opposition in Queensland if they all put their collective heads together. I think they are a bit worried, because yesterday the member for Gaven said that he was going to be the next Premier. I think that has worried the opposition leader. So there is a bit of negotiation going on. The member for South Brisbane is saying, 'Look, do you really want it? We were hoping Palaszczuk would to get it.' It is an absolute joke that the Labor Party would come in here and, despite the fact that we are reducing regulation and red tape for great Queenslanders, ask, 'What security have you put in place?' The Labor Party still does not trust Queenslanders to responsibly drink with their families. Why should a mother or a father or a carer not have a cold beer and watch the fireworks at a show? Why should they not? Because some drunken lout has mucked it up for everyone else, the Labor Party comes in here and says, 'All Queenslanders will suffer,' because the going position of the Labor Party is distrust of the Queensland community.

We hold the community in the utmost respect. We understand that communities will be held accountable and responsible. I have complete faith in our community associations to run these events and have great community spirit. We will revive the community spirit in these country towns that have been missed for many, many years under the Labor Party.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 121, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 122—

**Ms PALASZCZUK (11.57 pm):** This clause also relates to funds being paid directly into the Consolidated Fund. We will be opposing the clause.

Division: Question put—That clause 122, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 71**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

**NOES, 11**—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 122, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 123 to 126, as read, agreed to.

Clause 127—

**Mr BLEIJIE (12.02 am):** I move the following amendments—

**9 Clause 127 (Insertion of new ss 13–14B and pt 1, div 4, sdiv 2)**

Page 84, lines 3 and 4—

*omit, insert—*

- (d) for a fundraising event other than a small regional show—the liquor is sold during a period not exceeding a total of 8 hours; and

**10 Clause 127 (Insertion of new ss 13–14B and pt 1, div 4, sdiv 2)**

Page 85, lines 10 to 28—

*omit, insert—*

- (c) neither the entity nor an executive officer of the entity has, within the 5 years immediately before the event, been convicted of an offence under any of the following—

- (i) section 155A;
- (ii) section 156;
- (iii) section 156A;
- (iv) section 169; and

- (d) for an entity or an executive officer of the entity that is a licensee or permittee, neither the entity nor the executive officer has, within the 5 years immediately before the event—
- (i) been given a written notice for an urgent suspension of the entity's or executive officer's licence under section 137C; or
  - (ii) been convicted of an offence under section 148A(2) or (4); or
  - (iii) breached a condition of a licence or permit relating to minimising alcohol-related disturbances, or public disorder, in a locality.

This confirms and contains a little more information on what we have dubbed the Monto Show amendment, helping out these community associations and show societies to have fun in their communities.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 127, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 128 to 131, as read, agreed to.

Clause 132—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (12.03 am): I move the following amendment—

**11 Clause 132 (Amendment of s 67AA (Principal activity is the provision of entertainment))**

Page 95, line 24, 'subparagraph (i)'—

*omit, insert—*

paragraph (a)

This is a minor amendment. There is no need to consider it further.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 132, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 133 to 143, as read, agreed to.

Clause 144—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (12.04 am): I move the following amendments—

**12 Clause 144 (Amendment of s 141 (Order to close premises for unlawful trading))**

Page 103, line 27, after '141(1)'—

*insert—*

and (2)

**13 Clause 144 (Amendment of s 141 (Order to close premises for unlawful trading))**

Page 104, lines 13 to 28—

*omit, insert—*

- (2) The commissioner may give the person conducting business on the premises an order to cease trading in liquor on the premises and to close the premises.
- (3) A person must not contravene an order under subsection (2).  
Maximum penalty for subsection (3)—25 penalty units.

These are minor technical amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 144, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 145 to 151, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (12.04 am): I move the following amendment—

**14 After clause 151**

Page 105, after line 21—

*insert—*

**151A Amendment of s 155AC (Application of div 1A)**

Section 155AC—

*insert—*

- (2) To the extent that a holder of a commercial special facility licence has entered into an approved arrangement, this division applies for the licensed premises as if a reference to a licensee in this division were a reference to the lessee, sublessee, franchisee or manager with whom the holder entered into the approved arrangement.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 152 to 170, as read, agreed to.

Clause 171—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (12.05 am): Thank you and good morning to my honourable colleagues. I move the following amendments—

**15 Clause 171 (Amendment of s 5B (Availability of copies of records and transcriptions))**

Page 114, lines 4 and 5, 'library committee'—

omit, insert—

Library Committee

**16 Clause 171 (Amendment of s 5B (Availability of copies of records and transcriptions))**

Page 114, after line 8—

insert—

(3B) However, despite an arrangement put in place under subsection (4), the chief executive must not provide to the Supreme Court Library Committee copies of the following records or transcriptions—

- (a) any part of a record under this Act of a criminal proceeding that has been made while the court is closed under a provision of an Act, or an order made under a provision of an Act requiring the court to be closed;
- (b) any part of a record under this Act of a criminal proceeding if the court makes an order prohibiting access to, or the disclosure or publication of, the part.

**17 Clause 171 (Amendment of s 5B (Availability of copies of records and transcriptions))**

Page 114, line 10, 'to (6)'—

omit, insert—

to (7)

These amendments are to ensure that certain sensitive transcripts are not included in the Queensland Sentencing Information Service.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 171, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 172 and 173, as read, agreed to.

Clause 174—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (12.06 am): I move the following amendment—

**18 Clause 174 (Amendment of s 2 (Definitions))**

Page 115, lines 16 to 22—

omit, insert—

**sentencing information—**

- (a) includes—
  - (i) information about sentencing contained in transcripts or parts of transcripts, of recordings of criminal proceedings; and
  - (ii) other information related to the administration of the criminal justice system in Queensland; but
- (b) does not include any part of a record or transcript that can not be provided to the committee under the *Recording of Evidence Act 1962*, section 5B(5).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 174, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 175 to 190, as read, agreed to.

### Third Reading

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.06 am): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.07 am): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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


Motion agreed to.

### ADJOURNMENT

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (12.07 am): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### Torres Strait Islanders, Traditional Adoption


 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (12.07 am): The issue of traditional adoption practices in the Torres Strait Islands is a complex one that the former Labor government was investing time and resources into to ensure appropriate research and consultation was undertaken. This is an issue that cannot be solved overnight or with the flick of a ministerial pen. It asks that a modern society respect longstanding cultural practices while putting in place a framework of legal requirements that all of us need in our day-to-day lives. To form a solution it is obviously important that we understand the problem. Traditional adoption, or the practice of giving children, is relatively widespread in the Torres Strait. It is generally practised with an extended family group and involves the transferral of parental responsibilities for a child to someone other than the biological parents. While this practice has long been part of Indigenous culture, it is widely different from the practice of state sanctioned forced adoption, a shameful practice from decades ago which culminated in formal apologies in both the state and federal parliaments. Whilst we can respect the practice of traditional adoptions when conducted safely for the betterment of the child in question, it is very challenging to establish legal recognition of the new relationship. This is important in a modern society where proof of birth and next of kin requirements among others are commonplace in day-to-day activities such as acquiring a driver's licence, school enrolment, inheritance without a will, gaining a passport and dealing with a bank.

Because of the complexities of the issue, progressing it has been a long process. The issue was raised in prominence in the early nineties when the Queensland government was lobbied by the Kupai Omaker Working Party for Legal Recognition of Traditional Adoption, including making submissions to parliamentary committees in 2008. Before and during my time as minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships consultation was undertaken in the Torres Strait Islands and northern peninsula area. Because around 75 per cent of Torres Strait Queenslanders live on the mainland, discussions took place in Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton and in South-East Queensland which has significant populations of Torres Strait Islander people. Discussions centred on how to recognise the cultural importance of the practice and the legal realities. Importantly, this consultation included individuals that had experiences of traditional adoption, whether in giving or receiving a child or having been a child that was themselves given.

The consultations were about gathering information on how often traditional adoptions were occurring in the present day and how local communities recognise those adoptions. The consultation period revealed that the practice has continued, but is evolving as those communities evolve. These are complex issues that deeply affect the fabric of Indigenous communities in, most certainly, Torres Strait Islander communities. It was an issue that was being worked on towards the end of my last term in parliament. I hope it is something that is continually being worked on.

I am happy to stand corrected, but I am not aware that the LNP government has moved to progress this important issue to any large degree. I implore the LNP to use the opportunity of community cabinet in the Torres Strait to pick this up and get it back on the agenda and moving again. We all need to work collaboratively and consultatively to reach a consensus view, one which respects the cultural practices that predate European settlement while also recognising the legal aspects of these relationships.

### Pine Rivers Electorate, Small Business

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (12.10 am): Over the past 14 months in this role and indeed over the past few years, it has been an amazing honour to get to know the Pine Rivers business community. I am enjoying getting to know the fine business owners and managers and employees at so many of our local businesses and enjoying the challenge of working with them to push through some of the issues that their businesses have been facing and issues that our region as a whole has been facing.


My commitment to my electorate is that I am in this place to help build a better Pine Rivers. The bedrock of building a better Pine Rivers is ensuring we have a strong, thriving business community. As our government focuses on building a four-pillar economy based around construction, resources, agriculture and tourism, Pine Rivers is ideally positioned to benefit from this emphasis.

In recent months, I have undertaken a number of initiatives to assist Pine Rivers businesses and to help strengthen government engagement with our business community. I am working with Gympie Road businesses at Strathpine to help develop strategies towards a renewal of the Gympie Road precinct and an increase in customer numbers and ultimately jobs. We need to make Strathpine a destination of choice again. My Strathpine Business Forum on 6 May was the first step in that direction. As well as that, Peter Dutton, the federal member for Dickson, and I are leading the campaign for more reliable high-speed broadband internet for businesses in Brendale and Strathpine and are currently circulating a petition to champion that cause.

I recently launched Pine Rivers Business News, a quarterly business newsletter to keep local businesses up to date with government initiatives and programs that will benefit them and help them grow and be successful. The first edition has been received well by local businesses. To allow businesses an additional opportunity to connect with our government, I also recently launched the Pine Rivers Business Survey. This survey gives local businesses another avenue to have their say about issues that are important to their business and our community as a whole. I also look forward later this year to running the third annual 100% Local Christmas Challenge, which is a 'buy local' campaign that has been highly successful, as well as the careers expo planned for later this year and providing ongoing assistance to local tourism operators.

Pine Rivers is well positioned to develop into a future economic powerhouse. Now is the time for Pine Rivers businesses to build on the successes of the past, to put some of the recent blips and dips behind us, to take stock of where we are at, to plan for future growth, then to launch ourselves into a future where the Pine Rivers economy is once again a thriving, successful economy with an abundance of employment opportunities. Pine Rivers is a great region, with great opportunities. I look forward to continuing to work closely with local businesses in these and other ways as we get on with the job of building a better Pine Rivers.

### Burleigh Electorate, Small Business

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (12.13 am): Following on from the speech of the member for Pine Rivers, I point out that small business is a very important part of my electorate as well. Some 6,197 businesses are located in the Burleigh electorate. Of those, 5,964 are small businesses. Some 22 per cent of that number are in the construction industry, 13 per cent in real estate, 11 per cent in professional and technical services and seven per cent in retail. As indicated, 22 per cent of my local businesses are in the construction industry. Every morning we see a procession of utes leaving the Gold Coast. We need to do something about that. They are heading to more productive areas like Ipswich.

**Mr Berry** interjected.

**Mr HART:** I congratulate the member for Ipswich and the Ipswich council for their activities in their area.

It is important that we get those businesses back working on the Gold Coast and we stop those utes going up the highway. We are working towards—


**Mr Dowling** interjected.

**Mr HART:** Or going to the Redlands. We are working very closely with the council in order to get some of these utes off the highway and their businesses working in Burleigh. I am working closely with developers and businesspeople in my electorate—in Palm Beach, Burleigh, Miami, Mermaid Beach, Varsity Lakes and parts of Robina—to get this happening.

On 9 May the Minister for Small Business, Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games—and I deliberately put small business first—and I held a business forum at the Currumbin RSL. We had a packed audience with representatives from about 100 small businesses. We heard from them their issues and the sorts of red tape that we could look at trimming back on their behalf.

It is important to note that Burleigh is home to about 1.4 per cent of all businesses in Queensland. The people there on that night were representative of Burleigh and Currumbin businesses. I say thank you very much to the Minister for Small Business, Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games for supporting those businesses. It is important to recognise that a lot of those businesses took 'buy local' stickers home with them on the day and are now proudly displaying them on all of the businesses in James Street and in the Stockland and other shopping centres in Burleigh.

### Tabled Documents; Health Funding

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (12.16 am): Earlier tonight I attempted to table two documents relevant to the debate. One relates to electrical safety and is what the Attorney-General did not want tabled earlier. The other relates to QCAT and the matters JPs will be presiding over. These issues are very important to my community and I will not be silenced by the Attorney-General.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 17 January 2013, to Ms Jo Linde, Principal Legal Officer, Strategic Policy, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, from Ms Janice Enderlin-Cooper, of the Gold Coast Justices Association Inc., regarding a QCAT question [\[2672\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Document, dated 17 May 2013, titled 'Proposed Changes to Queensland Electoral Safety Regulation', by David Wilson, Springfield Test and Tag [\[2673\]](#).

The Treasurer seems to be a little embarrassed that the *Government Gazette* makes cuts to the state Health budget clearer to the people of Queensland than his budget papers. Hiding a \$1 billion cut in state funding of our hospital and health services this year and for each of the next three years in the footnotes simply does not wash. That is a \$1 billion cut in state funding over each of the next three years. Spruiking adjustments to the increasing federal contribution to the state's hospitals as the cause of local cuts and closures just does not wash any longer. The March quarter consolidated fund quarterly report shows jaw-dropping cuts in departmental expenses of over \$1 billion. There were no footnotes there explaining the reclassification of allocation as grants.


The CEO of the West Moreton Hospital and Health Service was much lauded in the *Queensland Times* by the Minister for Health and by the current member for Ipswich for cutting the local Health budget by \$21 million. For those who have taken the time to unpick the LNP's first Health budget, the evidence is clear. It is \$1 billion in cuts this year, \$1 billion next year and \$1 billion the year after that. I am concerned that in my electorate of Bundamba this is just the beginning of further cuts to front-line services to come as LNP budget forecasts demand similar three per cent efficiency requirements for each of the next two years.

Perhaps this is why West Moreton HHS is recruiting on seek.com for a new finance manager and four new AO7 business intelligence officers on three-month temporary appointments. The key responsibilities for these business intelligence officers include to 'monitor and provide expert advice regarding the implications of contract negotiations' and 'investigating alternative models of care and providing business cases on the implications of change.'

This is contestability-speak which has come to Ipswich, but we all know it is privatisation. Outsourcing current public health services to private providers may sound credible to radical free-market economists and those who ride on their coat-tails, but we will never accept this in the city of Ipswich. If you come to the Ipswich area, public health experience tells you that if it smells like a rat, if it moves like a rat, it is a rat and it is a Newman rat!

*(Time expired)*

### Health Funding

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (12.20 am): I cannot let the previous adjournment speech made by the delusional member for Bundamba go.

**Mrs MILLER:** Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that the member for Lockyer made comments in relation to 'delusional'. That is a medical term. I find it offensive and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for Lockyer, the member for Bundamba has asked you to withdraw that.

**Mr RICKUSS:** I withdraw. The member for Bundamba is struggling with reality. The Health budget lost \$1.2 billion on the Health payroll system and the Tahitian prince stole millions of dollars. The Mater Hospital is a privately run hospital; it is funded by the state and the feds but it is a private hospital. There is a concept of delusion coming from the member for Bundamba that is really amazing. She just does not get it. How much ramping now happens at Ipswich Hospital?

**Mrs Miller** interjected.

**Mr RICKUSS:** Very little, very little. They are not ramped for eight hours a day. The ambulance services are now running efficiently. Get real. We have stopped the rot. I must congratulate the Minister for Health. I must congratulate the Minister for Emergency Services. Things are starting to happen. Things are starting to happen in this state.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members! There are too many interjections across the chamber.

**Mrs Miller** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I warn—

**Mrs Miller:** Sorry.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for Bundamba, you have already been warned under standing order 253A earlier in the day.

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Members, I will be able to apply the same rules to those who are instructing me as to how I should apply those rules. The hour is late—

**A government member:** Very late.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Members, from across the chamber the same mistake is being made. The hour is late. In the interests of allowing the adjournment debate to continue, I will not take instruction on the orders I should give, but I give the member for Lockyer the call and ask for no more interjections.


**Mr RICKUSS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do need your protection. I was finding that very distracting. All I can say about the member for Bundamba is that she comes in here with this ideological bent that anything private is terrible. Fifty per cent of the health services in Queensland are delivered through private practices. The GPs are private practices. The clock has not restarted yet. That will give me an extra minute. Thank you very much for the extra minute. That is all right. I am going all right.

Fifty per cent of the health services in our hospitals in Queensland is delivered through private practices. What was wrong with that side when they were in government? They are hell bent on efficiency! 'How do we solve unemployment? Employ public servants.' That was their criteria. 'Efficiency does not matter: let's have a Tahitian prince who can blow millions of dollars for us.' He actually got more money than Diabetes Queensland. That is how good the systems were. He actually got more money than Diabetes Queensland. What a damning indictment on that government. Who was ticking off this stuff? You just cannot believe what was going on.

The hospital boards are working hard with the federal Labor government cutting money to local hospitals to the bone, yet here the system is finally starting to work. We are finally starting to put in place processes that do work—the triage is starting to work, the ramping is starting to disappear. All of the services are starting to work in unison. I do not have anywhere near the stress on my emergency service operators that I had when Labor was in power simply for the fact that the system is working.

*(Time expired)*

### Murrumba Electorate

 **Mr GULLEY** (Murrumba—LNP) (12.24 am): Tonight I would like to talk about the good place Murrumba, which is Aboriginal for 'good place', unlike Aboriginal for Kallangur which is 'somewhat good place', but Trevor is not here.

I would like to say thank you to Steve Dickson, the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing, for visiting the 'good place'. I have had some great feedback from Friends of Deception Bay Conservation Park and from Tigers AFL, who were very appreciative of your listening ear and your concerns.

I would also like to mention that Mobile Conveying Services opened in Narangba in my electorate on 6 May. Graeme Cooney started MCS with a single machine operating from his parents-in-law's yard in 2007. Today he employs 30 people which I congratulate him for, and his business has a replacement value of \$30 million. MCS has the largest telebelt in the world and it is only the second one built in the world. It sits on a crane base.

**Mr Hart** interjected.

**Mr GULLEY:** Yes, sorry about the lack of props. The telebelt extends to at least 50-odd metres.


I would also like to thank Jann Stuckey, the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games, along with the member for Kallangur, for attending a business roundtable on 7 May. We had 50 businesses turn up to that business roundtable and those 50 businesses employ 1,000 staff. I would like to thank the minister for her concerns and listening ear and for the thoughts that have been taken away from that day.

I would also like to thank Tracy Davis, the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services. I thank her for her company at a seniors forum. It was a great morning. I think we had to kick her out. She was the last person there at Moreton Downs State School. There was a great crowd and they kept us busy.

Tomorrow morning is the 'Chappy Breakfast' and I will be hosting several chappies from Murrumba. The breakfast will be hosted by Fiona Simpson, and I note that you are still here. This breakfast is part of Chappy Week. 'Chaplain' is a French word for chaplain or cloak or putting an arm around. Kerry Viney and Sarah Chandler, chaplains from Murrumba; Mark Turahui from Deception Bay State High School; Jendy Smith from North Lakes State College; and Bekky Hill from Deception Bay North State School will be there.

I meet some great people in my role including Chad and Prue Polinski. I note that Chad is a leader of the Murrumba Downs Men's Shed. I would also like to thank Prue for her initiation of and leadership in one of the local playgroups. I have one word for this couple—bazinga! Madam Speaker, Murrumba—a good place.


### National Volunteer Week

 **Mr SYMES** (Lytton—LNP) (12.27 am): Last week was National Volunteer Week throughout Australia. Volunteer groups are the backbone of all communities throughout Queensland and it is no different in the Lytton electorate. I had the pleasure to present numerous Lytton electorate office hampers and certificates to the following volunteer groups: the Bayside Men's Shed, Girls Brigade, Mission to Seafarers, Apostleship of the Sea, Wynnum Scouts, Manly Lota Scouts and St Johns Ambulance Wynnum Branch. This was to say thanks on behalf of the good people of Lytton to these groups who contribute to our great community.

The following month the Lytton community hosted an appreciation night for local community groups and their volunteers with the inaugural Tom Burns community awards night, which was a fundraiser for the Wynnum Manly Community Legal Service. The awards night was named fittingly after a man who was a real 'labour' politician, who rolled up his sleeves to serve his community back in the seventies, eighties and nineties as the first member for Lytton. Tom is someone for whom I have the utmost respect for what he did for Lytton and for his work ethic as a parliamentarian. So it was great to support the legal service's suggestion to name the night after him. Congratulations to the Wynnum-Manly Men's Shed, BABI, Port of Brisbane Rotary, Wynnum Manly Community Legal Service, Winnam, as well as the great Arthur Lovell of the Wynnum-Manly Leagues Club for receiving awards on the night.

On the night Tom's widow, Angela Burns, presented the awards. Angela is someone whom I also have the utmost respect for. I have had numerous chats with her before and since being the member for Lytton about fishing, politics and the Tom Burns Bridge. As highlighted in the *Courier-Mail* in the following week, I did my part to contribute to the Wynnum Manly Community Legal Service with a \$500 donation to win the auction prize of a print of the late great Tom Burns which is in my electorate office. It is the most highly regarded asset that I have in the office because of what he did for the community. It is a picture of him in the electorate on the infamous boat that was named after him.

### Charters Towers, Eventide Nursing Home

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (12.30 am): Today on behalf of the residents of Charters Towers and surrounding districts I tabled a petition of 1,000 signatures vehemently opposing any plans to privatise the state government owned Eventide aged-care facility in Charters Towers. The petition is simple and does not ask for much. It simply calls on the government to recognise that Eventide has provided a wonderful service to our frail and elderly citizens since it was built in 1929.


Charters Towers and district have a massive ageing population—those who originally paid for and built this wonderful facility in the first place with their hard-earned tax dollars. The thought of Eventide closing down or being privatised has caused great angst among our elderly, both in Eventide and those who are expecting to enter the facility in the future. Many are panic stricken and terrified at what might happen to them. Eventide in Charters Towers is on the Health minister's list of eight nursing homes to be privatised. Others include Parklands, Townsville; Ashworth House, Zillmere; Eventide, Sandgate-Brighton; Moreton Bay Nursing Care Unit, Wynnum; Redlands Residential Centre, Cleveland; Eventide, Charters Towers; North Rockhampton Nursing Centre; and Yaralla Place, Maryborough.

The legitimate concerns of our elderly residents for their future is one of today's top concerns in Charters Towers. Residents have every right to feel safe in their twilight years, knowing there is a place of safety, affordability and closeness to family. In August 2012 the then opposition leader, John-Paul Langbroek, asked the former Premier, Anna Bligh, whether the Premier would confirm that Labor has reached a new low with its plans to privatise and sell off nursing homes. It is extraordinary that the current government now considers the privatisation of nursing homes to be a valid and ethical decision to take.

As reported in the *Townsville Bulletin* on 28 November 2012, a spokesman for the Minister for Health said that Lawrence Springborg completely ruled out the closure of the two North Queensland sites, Parklands in Townsville and Eventide in Charters Towers. It would be a serious breach of faith for this statement to be proven to inspire confidence and then to dash hopes and trust. The tight-knit community of Charters Towers has faced many challenges over the years, always with the typical resilience and strength symbolic of the bush. However, this issue has caused much trauma to our elderly residents who need security and protection and somebody to passionately push their case for them. Families of the elderly have also been impacted by any suggestion that Eventide may be privatised.

The community of Charters Towers is sending a clear message through this strong petition that it vehemently opposes any plans or proposals to privatise the Eventide aged-care facility now and in the future. The petition calls on the state government to recognise that the community has made its decision and to accept this decision.

### Queensland Health, Brisbane Technology Park


 **Mrs OSTAPOVITCH** (Stretton—LNP) (12.33 am): It gives me great pleasure to rise to speak about one of my first accomplishments last year in ensuring that the new purpose-built Health building at Brisbane Technology Park in my electorate came to be. I thank the Hon. Lawrence Springborg for his prompt action in taking advantage of this initiative. Today I had the pleasure of donning a hard hat—a nice blue one at that—and getting behind a shovel to turn the first sod for this new project, which is being built at no cost to the government and which will save the taxpayer a great deal of money by moving the two Health departments under one roof.

The background to this is quite interesting. The company Interactive grew and its operation would have been hugely expensive to relocate. It would have been millions of dollars of disaster recovery infrastructure. On the other side we had two Health departments in two different buildings—one in McKechnie Drive that was housed with Interactive and one on Clunies Ross Court. Graystone, which manages Brisbane Technology Park, came up with an amazing solution, which was to build a purpose-built building for Queensland Health and allow Interactive to take over that whole building, saving it millions of dollars. The logical move was to secure Queensland Health space within the same building. It will also accommodate a very large parking station. Anyone who knows Brisbane Technology Park would know that we sadly lack parking space and it causes a bit of stress to people trying to find a park and drive and walk around there.

Graystone has done a great job in coming up with this solution. It ensured that the new lease replicated the existing obligations. It is working with the people in all of these departments in Interactive in order to have them moved suitably, streamline community health and have all the staff

under one roof. Graystone is now able to assist Interactive to grow and retain this business for the long term. This is a win-win for both tenancies, but I have to say that it is an absolute win for the Stretton people because this means jobs for the Stretton electorate.

### Ferny Grove Electorate

 **Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (12.36 am): It gives me great pleasure to rise in the early hours of this morning to overview an event I recently attended and preview another due in coming days. I had the pleasure of representing the Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts, the Hon. Ian Walker, on 11 May at the opening of Live! Queensland Band Culture exhibition at the State Library. I was again impressed by the innovation shown by our State Librarian, Janette Wright, who in collaboration with the library board and the foundation are looking at ways to better interact with Brisbane to make this precinct more accessible and interesting to the public.

Kevin Wilson and his fellow curators take us through the passage of time from the first live band at the City Botanical Gardens in September 1857 through the jazz era, largely influenced by the US Defense Force presence in the 1940s and 1950s onto the more recent bands of the Go-Betweens and other Queensland talent. The event at the State Library remains open until 15 September.

Next week the Ferny Grove High School will entertain a group of seniors at Parliament House. The choirs that will perform are two of the 24 ensembles in the Ferny Grove State High School instrumental music program, which involves around 400 students or approximately one-third of the school. It is one of the largest programs in Queensland. In 2007 it was recognised as the most innovative educational program in the state in Education Queensland's Showcase Awards for Excellence. The Ferny Grove program is currently the subject of a study of best practice in music education being conducted from the Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge in the UK. The conductors of the choir are Stephanie McCaw and Shannon Rogers. Stephanie McCaw has performed with orchestras, opera and theatre companies including as music director for the Queensland company Rock'n'Roll Circus's award-winning production *Body Slam*. Stephanie has taught full time at Ferny Grove State High School since 2000 and was appointed the head of department in 2005. In 2008 Stephanie was awarded a Churchill Fellowship to study community music projects in the UK, Finland and the USA.

Shannon Rogers, the other conductor, like several of the Ferny Grove music teaching staff, went through the program himself as a high school student, graduating in 2003 and then pursuing further studies at the Conservatorium. Shannon has performed with the Queensland Symphony Orchestra, the Australian Youth Orchestra and numerous bands including his own group, the Teapots. In closing, my electorate of Ferny Grove is filled with talent, and I am reminded daily of the immense privilege I have of serving my community.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.39 am (Thursday).

### ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C. Davis, T. Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young