



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 21 November 2013

Subject	Page
REPORTS	4169
Auditor-General	4169
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 7 : 2013-14—Results of audit: water sector entities 2012-13.	4169
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 8 : 2013-14—Results of audit: hospital services entities 2012-13.	4169
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	4169
Answers to Questions on Notice and Responses to Petitions	4169
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association	4169
Driscoll, Mr SN, Service of Order	4169
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane.	4169
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment A—Copy of covering letter, dated 20 November 2013, from the Clerk of the Parliament (Mr N Laurie) to Mr Peter Russo, Solicitor, enclosing a certified copy of the order agreed to by the Legislative Assembly.	4169
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment B—Original certified copy, dated 19 November 2013, of the order agreed to by the Legislative Assembly of Queensland on 19 November 2013 directed to Mr Scott Driscoll.	4169
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment C—Copy of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly current as of 12 September 2013.	4169

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 November 2013

<i>Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane:</i>	
Attachment D—A copy of chapter 3, part 2 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001.	4169
<i>Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane:</i>	
Attachment E—A copy of the Ethics Committee report No. 139 tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 19 November 2013.	4170
<i>Tabled paper: Memorandum, dated 21 November 2013, from the Speaker, Hon. Fiona Simpson MP, to all honourable members relating to the appearance of Mr Scott Driscoll at the bar of the House.</i>	4170
PETITIONS	4170
TABLED PAPER	4170
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	4170
Member for South Brisbane.....	4170
Underground Bus and Train Project	4171
Ministerial Gift Auction	4172
Queens Wharf.....	4172
State Finances.....	4173
MOTION	4174
Suspension of Standing Order.....	4174
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE.....	4175
Report	4175
<i>Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 36—Portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 20 August 2013 and 15 October 2013.</i>	4175
EDUCATION AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE.....	4175
Alleged Contempt of Parliament, Referral to Ethics Committee	4175
LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE	4175
Report	4175
<i>Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 46—Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013.</i>	4175
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	4176
School Group Tours.....	4176
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	4176
Levy, Dr K	4176
Levy, Dr K	4176
Insurance Premiums	4177
Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee	4178
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	4178
Queensland Health	4178
Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee	4179
<i>Tabled paper: Courier-Mail article, dated 16 September 2003, titled 'Party trick embroils Welford' ..</i>	4180
<i>Tabled paper: Courier-Mail article, dated 17 September 2003, titled 'Lawyers are divided over Welford letting hair down'.</i>	4180
Education System	4180
Levy, Dr K	4181
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	4182
Division: Question put—That the Premier be further heard	4182
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4182
<i>Tabled paper: Courier-Mail article, dated 7 March 1997, titled 'Departure of senior PS women sparks row' ..</i>	4182
<i>Tabled paper: File note, dated 6 August 1996, by Acting Executive Director, Administration of Justice & Criminal Justice Program, Mr Barry Read, relating to Mrs Jo-Ann Miller.</i>	4183
Department of Transport and Main Roads.....	4183
Levy, Dr K	4183
Police, Fire and Emergency Services	4184
Dalrymple Saleyards, Rail Siding	4185
Natural Disasters, Recovery Assistance.....	4185
Nambour Community Centre	4186
Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts Portfolio	4187
DRISCOLL, MR SN	4187
Appearance at Bar of House Pursuant to Order.....	4187
MOTION	4190
Driscoll, Mr SN, Finding of Contempt and Fine.....	4190
Division: Question put—That leave be granted for the member for Gladstone to present a report to parliament.	4199
Resolved in the negative.....	4199
MOTION	4199
Order of Business	4199
CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	4199
Second Reading	4199

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 November 2013

ETHICS COMMITTEE	4206
Report	4206
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 140—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 25 October 2012 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of an estimates committee by a chief executive officer.	4206
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	4206
Gold Coast Airport	4206
Currumbin, Australia's Cleanest Beach	4207
Asbestos Awareness Month	4207
Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, Report; Alleged Deliberate Misleading of a Committee, Referral to Ethics Committee	4208
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Report to the House from the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee in relation to a potential misleading of the committee by Dr Levy, in accordance with standing order 268(1).	4208
Cleaning Up the Bay Campaign	4208
Mudgeeraba, School Leaders	4209
Blackdown Tableland National Park	4210
Alzheimer's Disease	4210
RACQ NQ Helicopter Rescue Service; Water Infrastructure; Mining Royalties	4211
Lockyer Valley, Flood Recovery	4212
Carbon Tax	4212
Toowoomba North Electorate, Education	4213
Health Services, Funding	4213
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Perspectives, Building Queensland's human capital: the case for health advocacy', by Claire E Brolan and Jo Durham from School of Population Health, University of Queensland.	4213
Logan Electorate, Education Services	4214
Take My Seat Challenge	4215
Sunnybank Electorate, Road Infrastructure	4215
Townsville Electorate, Road Infrastructure	4216
Woodridge Electorate, Schools	4216
Toowoomba South Electorate, Schools	4217
Rural Fire and Emergency Services, Volunteers	4218
Coolangatta Airport	4218
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of documents, including article from Gold Coast Newspaper direct titled 'Flight fright stalling storm system' by Andrew Potts and article from goldcoastbulletin.com.au, dated 21 November 2013, titled 'Plane Crazy'.	4218
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from goldcoastbulletin.com.au, dated 21 November 2013, titled 'Inspiring a world-class city is an art'.	4218
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document from Wikipedia titled 'Required navigation performance'.	4219
Chang, Ms L	4219
LNP Government, Performance	4219
Driscoll, Mr SN; Redcliffe Electorate	4220
Mundingburra Electorate	4221
Motorcyclists	4221
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-confirming petition regarding legislation that discriminates against motorcyclists.	4222
Yorkeys Knob, Cruise Ship Infrastructure	4222
Greenslopes Electorate	4223
Skills Reform	4224
Bulimba Electorate	4224
PRIVILEGE	4225
Ethics Committee Report No. 140	4225
ELECTORAL REFORM AMENDMENT BILL	4226
Introduction	4226
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013.	4226
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes.	4226
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Memorandum, dated 20 November 2013, from the Crown Solicitor to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, regarding Queensland and Commonwealth electoral acts.	4227
First Reading	4230
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	4230
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	4230
CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	4230
Second Reading	4230
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT	4250
Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee	4250
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 21 November 2013, to the Clerk of the Parliament from the Acting Chairperson, Crime and Misconduct Commission, Dr KS Levy, regarding a statement to parliament.	4250
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Statement to parliament, dated 21 November 2013, by Acting Chairperson, Crime and Misconduct Commission, Dr KS Levy, in relation to a motion moved by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice.	4250

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 November 2013

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	4250
Second Reading	4250
Consideration in Detail.....	4256
Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.	4256
Clause 7—.....	4257
Division: Question put—That clause 7, as read, stand part of the bill.	4257
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4257
Clause 7, as read, agreed to.....	4257
Clauses 8 to 13, as read, agreed to.	4257
Clause 14, as read, agreed to.	4257
Clause 15, as read, agreed to.....	4257
Clause 16, as read, agreed to.....	4257
Clause 17, as read, agreed to.....	4257
Clause 18—.....	4258
Division: Question put—That clause 18, as read, stand part of the bill.	4258
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4258
Clause 18, as read, agreed to.....	4258
Clauses 19 to 41, as read, agreed to.	4258
Clause 42—.....	4258
Division: Question put—That clause 42, as read, stand part of the bill.	4261
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4261
Clause 42, as read, agreed to.....	4261
Clauses 43 to 55, as read, agreed to.	4261
Clause 56—.....	4261
Division: Question put—That clause 56, as read, stand part of the bill.	4261
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4261
Clause 56, as read, agreed to.....	4261
Clause 57—.....	4261
Division: Question put—That clause 57, as read, stand part of the bill.	4261
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4261
Clause 57, as read, agreed to.....	4261
Clauses 58 to 67, as read, agreed to.	4261
Clause 68—.....	4261
Division: Question put—That clause 68, as read, stand part of the bill.	4262
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4262
Clause 68, as read, agreed to.....	4262
Clauses 69 to 109, as read, agreed to.	4262
Clause 110 to 126, as read, agreed to.	4262
Clause 127—.....	4262
Division: Question put—That clause 127, as read, stand part of the bill.	4262
Resolved in the affirmative.....	4262
Clause 127, as read, agreed to.....	4262
Clause 128—.....	4262
Division: Question put—That clause 128, as read, stand part of the bill.	4262
Clause 128, as read, agreed to.....	4262
Clauses 129 to 233, as read, agreed to.	4262
Third Reading	4262
Long Title.....	4263
COMMITTEES	4263
Select Committee on Ethics, Order of Appointment; Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct	
Committee, Membership	4263
Speaker's Ruling, Motion Out of Order.....	4272
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	4273
Resolved in the affirmative.	4273
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT	4273
VALEDICTORY	4273
ADJOURNMENT	4280
ATTENDANCE	4280

THURSDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2013



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

REPORTS

Auditor-General

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Acting Auditor-General report No. 7 of 2013-14 titled *Results of audit: water sector entities 2012-13* and report No. 8 of 2013-14 titled *Results of audit: hospitals and health services entities 2012-13*. I table the reports for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 7 : 2013-14—Results of audit: water sector entities 2012-13 [\[4118\]](#).

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 8 : 2013-14—Results of audit: hospital services entities 2012-13 [\[4119\]](#).

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Answers to Questions on Notice and Responses to Petitions



Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, standing order 114 requires that answers to questions on notice shall be supplied to the Table Office within 30 calendar days. Where the 30th day is not a working day, the longstanding practice that has been adopted is that the answer should be provided by the next working day. An answer is deemed to be tabled when it is received by the Table Office and its receipt is noted by the Clerk or their nominee.

I wish to advise honourable members that, due to the intervening Christmas New Year closure period, answers to questions on notice asked today are required to be supplied to the Table Office by Monday, 6 January 2014. Additionally, ministerial responses to any petitions tabled today are also required to be supplied to the Table Office by 5 pm on Monday, 6 January 2014.

Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

Madam SPEAKER: I remind honourable members that the annual general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Queensland Branch will be held in the Legislative Assembly chamber today at 1 pm.

Driscoll, Mr SN, Service of Order



Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I table for the information of members an affidavit of service by the Sergeant-at-Arms dated 20 November 2013 and attachments to that affidavit which evidences the service of the order of the House dated 19 November 2013 and various other documents.

Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane [\[4120\]](#).

Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment A—Copy of covering letter, dated 20 November 2013, from the Clerk of the Parliament (Mr N Laurie) to Mr Peter Russo, Solicitor, enclosing a certified copy of the order agreed to by the Legislative Assembly [\[4121\]](#).

Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment B—Original certified copy, dated 19 November 2013, of the order agreed to by the Legislative Assembly of Queensland on 19 November 2013 directed to Mr Scott Driscoll [\[4122\]](#).

Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment C—Copy of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly current as of 12 September 2013 [\[4123\]](#).

Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment D—A copy of chapter 3, part 2 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 [\[4124\]](#).

Tabled paper: Affidavit of Service, dated 20 November 2013, served by the Sergeant-at-Arms on Ms Amy Soong, Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative, at George Street, Brisbane: Attachment E—A copy of the Ethics Committee report No. 139 tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 19 November 2013 [\[4125\]](#).

Included in this material is a letter from the Clerk to Mr Scott Driscoll's legal representative dated 20 November outlining the process that will occur today. I also table a memorandum which has been circulated to all members regarding the procedures for the appearance of Mr Driscoll today.

Tabled paper: Memorandum, dated 21 November 2013, from the Speaker, Hon. Fiona Simpson MP, to all honourable members relating to the appearance of Mr Scott Driscoll at the bar of the House [\[4126\]](#).

Honourable members, the House has ordered Mr Scott Driscoll to appear before it to answer charges of contempt and to afford him the opportunity to speak to the issues. This follows an inquiry of the Ethics Committee and the committee's subsequent report and recommendations.

Charges of contempt are very serious matters. As Mr Driscoll has resigned from the parliament and is no longer able to speak in this place as a member, he must address the House from the bar of parliament. Such proceedings of the House are different from normal and are more akin to a serious judicial process. Thus it is essential for members to understand that I will be in sole management of the House and it is not a time for them to speak or interject. I ask members to conduct themselves strictly in accordance with my memorandum as circulated.

I undertake to the House to strive to ensure fairness to Mr Driscoll whilst upholding the rules of this House and the rights of members and others. It is vital that members restrain themselves until Mr Driscoll is discharged and the mace again lays on the table. I will then listen to any matter that members may wish to raise.

Finally, I note the main bar facing my chair will be inaccessible from approximately 10.55 am today. Members will need to access the House via the other entrances after this time until the conclusion of Mr Driscoll's appearance.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petition, lodged and sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

Royal Children's Hospital

Dr Davis, from 5,560 petitioners, requesting the House to retain and resource Queensland's Royal Children's Hospital as a leading centre of excellence in patient care, that will benefit current and future generations of sick babies and children, their families, healthcare trainees, researchers and taxpayers [\[4127\]](#) [\[4128\]](#).

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the honourable members indicated—

Helium Balloons, Release

Mr Dowling, from 473 petitioners, requesting the House to ban the release of helium balloons in Queensland, with an appropriate penalty for deliberately doing so [\[4129\]](#).

Eagle South State School, Flashing Lights

Mr Crandon, from 28 petitioners, requesting the House to install flashing lights on Fryar Road to alert drivers to the Eagle South State School [\[4130\]](#).

Petitions tabled.

TABLED PAPER

MEMBER'S PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

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

Member for Stafford (Dr Davis)—

[4131](#) Non-conforming petition relating to the Royal Children's Hospital

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Member for South Brisbane



Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.36 am): Over the past two days I have sought to highlight significant shortcomings in the attitude of the ALP and various Independent members in their approach to their roles as members of this House. In particular,

I have sought to highlight the complete lack of integrity in many of their dealings. I did this with no sense of triumphalism but as a sincere endeavour to point to the way in which performance falls far short of promise.

We cannot escape the fact that this parliament will lose the confidence of the people of Queensland if we fail to practice what we preach. To speak in high-minded language of the importance of our integrity and then to fall so far short of the standards we have set ourselves is a recipe for a continuing loss of public confidence.

On Tuesday I pointed to the fact that the honourable member for South Brisbane had failed to comply with the provisions of standing order 259—that is, the requirement to declare any pecuniary interest before a member participates in a division. Yesterday in parliament the honourable member tried to exculpate herself by saying that her omission ‘was in no way deliberate or intentional’. The honourable member claimed to take full responsibility for her actions but, in reality, did nothing else.

What I, and I suspect many others, find particularly disturbing in this whole sorry tale is that the honourable member for South Brisbane believes that this is the beginning and end of the matter. However, the member for South Brisbane is one of the six members of the Ethics Committee. The committee’s areas of responsibility as set out in section 104B of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 are as follows: dealing with complaints about the ethical conduct of particular members; and dealing with alleged breaches of parliamentary privilege by members of the Assembly and other persons. These are clearly significant responsibilities—and they are not responsibilities which should be exercised by anyone with a cavalier attitude towards their own obligations to this House and the people of Queensland.

I am hard pressed to think of a more cavalier attitude than that revealed by the honourable member for South Brisbane yesterday when she sought to excuse her dereliction of duty by blaming her failure to attend an introductory session for new members when these important responsibilities were explained. This is ludicrous—a member of the important Ethics Committee, which sits in judgement on other members of parliament, believes it is adequate to blame her nonattendance at an information session for new members. This is nothing more than a West End version of ‘the dog ate my homework’ excuse. I find it hard to believe that the honourable member—who is gaining a reputation as an assiduous disrupter of the proceedings of this House—has not examined the standing orders in detail.

The simple fact to emerge from this sorry episode is that the honourable member lacks the moral authority to judge her parliamentary colleagues. The honourable member is no longer in any position to deliberate on the conduct of others when her own conduct fell so short of accepted standards. Accordingly, there are two available options to resolve this impasse. Firstly, the honourable member for South Brisbane should do the decent thing and resign from the Ethics Committee or, secondly, the Leader of the Opposition should demonstrate the leadership qualities she always claims to possess and require the honourable member for South Brisbane to resign from the Ethics Committee. It is time for the honourable member for South Brisbane and the Leader of the Opposition to act honestly and ethically. The member for South Brisbane must immediately resign her position on the Ethics Committee.

Underground Bus and Train Project



Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.40 am): Today marks the continuation of a tradition that dates back to the early 1930s—a tradition that has been passed down from generation to generation. This morning almost 40,000 people are making the pilgrimage to the Gabba to see the first ball of the first cricket test of the summer. This year it is not just any test series; it is an Ashes series. There is simply nothing more traditional than that.

Cricket fans from across Brisbane, Queensland, Australia and the world will descend on the Gabba. The Barmy Army and visitors from out of town and interstate are already supporting our local economy and enhancing our culture. We know the 2010 Ashes Test in Brisbane contributed an estimated \$59 million to the local economy, and we hope it is even better this time. The question today is: how are cricket fans going to get to the Gabba? Many will drive, risking parking fines and sacrificing a few cold beers. Some will catch a cab at greater expense, and others will find their way on buses.

Current public transport usage, with only buses available to the Gabba, is 45 per cent, while at Suncorp Stadium, which has buses and trains, it is about 85 per cent. Wouldn’t it be great if there were more flexible and efficient public transport options to get us to and from the Gabba? Perhaps an

integrated public transport system that could drop you across the road from the Gabba with ease and comfort? That is exactly what will happen in the future following the announcement and delivery of the Brisbane underground bus and rail system. The project, which I outlined in this chamber on Tuesday, will give direct access to the Gabba from the north, south, east and west on both buses and trains. It will also allow office workers to easily jump across the river at lunch time or to catch the last session of play either from Roma Street or the new George Street station. But it won't just benefit cricket fans. AFL fans will benefit from this new, innovative, elegant transport system solution, as will thousands of QUT students, workers in the new 1 William Street building and all those who will visit the revitalised George Street precinct in the future.

Queenslanders love their cricket. I look forward to making it easier for fans to access the hallowed turf of the Gabba.

Ministerial Gift Auction



Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.42 am): I am also very pleased to report to the House that last week the Queensland government held the first ministerial gift auction since 2009. Nearly 300 gifts given to the previous government that were collecting dust in storage went under the hammer for charity. Gifts ranged from teapots to vases, shawls and wine glasses to surfboards, Tiffany & Co. crystal plates, bottles of Vintage Dom Pérignon, opal cufflinks, swords and even a blue elephant. The proceeds of the sale netted an impressive \$10,774, which will be given to the Salvation Army and Youngcare.

Queens Wharf



Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.43 am): In May 1825 Lieutenant Henry Miller and a detachment of the 40th Regiment of Foot, together with their convict charges, constructed a landing area for stores and supplies on the northern bank of the Brisbane River. This area later became known as Queens Wharf. Queens Wharf was the entrance to the new colony of Moreton Bay, and Queens Wharf Road was the access point for all supplies that came into the colony into Queen Street, William Street and George Street.

Mr Newman interjected.

Mr SEENEY: All of the supplies, Mr Premier. Today CBD maps still show Queens Wharf Road running between William Street and the river. To reflect this rich history, the Queensland government has decided to name the government precinct redevelopment Queens Wharf. The name was selected following community feedback which highlighted the importance of the heritage area to the public. The name will better reflect the project's contribution to Brisbane's emergence as a new world city, and the name will give the area a clear identity that in years to come we hope will be internationally recognised.

Queens Wharf will reconnect Brisbane's city centre to the river and its historic links at the William Street end of the city. The extensive public consultation undertaken earlier this year has resulted in a number of changes, not least a new precinct vision and objectives which will be released on the project website shortly. There has also been a lot of feedback, with almost 2,200 comments received during the consultation process. Much of the focus has been on the new development, delivering better public realm and heritage outcomes for the community.

Labor paid very little attention to the construction industry, but it is being reinvigorated as one of the four pillars of the economy by the Newman government. This project will give the sector a significant boost. It is one of the most gratifying things for me each morning as I walk to work from the Parliamentary Annexe to the Executive Building to see the increasing number of people and construction workers employed on the William Street site—people who would never have got the opportunity of a job under the Labor government.

The announcement of the government's intention to offer a casino licence for the Queens Wharf development plus up to two additional licences for similar integrated resort developments has sparked national and international interest. Government officers have engaged with a broad range of international developers to canvass international interest. I want to assure Queenslanders today that there are more than two interested parties. Reading some of the local media, you could be forgiven

for thinking that this was a two-horse race. There is a larger number of entities interested in the Queens Wharf development. There is a strong international interest and national developers have also expressed interest. We are engaging with that range of national and international interest to ensure that the state gets the best possible outcome from the development. We are delivering an open, fair and equitable process with all potential bidders having the same opportunity to win the tender.

The government's efforts to get this process underway are well on track, with former Queensland Auditor-General Len Scanlan appointed as probity adviser and the expressions of interest process to be formalised before Christmas. The EOI period is expected to be concluded by the end of March 2014 and, following assessment and short-listing, the request for detailed proposals is expected to be issued by the end of June 2014. Hopefully, a decision on the successful proponent is expected to be finalised by 2015. Queenslanders can be assured that our government is working to ensure that Queens Wharf Brisbane will one day become nationally and internationally recognised as one of our city's great icons.

State Finances

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (9.47 am): 2013 has been a year of action—a year of can-do action. The list of achievements is long but, importantly, they are all part of the well thought out and calmly implemented plan to get Queensland back on track. In many respects, getting Queensland back on track is not an overnight job. I have said on many occasions that you cannot turn the *Queen Mary* around on a dime and repairing the mess left by Labor will take time.

The summer of natural disasters we experienced this year set many Queenslanders back, but the resounding spirit and perseverance of our fellow Queenslanders was remarkable. From a Treasury perspective, we have had to stay the course and continue the fiscal repair task to deal with the legacy of debt and deficit left to us by those opposite. We have done this by following a clear plan—a plan set out during the last election and carried out through our state budgets ever since.

This can-do government does not shy away from hard challenges. We rise to them in a planned and considered way, and our achievements this year are a testament to that. Expenses growth under the previous government was out of control—at an average of 8.9 per cent per annum. We have been successful in restraining expenses growth. Actual expenses for 2012-13 came in just 0.2 per cent higher than the previous year, even lower than the 1.1 per cent we estimated in this year's budget. This is the lowest level of state government expenditure growth in Australia. Next year we are forecast to deliver a budget with a \$2 billion operating surplus—the first operating surplus since 2008-09. No longer will government need to borrow to keep the lights on, pay public servants or put fuel into ambulances.

A fiscal surplus is also forecast in 2015-16. This will be the first fiscal surplus delivered in Queensland in a decade. We went to the last election with a clear plan and we are implementing that plan, which was embraced overwhelmingly by the great majority of Queenslanders. We did promise to build a four-pillar economy. Our economy is forecast to be the fastest growing state economy by 2014-15, which shows that our plan to grow that four-pillar economy is having an impact. Already in 2012-13, the first full financial year of this government, the report on state finances has shown that state growth exceeded expectations and grew by four per cent. To put that in perspective, the Queensland economy is now \$11 billion larger than it was just one year ago.

More than a quarter of all Australian business investment happened in Queensland last year. Real business investment in Queensland rose by almost another 10 per cent in 2012-13 to be almost \$60 billion, well above that in New South Wales and Victoria. In the year to March 2013 Queensland's population growth was two per cent stronger than the rest of the country. Retail turnover in Queensland rose 3.7 per cent in 2012-13, more than double that of the rest of the nation. The Queensland consumer sentiment index of November 2013 was at its highest level since October 2010 in three-month average terms. The September NAB business survey shows that business confidence in Queensland increased strongly over the September quarter. Trend dwelling approvals were 14.2 per cent higher over the year, with the \$15,000 Great Start Grant having been given out to over 3,000 Queenslanders, and the outlook for further growth is strong.

We promised to lower the cost of living for families and we are delivering on our promises. This year I published a concession statement as part of the budget documents and that statement outlines the \$5.2 billion of assistance that the Newman government will provide Queenslanders in 2013-14 to

help lower the cost of living. Recognising that not every Queenslander receives every available concession, the value of concessions to taxpayers is almost \$1,460 each. This demonstrates that the government's commitment to lower the cost of living is resolute.

We promised to deliver better infrastructure and better planning. After the natural disasters earlier this year, the government was true to its promise to the people of Queensland. We are determined to deliver better infrastructure and better planning, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the betterment funds we set aside to rebuild and increase resilience.

The Toowoomba second range crossing business case, a project that is vital to the regions of Queensland is ready to go to market. It is a solution which is practicable and affordable and, most importantly, it can be delivered in a cooperative fashion between the Commonwealth and the state government.

We promised to revitalise front-line services. This year we received and responded to a document which represents the most significant reform of service delivery in this state, the final report of the independent Commission of Audit. The commission makes the case very clearly that business as usual is simply not an option. The commission presented a range of reasons for this, including the fact that under Labor Queensland's productivity had declined to the point that the cost of delivering many front-line services was higher in Queensland than in any other mainland Australian state. In essence, Queenslanders were paying more but receiving less.

The implementation of the Commission of Audit is ongoing. It represents the most significant transformation of the public sector in Queensland in four decades. But we are determined to deliver on our promise to deliver more and better services for Queensland and to make sure services are delivered in the most effective and efficient way, regardless of who delivers that service.

We are also living up to our promise of improving front-line services. In 2013-14 the budget included increases to both the Health and Education budgets of around half a billion dollars and provided \$868 million in funding for DisabilityCare Australia. While we are undertaking this reform, we are also delivering—can-do action at work. As the Deputy Premier has just spoken about, 1 William Street is underway. We delivered the government wireless network, a project the other side dreamed about but we are delivering. It will provide secure communications for our hardworking emergency services personnel starting with the Queensland Police Service for the G20. We are delivering the next generation rolling stock through an innovative funding model which has achieved exceptional value for the scarce taxpayer dollar. Shortly, we will deliver the successful procurement of 10 new private-public partnership schools; we will reform the government banking services; and we are in the process of developing the underground bus and train project in Brisbane. None of these projects would have been possible without the hard decisions we took when we first came to government.

We are restoring accountability in government. We introduced the supplementary appropriation bill as soon as practicable after the end of the financial year to ensure parliamentary scrutiny could occur, unlike those opposite, who waited over 12 months to introduce a supplementary bill. There can be no doubt that the previous Labor government's decision in 2008 to combine supplementary appropriation with the annual appropriation bills was purely political. It was an attempt to avoid scrutiny of the budget blow-outs that were a hallmark of the former Labor government. Labor blow-outs covered up in supplementary appropriation bills were \$2.2 billion in 2007-08, \$3 billion in 2008-09, \$1 billion in 2009-10, \$9.3 billion in 2010-11 and \$2.8 billion in 2011-12. There remains more work to be done. I look forward to continuing to get Queensland back on track in 2014 so that we are once again a great state with great opportunity. The only way this will happen is through can-do action.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Order



Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.54 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That standing order 136(5) be suspended for the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, to allow the commencement of the second reading debate despite one day not having elapsed since the tabling of the portfolio committee report.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Report



Mr DAVIES (Capalaba—LNP) (9.55 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 36 of the Finance and Administration Committee. This report covers the portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 20 August 2013 and 15 October 2013 considered by the committee. The subordinate legislation have disallowance dates between 12 February 2014 and 6 March 2014. The committee did not identify any significant issues regarding consistence with fundamental legislative principles or the lawfulness of the subordinate legislation. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 36—Portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 20 August 2013 and 15 October 2013 [\[4132\]](#).

EDUCATION AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE

Alleged Contempt of Parliament, Referral to Ethics Committee



Mrs MENKENS (Burdekin—LNP) (9.56 am): I rise today on behalf of the Education and Innovation Committee to report to the House that a matter has arisen in respect of the Education and Innovation Committee's proceedings. The committee has decided to refer the matter, under standing order 268(1), to the Ethics Committee for further investigation as a possible contempt of parliament, which is a very serious offence.

On referral from the House, the Education and Innovation Committee recently completed an inquiry into the assessment methods used for senior mathematics, chemistry and physics in Queensland schools. The inquiry attracted a large number of written submissions—288 in total. Of these, a number of pro forma type submissions were received. The committee undertook the usual verification procedures of ensuring names and addresses of all submitters were provided before the submissions were published.

However, it disturbs me to advise the House that, since the tabling of our report, the committee has been made aware that at least one, and possibly more, of the pro forma submissions may have been fraudulent. The committee understands that the issue under inquiry attracted very strong views, passionately held and expressed by many who made submissions. It is important to state, as we have in our report, that the committee acknowledges the strength of views as conveyed by the number of submissions. However, in developing our recommendations, we focused on content, not number—or, to put it another way, quality, not quantity.

The committee's submission process was not a vote, nor was it a survey. The recommendations we made are not changed by whether or not a pro forma submission is found to be fraudulent as they were based on analysis of the evidence we considered, not on popularity. However, it is imperative that, as a proceeding of parliament, a committee inquiry must maintain absolute integrity. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Ethics Committee investigate the possible contempt, under standing order 268 of the parliament of Queensland and, as such, this matter stands referred to that committee.

LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Report



Mr BERRY (Ipswich—LNP) (9.58 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 46 of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee into the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I would like to thank all those who have assisted the committee with this inquiry. I say thank you to my fellow committee members for their assistance and support. I say thanks also to the committee staff for their assistance. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 46—Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 [\[4133\]](#).

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before beginning question time, I acknowledge schools visiting today: Palm Beach State School from the electorate of Burleigh, Caningeraba State School from the electorate of Burleigh, Terranora Public School, St Monica's Catholic School Oakey in the electorate of Condamine and Goodna State School in the electorate of Bundamba.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Levy, Dr K

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.00 am): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please advise the House when he first became aware that the acting chair of the CMC, Dr Ken Levy, was having a meeting with the head of the government media unit, Mr Lee Anderson, on the 15th floor of the Premier's office?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. In relation to my reply, I should preface my remarks with a bit of education for the honourable member and her colleagues about the functions of the Crime and Misconduct Commission.

The CMC has two main purposes: firstly section 4(1)(a), 'to combat and reduce the incidence of major crime'; and section 4(1)(b), to superintend issues of public sector misconduct. As section 4 makes clear, these purposes are separate and distinct and, arguably, major crime is the more important focus. This gives the CMC a very interesting role, because there are different relationships with the executive in respect of these two different functions. The major crime function involves the CMC working cooperatively with the executive, whereas the public sector misconduct function involves the CMC, being the oversight body, superintending the executive. What is appropriate communication between the executive and CMC when working cooperatively may not be appropriate when the executive is being superintended.

The honourable members opposite clearly have difficulty with the legislation and understanding these distinct differences. I have said consistently that there has been ongoing contact between the government and the CMC, and there is nothing wrong with that whatsoever because this—

Ms Palaszczuk: On the 15th floor in your office!

Mr NEWMAN: I will share this with the Leader of the Opposition, because the Leader of the Opposition clearly does not listen. The head of the CMC and the Deputy Commissioner of Police have been to the 13th floor—(scary music plays). That is where cabinet meets because the head of the CMC and the deputy commissioner almost every week have been briefing the cabinet on the progress of the fight against criminal gangs. Let us just quickly cover off on information.

This is the legislation. Some of the statutory functions of the CMC are set out in section 24, which says—

- (e) providing information to, consulting with, and making recommendations to, units of public administration; and
- (f) providing information relevant to its prevention function to the community; and
- ...
- (i) reporting on ways to prevent major crime.

This is exactly what has been going on. At the end of the day, my question for the Leader of the Opposition and her colleagues is: do they support the fight against criminal gangs, or not? Do you want to cleanse Queensland of these criminal activities, or not? I think not!

(Time expired)

Levy, Dr K

Ms PALASZCZUK: My next question is to the Premier. Premier, given the serious revelations raised in the early hours of this morning and given the now public transcripts that were tabled in this House in the early hours of the morning, will the Premier now commit to a full judicial inquiry to work out the truthfulness of the allegations in relation to Dr Ken Levy raised at the PCMC hearings?

Mr NEWMAN: Clearly the Leader of the Opposition was not part of the whole thing that was going on in this place last night, because I think it was all dealt with last night and—

Ms Palaszcuk: No, it was not!

Mr NEWMAN: It certainly was! This is what I saw—

Ms Palaszcuk interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will cease her interjections. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: This is what I saw yesterday afternoon and last night: I saw the Leader of the Opposition presenting her tainted views as revealed by the Attorney-General; I saw the member for South Brisbane with all her bile and bias; I saw the clearly conflicted member for Bundamba who blames Dr Ken Levy for kicking her out of the department of justice 17 years ago. We know the Labor Party are haters. They hold a grudge deep down inside, and they never forgive and they never forget. The member for Bundamba should have recused herself from these hearings from the word go.

I am sad to say there are other things that give us great concern about the conduct of that committee. I will make the point as well that in 2004 in this House it became clear that when Dr Levy was the director-general of the department working for Rod Welford, he had the guts to actually go to Premier Beattie and report the Attorney-General for allegations of misconduct at a DPP Christmas party. We can tell from the transcript that Peter Beattie was not very happy at the time. What happened to Dr Levy?

A government member: Out he goes!

Mr NEWMAN: That's right: his contract was not renewed! They got him!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I rise to a point of order.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, what is your point of order?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I ask you to rule on relevance. My question is clearly: will the government commit to an independent judicial inquiry; yes or no?

Madam SPEAKER: I ask you to take your seat. Order! I call the Premier. The Premier has time on the clock to answer the question.

Mr NEWMAN: I will go to Hansard from May 2004 where Peter Beattie is talking about this little affair. This is what happened—

A government member interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: It was an affair! He said—

I put these matters to the Attorney. The issues that were raised with me by the Director-General, Dr Levy, were denied by the Attorney. My requirement to satisfy whether I was personally satisfied with his explanation of events was very clear—and I was.

So the member is saying to me that the decision was mine. Yes, it was mine. I exercised my discretion in discussions with the Attorney. I was satisfied with his explanation. I determined that that was the end of the matter ...

The old 'eyeball factor'. Then what happened? They dropped Dr Levy. We also had an admission that the Attorney-General rang Brendan Butler, the head of the CMC, to say 'When will you finish investigating me?' That is what they did. Welford was under investigation, and Welford rings up Brendan Butler as head of the CMC and says, 'When will you finish investigating me?' Come on! The emperor has no clothes!

(Time expired)

Insurance Premiums

Mr TROUT: My question without notice is to the Premier. What can the Queensland government do to assist Queensland, especially in the north and the far north of the state, to tackle high insurance premiums that are raising the cost of living and leaving some properties at risk?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for the question. I wish him happy birthday as he turns 50 today.

Indeed, this issue is a massive problem that was reinforced to me recently on my trips to Cairns and Ingham; for example, North Queensland residents in body corporate unit blocks have seen premiums increase by up to 500 per cent over five years, and they do not have any choice. They must have insurance for the replacement cost of their buildings.

Unfortunately, there are limitations to what the state government can do to address high insurance premiums. Regulation and monitoring of the insurance industry is the responsibility of the federal government. But we cannot, and we will not, just stand by and wait for the problem to get worse. That is why I asked the member for Cairns—and we do wish him a speedy recovery from recent illness—to get together with his fellow government members from the north and the far north and provide some clear recommendations on actions to try and push insurance prices down. At the end of last week, the North Queenslanders handed me a 10-point action plan developed in consultation with the Commonwealth and local governments and the business community. While many of the actions require Commonwealth government support, there are several to which the Queensland government will need to contribute.

Some of these actions include better data sharing with the insurance industry so that we can get fairer premiums based on the actual risk faced by individual properties; looking at co-funding research on mitigating property damage from cyclones and natural disasters; partnering with councils and the Commonwealth on flood mitigation projects in targeted areas—and we are already seeing some companies re-examining premiums following mitigation works or proposed works in other parts of the state such as Roma and the town of Emerald—and being part of a joint education awareness campaign to better inform consumers about their rights and ways they might reduce their premiums.

Next week I will be meeting federal Assistant Treasurer Senator Arthur Sinodinos to progress these and other actions in the plan. I am looking forward to pursuing this issue, which is so vitally important to the north and far north of our state because of its future potential to contribute to the state's growth and decentralisation.

I have spoken about the Queensland Plan on a number of occasions in recent weeks and about our very clear direction for the future to see 50 per cent of the population outside South-East Queensland. If the north and the far north are to be part of that vision for our state, they will need to grow by a factor of approximately 2.35 over the next 30 years. This insurance issue must be dealt with as it is a clear impediment to the development of the north and the far north of the state. That is why this government and this political can-do team will do everything we can to try to resolve this issue.

Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee

Mrs MILLER: My question is to the Premier. I refer to testimony from the Premier's chief media adviser to the PCMC that, to the best of his recollection, he advised the Premier's chief of staff of his contact with Dr Levy. Given the responsibilities of ministerial officers, why did the Premier's chief media adviser and his chief of staff not inform the PCMC as soon as they became aware that Dr Levy had not disclosed that meeting to the committee?

Mr NEWMAN: What I say is this—

Madam SPEAKER: I will ask you to pause, please, Premier. I would ask the member to repeat the question. I will listen carefully as to whether it is in accordance with the standing orders.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier. I refer to testimony from the Premier's chief media adviser to the PCMC that, to the best of his recollection, he advised the Premier's chief of staff of his contact with Dr Levy. Given the responsibility of ministerial officers, why did the Premier's chief media adviser and his chief of staff not inform the PCMC as soon as they became aware that Dr Levy had not disclosed that meeting to the committee?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Madam SPEAKER: I rule the question out of order. I will explain why. The question, which I have listened to carefully, refers to the actions of other people or potentially their intentions or state of mind, which is not the Premier's responsibility but other people's responsibility. The question is out of order.

Queensland Health

Mr STEWART: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise how Health has changed since the election of the can-do LNP government?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Sunnybank for his question. As the honourable member for Sunnybank and other members of this parliament know, Queensland Health is a fundamentally different place since the election of this can-do government over 18 months ago.

Queensland Health was an absolutely moribund organisation, which we inherited. The Labor Premier of the day said even she had lost confidence in the organisation to the extent that she said the bureaucracy had grown so big that she needed to tear it into two. So we would have had two bureaucracies. She had fundamentally lost confidence in it. The Labor Party had absolutely no plan whatsoever to fix it.

Who can forget the fake Tahitian prince? Who can forget the blow-out in hospital waiting lists? Who can forget the ambulance ramping and the ambulance bypass? Who can forget the notorious \$1.253 billion payroll debacle? Is it any wonder that in the entire term of this parliament there have been only seven questions from the opposition spokesman when it comes to health in Queensland?

Mr Seeney: You are lucky!

Mr SPRINGBORG: I understand how the Deputy Premier feels about being neglected by the opposition not asking him questions about his portfolio.

With a track record like that, is it any wonder the Labor Party does not want to talk about Health? We have had not one policy from the Labor Party in the last 19 or 20 months. The only thing we hear from them is that they want to go to the people of Queensland at the next election and ask them to give them a mandate to run Health exactly the way they ran it previously in their years in government.

There have been some significant turnarounds. We have increased the budget for Health in Queensland to over \$1 billion—an increase of over 11 per cent. It is not just about inputs; it is also about outcomes.

Madam SPEAKER: Excuse me, Minister. I will just check whether the clock was set.

Mr SPRINGBORG: There is still three minutes to go!

Madam SPEAKER: We will set the clock at two minutes. I call the Minister for Health.

Mr SPRINGBORG: There have been fundamentally important and very real service improvements for the people of Queensland since the election of this can-do government. We now see some of the best performances when it comes to our standardised hospital mortality index. We are seeing better patient care delivered more efficiently to the people of Queensland. Indeed, Queensland had some of the worst emergency department figures in Australia but is now knocking on the door of having the best performance in Australia. Indeed, interstate jurisdictions are coming up here to see how we are doing things. Our elective surgery performance is the best in the country.

Our nurses and midwives—an intrinsically important part of our health workforce—have been paid more than three per cent more per annum under our government than under the previous government. They are actually being paid and being paid on time, despite the fact that the Labor Party had a budget management action plan which they had hidden away. I actually brought that to the attention of the estimates committee this year. They were going to pay them an increase of only 2.5 per cent. We value our nurses and midwives.

We have also doubled the number of rural generalists, to expand that workforce. We are also putting in place a program of recruiting more midwives as we grow that program. Next year we will be reopening Beaudesert as a place for women to birth, so they can have their babies in their local community. We will follow soon after with Cooktown. We are one of the few jurisdictions in the world—probably the only one—reopening closed birthing services.

We have also made a significant investment in telehealth as a way of providing modern and new health care and we have made a \$320 million investment in backlogged maintenance, addressing the neglect of hospitals under the previous Labor government, to name just a few.

(Time expired)

Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee

Dr DOUGLAS: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. In camera and public transcripts of hearings tabled in parliament last night by the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee chair refer to the Attorney-General's involvement in the transcript stated by the chair of the PCMC. Will the Attorney-General please inform the parliament whether he will offer his resignation to restore public confidence in the government?

Mr BLEIJIE: Categorically the answer is no, but I do thank the honourable member for the question. I note that he also is one of the biased members of this House who has been made leader of the party, and I note that as of yesterday he is the leader of the party. But his former leader had made comments about Dr Ken Levy and had been judge and jury and executed Dr Levy before any fair trial had taken place, before any requirement and position where Dr Levy could address the concerns raised by people and those giving testimony. What we have witnessed over the last few days, as I have explained in this House, is an absolute political witch-hunt by those opposite. We know that the member for Bundamba has a personal vendetta against Dr Levy. We know that Rod Welford, the former Attorney-General, had a vendetta against Dr Levy. Incidentally, isn't it funny: when I look at the *Hansard* from back then, the Deputy Premier was the one prosecuting the case against Mr Welford, the Attorney-General at the time.

Mr Seeney: A good opposition leader!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. Members opposite would be interested to note the *Hansard* when Peter Beattie, the Premier at the time, said when talking about the CMC and Mr Welford—

The opposition lost the ... election and instead of pursuing policies they are pursuing gutter tactics in this House.

Hasn't it turned around over the last 10 to 12 years? Mr Welford was the Attorney-General at the time, and I only have to table a couple of these documents. I am not going to explain what the issues were, but I think the headlines say it all: 'Party trick embroils Welford'—and I table a copy of that article—and 'Lawyers are divided over Welford letting hair down' at a party.

Tabled paper: *Courier-Mail* article, dated 16 September 2003, titled 'Party trick embroils Welford' [\[4135\]](#).

Tabled paper: *Courier-Mail* article, dated 17 September 2003, titled 'Lawyers are divided over Welford letting hair down' [\[4134\]](#).

Then of course we had the admission by Peter Beattie at the time that he had complete confidence in the Attorney-General. Not only that, Peter Beattie, if my memory of the *Hansard* that I have read serves me correctly, in fact said that he met with the CMC chair about the issue. So not only did Peter Beattie talk about this issue; if memory serves me correctly, he met the CMC chair on a misconduct matter—not about criminal organisations and not crime fighting, as the Premier said in the debate earlier today, but on a misconduct matter. Mr Beattie came in here and talked about the CMC and all of these issues. The fact is that Dr Ken Levy was a director-general at the time. He had an obligation, as he explained to the Premier at the time. This is payback. This is payback by the Labor Party over the last 15 years for Dr Levy by the member for Bundamba and by the Labor Party. They should be condemned and Queenslanders should see this for exactly what it is.

Education System

Mr DOWLING: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister please inform the House about what the Newman LNP government is doing to improve educational outcomes for Queensland children and what this means for our great state?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for the question. Members will have heard me say relentlessly that we have a relentless focus on high standards in Queensland schools. Everything we do in school education is aimed at lifting student outcomes, and we are doing this in three key priorities—boosting teacher quality, increasing school autonomy and improving student discipline, and 2013 has been a big year in achieving these goals. We have introduced Great Teachers = Great Results, 15 separate initiatives worth \$537 million that will identify our best teachers and reward our best teachers and deploy our best teachers to where they are needed most. We have announced the second round of our Advancing Our Schools maintenance fund to clean up the \$300 million backlog of maintenance left in our schools by those opposite. We will have 80 independent public schools next year, 20 more than our election promise. We announced another 150 prep teacher aides. As a result of the 30 principals forums around the state this year, we have listened and slashed red tape for principals and teachers. We opened schools in Pimpama and Mackay Northern Beaches.

When it comes to training, as I said yesterday, we want a training system that fuels our economy. We are making training contestable to lift quality and provide the skills that are required for real jobs in the economy. By doing this we will boost productivity, increase workforce participation to

reach the four per cent unemployment target and improve economic growth to build a four-pillar economy. To this end, the Newman government in 2013 has separated the purchaser of training from the provider of training so that TAFE can be more responsive to the needs of students. We have established the Ministerial Industry Commission chaired by Assistant Minister Rice to hear directly from industry what skills are needed in the economy.

We have introduced contestability into the training sector to increase outputs, improve responsiveness and lift quality. We have introduced a certificate III guarantee to get Queenslanders into training in priority skills areas. In other words, we want to make sure we train people for real jobs. We have introduced a \$47 million community learning program to help those with difficulties with getting into training and completing their courses. Last week I announced fee-free training for year 12 graduates so that they can access training in priority course areas. It is obvious that the Newman government, when it comes to education, training and employment, is absolutely focusing on the things that are important to Queenslanders—young Queenslanders, Queenslanders who may be looking to upskill or reskill—because it is that participation in the economy that will help to build the four pillars and all of the other things that support it that will turbo-charge the Queensland economy. That is what we are focusing on—not drinking from a bottle of poison like those opposite, as we have heard from them this morning and as we have heard from them over the last couple of days. We will focus on the things that are important for Queenslanders into 2014 and beyond.

Levy, Dr K

Ms TRAD: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the testimony given to the PCMC by his director of government communications, Mr Lee Anderson, as detailed in the 18 November 2013 transcript tabled in the House last night, and I ask: will the Premier advise whether his Chief of Staff informed him that Dr Ken Levy had attended a meeting with Lee Anderson in the Premier's office before the publication of the op-ed piece by Dr Levy?

Mr NEWMAN: Before I go to the heart of the matter, I want to refer to the quote from 19 May 2004 in relation to the Welford affair. This is the quote from Peter Beattie—

It is important to point out that as soon as I was made aware of this matter—
he could have said 'affair'—

on 22 July last year by the then Director-General of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, Dr Ken Levy, I met with the Crime and Misconduct Commissioner, Brendan Butler SC, and wrote to him the same day. I asked him to review the matter in detail and advise me as to any action that should be taken by the government or by me. I table a copy of that letter.

In my view this was not appropriate. He has a minister who is under investigation and he is actually sitting down with the head of the CMC. Later in the same *Hansard* we see that not only did Mr Beattie meet with the head of the CMC but Rod Welford rang the CMC chief and said, 'When will you finish investigating me?' But it was all okay—just like Nuttall was okay. Just like Nuttall! What an interesting article today by the *Courier-Mail* contrasting our treatment of a certain individual and Mr Nuttall, and it was a very interesting comparison indeed. To go back to the question, we have had a question from somebody who does not even read the rule book—does not even read standing orders—and has the excuse of 'the dog ate my homework'. That person—

Ms Trad interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr NEWMAN: Here is an honourable member who comes into this place and pretends that they have not read the rule book—it just defies belief—and on the Ethics Committee has the gall—

Ms Trad: Answer the question!

Mr NEWMAN: That honourable member should not be on the Ethics Committee and also she should not be on the PCMC, because while these hearings were underway the member for South Brisbane was busy tweeting against Dr Levy and giving statements to the media.

Mrs Miller: How do you know that?

Mr NEWMAN: And so was the member for Bundamba. I wondered why the member for Bundamba should be so against Dr Levy and I found an article from the *Courier-Mail* in March 1997 where the accusation was—

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. Madam Speaker, I ask you to rule on relevance. There is 34 seconds left on the clock and the Premier has not attempted to address my question.

Madam SPEAKER: Take your seat. Premier, I ask you to answer the question.

Mr NEWMAN: Madam Speaker, for her benefit, I have said time and again there has been ongoing contact between the government and the CMC in relation to the prosecution of criminal motorcycle gangs. I have said that.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members! I warn members on my left for their interjections. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: I was wondering why the Labor Party was so against Dr Levy and I thought I would go back and have a little look at some of the stuff at the time—back in 1997—as to why the member for Bundamba would be so anti and why the Labor Party would be so anti Dr Ken Levy. I found an article, which I will table in a moment—

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.28 am): I move—

That the Premier be further heard.

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

In division—

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: I know the bells are ringing and it may be difficult to hear, but I am going to warn members to cease their interjections and exchanges of their assessment of each other's character across the chamber.

Division: Question put—That the Premier be further heard .

AYES, 76—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, Katter, Kempton, Knuth, 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, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 7—Byrne, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Madam SPEAKER: I call the Premier and ask members to quietly return to their seats. Two minutes.

Mr NEWMAN: Thank you Madam Speaker. What an opposition we have here. If they want to interject while I try to answer the question, then I would be happy to take another extension of time from the honourable members, because I do not want to be silenced. I want to talk about this until the cows come home if necessary. That is what I want to do.

I wanted to know why the Australian Labor Party was so against Dr Levy, particularly the member for Bundamba. So I found an article from the *Courier-Mail* dated 7 March 1997, which referred to the departure of Jo-Ann Miller, who was an employee of the Queensland Public Service the previous year. We have a quote here from a former Labor heavyweight, Mr Dean Wells. The quote reads—

Jo-Ann was forced out of the public service because she was a member of the Labor Party, while Jan chose to leave some months after the change of government.

Tabled paper: *Courier-Mail* article, dated 7 March 1997, titled 'Departure of senior PS women sparks row' [\[4136\]](#).

That is referring to another individual, Jan Williams. So according to the Labor Party, the member for Bundamba was forced out because she was a member of the Labor Party. I table the document.

I thought, 'Was that the case?' I have here another diary note today from August 1996 from Mr Barry Read, referring to Ms Miller's departure. It says nothing about the member being a member of the Labor Party. Mind you, it has some other interesting material. My point is this: for 17 years the member for Bundamba has borne a grudge against Dr Levy. He was her superior and she has

blamed him ever since for her termination from the Queensland Public Service—quite erroneously as the diary note from August 1996 will bear out. The bottom line is that this inquiry has been a sham from the beginning.

Tabled paper: File note, dated 6 August 1996, by Acting Executive Director, Administration of Justice & Criminal Justice Program, Mr Barry Read, relating to Mrs Jo-Ann Miller [\[4137\]](#).

Department of Transport and Main Roads

Dr FLEGG: My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Can the minister please outline how the Department of Transport and Main Roads has delivered better infrastructure and better planning to all Queenslanders in 2013?

Mr EMERSON: I thank the member for Moggill, because I know he is very keen on public transport.

Dr FLEGG: Very keen.

Mr EMERSON: And roads and delivering better infrastructure with better planning as well. Over the last 12 months we have delivered for Queensland. There is so much to talk about, but I will contain my comments to three areas. As everyone knows, one of my favourite topics is the Bruce Highway. We are delivering for the Bruce Highway. In working with the Tony Abbott-led coalition government in Canberra, we are delivering \$10 billion over 10 years from the Gateway North all the way up to Cairns—up the Bruce—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr EMERSON: I take the interjection from the Minister for Local Government, because we know that state Labor believes that state money spent on the Bruce Highway is a waste of money. I do not agree with that. No-one on the LNP side of politics agrees with it, but that is Labor's stated policy: state money being spent on the Bruce Highway is a waste of money. We will be reminding them of that over and over and over again. But \$10 billion over the next 10 years will be spent on the Bruce and on the Gateway North all the way up to Cairns.

Let us not forget what federal Labor's policy was. It was to wind back federal money for federal roads in Queensland. While their Labor mate Albo in Canberra was doing that—winding back the 80 per cent funding to 50 per cent—we had the cheer squad on the other side of the House saying, 'Great. Sign up to it. That's fine. Cut, short-change Queensland on federal roads.' We are delivering for the Bruce Highway. Labor believes that money spent on the Bruce Highway is a waste.

We have a record \$350 million road safety action plan over the next two years, which is a great result for Queensland. We are working on safer roads by providing community grants, particularly for those flashing lights at school zones. More than 100 schools now have them. We are delivering and we are continuing to deliver.

But let us not forget what Labor talked about. It talked about it over and over and over again. Those who have been in this House for a long time will remember them talking about it over and over again, but never delivering. Already, 100 schools have received flashing lights at school zones and there are more to come. The schools in the electorates of so many members across the chamber are getting them. It is a great result.

We have kept to our election promise of halving Labor's planned fare increases. Let us not forget that Labor had one policy and one policy alone on public transport and that was to put up fares by 15 per cent every year, year after year, after year, after year.

Let us not forget what the then transport minister, now Leader of the Opposition, said when she became transport minister. She said she would fix the problem and what did she do? She put the fares up 15 per cent and then promised, going to the next election, to put them up again the year after in 2014 and in 2013 put them up. Labor's policy: putting fares up. We will not be going back to the bad old days of Labor and 15 per cent fare increases.

Levy, Dr K

Mr BYRNE: My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier have any discussions with the Attorney-General about Mr Lee Anderson's meeting with the acting chair of the CMC before the opinion piece was published in the *Courier-Mail*?

Mr NEWMAN: The answer is very clearly no. The first I knew about the opinion piece was when it appeared in the *Courier-Mail* and, indeed, that is what we have been saying all along. We have been saying that the government has had ongoing contact with the CMC over the pursuit of criminal gangs. We have said that. I described earlier on that that was entirely appropriate with references to the actual act—24E, 24F and 24I. What don't the Labor party get?

So there has been ongoing contact, but again the clear point here is that the government had no contact with Dr Levy in terms of getting him to do an opinion piece or writing the opinion piece or telling him about what should be in the opinion piece. There was no such action. There was no such action. Mr Anderson has met with him about the prosecution of the fight against criminal gangs. I have said it on ABC Radio. I don't know what the big revelation is. They are going, 'Ooh, aah, scary music', when I have said on ABC Radio, on Steve Austin's show, that we have been trying to get the CMC to talk as much possible about the fight against criminal gangs because we want Queenslanders to know about the extent of the problem, their pervasive influence within our society in Queensland and we have urged them to be as open and accountable as they possibly can in accordance with 24E, 24F and 24I of the act. What a surprise!

Let us just go back to the whole tainted, corrupted process we have seen over the last two or three weeks. We have seen the member for Bundamba, the member for South Brisbane and the Leader of the Opposition all on this committee at various stages making totally inappropriate remarks prior to any sort of finding. They have said that they had no confidence in him. They said he should resign. They have been quite overt about that without any shame. I say why shouldn't they be referred to the Ethics Committee themselves for a contempt of the process, the very process itself? We have had other people, like the member for Nicklin and the member for Gaven, who have been doing the same thing. This is a fit up, a set up. The documents were tabled here in the chamber last night—selectively, I might add. The documents have been tabled. What is there to hide? We are not embarrassed whatsoever about the ongoing contact with the CMC to rid this state of criminal gangs. By their actions the Labor Party have shown that they clearly do not have any sort of moral or ethical ballast in their tanks whatsoever.

Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Dr ROBINSON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services. Can the minister please inform the House about the achievements in his portfolio over the last 12 months delivering on the Newman government's commitment to make our communities safer after years of Labor inaction?

Mr DEMPSEY: It certainly is a privilege to have a question from the member because I understand he supports and has a commitment to reducing crime and keeping his electorate safe. The police, fire and emergency services portfolio has undergone some exciting and dynamic changes over the past 12 months. Unlike those opposite, this government takes emergency management and policing responses very seriously. We have seen the completion of the police and community safety review and the Malone review into the Rural Fire Service. Implementation groups are now working through the recommendations of these reports to build a platform for our emergency services staff and its important volunteers. Implementing these recommendations includes providing strong support for our hardworking Rural Fire Service brigades by fully funding essential equipment and training. We introduced the nation's toughest antihooning laws with more than 1,600 people charged with type 2 offences, more than 160 sets of number plates confiscated and nearly 200 vehicles already impounded. We have also cracked down on criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland, letting these thugs know that they are no longer welcome here in Queensland.

This can-do government will continue to work on fixing the mess left by Labor, such as the lack of resources for our hardworking front-line police and other emergency services. We are well on the way to delivering our commitment to 1,100 additional police, with over 550 extra police on the beat by the end of this financial year. We have also funded the purchase and local construction of QPS catamarans for Cairns, Townsville and Whitsundays to make our oceans and bays even safer and we have seen the police helicopter equipped with state-of-the-art technology to ensure police have an eye in the sky, something those opposite refused to provide. There is a second police helicopter coming shortly.

We have also invested in our firefighting capabilities with 69 new firefighting vehicles joining our fleet. Construction is well underway on the \$1.25 million Cairns state emergency headquarters to enable volunteers the easy access and storage they need to support them in their incredible roles protecting the lives of Queenslanders. A lot has been achieved over the last 12 months and it is only

a snapshot. We live in a great state with great opportunities and this can-do government will continue to listen to Queenslanders to ensure police, emergency services and its volunteers have the most up-to-date resources to ensure the safety of all Queenslanders and future Queenslanders for the next 30 and even 50 years.

Dalrymple Saleyards, Rail Siding

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Can the minister explain why the government supported the ripping up of the rail siding at Dalrymple Saleyards five days after the government requested the transport committee investigate incentives for the livestock industry to utilise rail?

Mr EMERSON: I thank the member for the question. I have spoken to Queensland Rail specifically about that area and I have indicated to them that I want to ensure that siding remains open, particularly pending the investigation by the transport committee into more freight onto rail because as a government we are committed to getting more freight onto rail. That is why we have taken a number of significant steps. We have moved forward with our Moving Freight strategy, our 10-year strategy for getting more freight onto rail, because the task facing Queensland is so important.

Over the next decade, we expect that the freight task across the state will increase by 70 per cent. As a government, we do want to see more freight onto rail. We have already taken some actions along those lines. I know that the members from the Toowoomba area will be very much aware of the \$50 million that we have committed to extra passing loops at Toowoomba and the extra \$17 million to deepen 11 tunnels on that track as well, because those high-cube containers need extra space. Of course, as I said, the freight strategy has gone out to draft form and has had feedback and we are now finalising it as well. As the member said, the other day we referred the matter to the transport committee, which is headed by the member for Warrego, Howard Hobbs. That committee will investigate getting more freight onto rail. We are doing more than any other government has done in past years, especially under Labor, to get more freight onto rail and more agricultural freight onto rail in particular. That is why I am looking very much forward to the investigation by the transport committee. I want to see from it an examination of the issue to ensure that moving forward, irrespective of who is in government in the years ahead, we have solved this problem because it is so important for all of Queensland to get more freight onto rail. It is a great way to move. Clearly the trucking industry will always play an important role across the state, particularly in the first mile and the last mile, but we do want to get more freight onto rail. The Premier, in particular, especially given his business background, has been incredibly keen on getting more freight onto rail. As a government we are determined to do that. We have set up the Moving Freight strategy. We have been talking to the industry and putting more money into passing loops and deepening tunnels. We have sent the matter to the transport committee to get that done. We are focusing on that strategy. We want to deal with the freight task that we face. As I said, there will be a 70 per cent increase in the freight task over the next decade across Queensland and we want to get it done. We want freight on rail.

I thank the member for the question. As I said, I have spoken to QR and said that I want to keep that siding open, pending the inquiry by the transport committee.

Natural Disasters, Recovery Assistance

Mr HATHAWAY: My question without notice is to the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience. Can the minister please advise the House on any significant moments in the rebuilding efforts following Tropical Cyclone Oswald and the broader relationship between the state and local government?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the member for the question and the answer is that there have been many significant moments. I start by acknowledging the member for Townsville and his breadth of knowledge that enables him to ask the question, because my home city, which I share with the very hardworking member for Townsville, was not affected during the summer of disaster—we were lucky; we dodged a bullet—yet the member knows full well how the disaster impacted across the state. I contrast that with another member who is not in the House at the moment, so I will not name that member, but who came into this place on Tuesday and chastised the Treasurer, saying that one of the reasons why he has managed to turn around the position that we inherited, the debt and deficit, was because there had been no significant natural disasters in this state in the previous financial year. That shows a complete lack of understanding. If it happens outside of Brisbane, there are those opposite who just do not understand it.

The question goes to the heart of the recovery. I want to talk about the turnaround and what happens when you actually work with a level of government, rather than beat it over the head with a stick. In 2011, Bundaberg was affected. It was affected very significantly. It did not get the coverage that it might otherwise have received, but it was affected. In 2011, it took the council 18 months to get \$25 million worth of work out to market. This year, it took four months to get \$40 million worth of work out to market. That shows the turnaround. That shows what happens when people are on the ground. That shows what happens when you place your faith in local government, rather than bullying and battering them.

There has also been a change in the way we recover. One of the legacies of this recovery will be the betterment fund. I say to the member for Townsville, it will be a fund that one day comes to the rescue of his home city, because gone are the days when we will go through the motions and replace the same bits of infrastructure to the same standard in the same location and expect a different result. That was the Labor way. It was part of the bureaucracy. That was the guideline, so that is how it was done. We have done it differently and we will continue to do it differently, because taxpayer dollars deserve to be spent wisely.

We will also be doing mitigation projects. I was delighted to hear the Premier touch on this earlier today. We are going to do everything we can to work with local councils and, indeed, the federal government to make sure that we safeguard these communities as best we can. You will never flood proof a state like Queensland, but that does not mean that you should not do better; that does not mean you should not look for opportunities in places such as Roma and St George to do the things that are being done now.

In closing, can I say it has been an excellent year despite the heartache that Mother Nature threw at us. We will go into this disaster season in a better place because of a better relationship with local government.

(Time expired)

Nambour Community Centre

Mr WELLINGTON: My question is to the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services. I am informed that the Nambour Community Centre is not able to satisfy the demand for rooms at the centre during peak times in the morning. I ask: what support can the department provide to assist the community centre in expanding?

Ms DAVIS: I thank the honourable member for the question. I start by saying that the Nambour Community Centre is a very valuable service provider up in the north coast region. I can advise the member that my department funds that organisation to the tune of just under \$200,000 so that it can provide services into the community, because that is what this government is about. It is about directing funding to areas of need so that organisations can deliver valuable front-line services into the community. I understand that the department also provides the building in Shearer Street at a peppercorn rent. The community centre is able to use that building at next-to-no cost, which keeps its overheads down and it can continue to deliver those services.

I also understand that recently the organisation sought some funding through the Regional Development Australia Fund for some works. The department assisted the organisation by providing a letter of support to secure that funding so that it could get a longer-term leasing arrangement on that building. Unfortunately, for whatever reason, the organisation was unsuccessful with its bid for that funding. However, the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services will always work with local organisations to keep them as viable as possible in order that they can deliver services into the community.

More broadly, my department continues to invest in local community centres. In 2013-14 we will provide around \$11.5 million to support the continuation of 122 neighbourhood and community centres, of which the Nambour Community Centre is one. The reality is that when we came into government I inherited a department that was spread very thin. Organisations were getting funding willy-nilly. There was no structure to the way that funding was reviewed; in fact, there were no reviews. If the member is seeking an explanation as to why there is no additional funding to meet the unmet demand in his local area, he need look no further than those opposite.

Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts Portfolio

Mrs FRANCE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts. Can the minister share with the House some of the outcomes achieved for Queenslanders in the areas of science, IT, innovation and the arts in 2013.

Madam SPEAKER: I call the minister. You have one minute, Minister.

Mr WALKER: It gives me great pleasure to update the House on these achievements. For a start, the Newman government has delivered millions of dollars in savings to Queensland taxpayers as part of our major ICT reforms. That is a can-do government in action.

We have saved more than \$17.6 million on ICT expenditure during 2012-13 simply by identifying waste that the previous administration had simply totally overlooked. We promised greater transparency. We have the ICT dashboard up. People are able to see the status of ICT projects. That is a great advancement on where things were with projects like the Health payroll system, which I need not remind those opposite of their involvement in.

We have published the ICT strategy action plan. We have published our consultation on the Digital Economy Strategy, which is open for feedback until 9 December. We are about to produce our Arts for all Queenslanders policy. We have done a great job as a can-do government in delivering great outcomes in the areas of science, IT, innovation and the arts.

(Time expired)

Madam SPEAKER: The time for questions has expired.

DRISCOLL, MR SN

Appearance at Bar of House Pursuant to Order



Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, in accordance with the resolution agreed to by the House on 19 November 2013, I now propose to call Mr Scott Driscoll to appear in person at the bar of the House to address the House in relation to the specific charges of contempt set out in the order dated 19 November 2013.

I understand that Mr Driscoll has elected, in accordance with standing order 274(3), to be heard in his defence by his solicitor, Mr Peter Russo. The Sergeant-at-Arms bearing the mace will escort Mr Driscoll and Mr Russo to the bar of the House. In accordance with my memo circulated to all members earlier today, no member other than the Speaker may speak during the attendance of Mr Driscoll and the address on his behalf by Mr Russo.

I remind honourable members that the doors at the back of the chamber near the bar will remain open while Mr Russo is addressing the House from the bar. However, no person other than Mr Russo, Mr Driscoll and the Sergeant-at-Arms and security and chamber staff will be permitted in that immediate vicinity. Sergeant-at-Arms, please escort Mr Driscoll and his solicitor to the bar of the House.

Mr Scott Nicolaus Driscoll and Mr Peter Russo were announced at the bar of the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms bearing the mace.

Madam SPEAKER: Mr Scott Driscoll, the Legislative Assembly has ordered you to appear in person at the bar of the House to address the House in relation to the specific charges of contempt set out in report No. 139 of the Ethics Committee and order dated 19 November 2013. I understand that you seek to be represented by your solicitor, Mr Peter Russo. Mr Russo, do you appear here on behalf of your client Mr Driscoll?

Mr RUSSO: Yes, Madam Speaker, in accordance with the standing orders, Mr Driscoll has asked me to address the House on his behalf.

Madam SPEAKER: The order of 19 November 2013 sets out precisely the 49 charges of contempt made against Mr Driscoll. The charges are that Mr Scott Driscoll failed to register a total of 14 different interests in the Register of Members' Interests and Register of Related Persons' Interests on a total of 48 occasions in accordance with schedule 2 of the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly and Mr Scott Driscoll deliberately misled the Legislative Assembly in his personal explanation on 19 March 2013. Mr Russo, does your client agree to waive my reading of each of the charges.

Mr RUSSO: Yes, Madam Speaker, Mr Driscoll waives his right to have the charges read.

Madam SPEAKER: Mr Russo, you are required in the address on behalf of your client to observe strict and direct relevance to the contempt charges and the recommended penalty. If your address becomes irrelevant, I will be compelled to take appropriate action. Your appearance before the bar of the House does not carry with it a right to ask any question. There is no right for you to table documents without the leave of the House, and you should not assume such leave will be granted.

You must direct your address to the House only through me as the Speaker. The House has resolved that the time for your address shall not exceed 30 minutes. Mr Russo, you may now proceed with your address.

 **Mr RUSSO:** Madam Speaker, Mr Driscoll was sworn into the 54th Parliament on 15 May 2012, having been elected to the seat of Redcliffe on 24 March 2012. This was Mr Driscoll's fourth attempt to be elected to state parliament.

Prior to being elected to the Queensland parliament, he had a background of helping family businesses. He was involved in numerous family businesses—businesses ranging from running a coffee shop to a florist and doing some consultancy work with other small businesses. He has always had a keen interest in small business and has a strong belief in the value small business adds to the community by way of employment and financial stimulus to other activities in many communities throughout Queensland.

Mr Driscoll resigned from the 54th Parliament on 18 November 2013. Mr Driscoll's interest in the political process began when he was a member of the National Party, as it was then in Queensland, and he joined in grade 9.

It is acknowledged that Mr Driscoll has been provided with the opportunity to make written submissions to the committee on numerous occasions. However, due to ill-health and acting on the advice from his treating specialists—reports had been provided to the committee previously—he was unable to engage in providing either oral evidence under oath to the committee or, for that matter, detailed written submissions regarding these matters.

The committee has commented in part that it was somewhat of a disadvantage in not being able to call Mr Driscoll in these matters to question under oath as to his knowledge of the matters and his understanding. It is my submission that this was a mutual disadvantage to both the committee and to Mr Driscoll but was the result of his illness and the prognosis of his specialist.

Mr Driscoll has attempted on a number of occasions to address the issues raised by the Leader of the Opposition in correspondence to the committee. His first attempt was 29 November 2012, then 18 April 2013 and 2 May 2013. All of these submissions have been relied upon by the Ethics Committee as well as two recent pieces of correspondence dated 7 November 2013, signed by Mr Driscoll.

There have been two matters that the Ethics Committee has been concerned with, the first being the matter of privilege referred to by the Registrar on 19 March regarding an allegation of failing to declare an interest in the Register of Members' Interests, and the second being a matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 4 June 2013 regarding the alleged deliberate misleading of the House. It would appear from the findings of the committee that the two matters are somewhat interwoven and the intention of the declaring of one's interest is designed to eliminate the possibility of a conflict of interest arising by a member of parliament when considering and passing legislation that has impact on the Queensland public.

The first submission of 18 April 2013 and 2 May 2013 were returned to Mr Driscoll as there was an external investigation being conducted by agencies outside of the committee and it was believed that these investigations be allowed to conclude before the committee would conclude its investigations so as not to prejudice Mr Driscoll's rights should he have to answer any allegations in the courts. This would accord with what occurred in former member Nuttall's case, which has become a large part of the Ethics Committee's submission in regard to penalty. On reflection, and after the committee receiving advice, it was decided that the committee would be able to conclude its investigation into Mr Driscoll.

I do not intend to address you, Madam Speaker, on any other matters where there have been recommendations by the committee for no action or penalties to be imposed but to direct my submissions to what I will refer to as the substantive matters for consideration before the House today.

On 24 October 2013 attempts were made to address issues. However, due to constraints of Mr Driscoll's health and the way the submission had been constructed, they had been rejected by the committee. This I believe is unfortunate for Mr Driscoll and is really the first distinction that can be drawn between Mr Driscoll and the former member Nuttall as he is referred to in the Ethics Committee report No. 139.

The rejection of that submission is unfortunate for Mr Driscoll and caused a real dilemma that was not able to be addressed then, nor can it be addressed today. The crux of the committee's suggestions seems to place great emphasis on the former member Nuttall in reports No. 105 and No. 114 of the Ethics Committee, where the imposition of \$2,000 for each separate occasion that was deemed to be contempt as an appropriate penalty to be applied to Mr Driscoll's case. There has to be a real distinction drawn between what occurred in the former member Nuttall's matter and that of Mr Driscoll's matter. There can be no dispute that Mr Driscoll's matter required certain disclosure by Mr Driscoll. The difficulty was did that nondisclosure result in the public interest being harmed as a result of the private member's interest.

Mr Driscoll had only been in parliament for a very short time compared with the former member Nuttall. The former member Nuttall had been in parliament from approximately 1992 to 2006. His conduct on the report would seem to have spanned a period of between four to five years. The former member Mr Nuttall had been convicted by a jury for receiving a number of secret commissions and had been sentenced to a term of seven years imprisonment.

The real issue for Mr Driscoll arises out of the family company Norsefire and the income that that company has received from various sources. Income from one source is no doubt an issue for the committee and the House. However, to rely on the findings in Nuttall for a penalty range would, in my submission, lead the members of the House into error on penalty.

There simply has to be a distinction drawn on penalty between a backbencher and a minister of the Crown. To do otherwise does not accord with the due process nor does it accord with the social principles of fairness and treating each matter on its merits, rather than a blanket approach to penalties for failing to declare a pecuniary interest leading to contempt of this parliament.

Mr Driscoll has lost prestige in the community. He has lost his ability to be an active member of parliament and forever will be remembered for his error of judgement in this House. He has lost his political career and this is a significant consequence in itself. Mr Driscoll leaves parliament a broken man.

Mr Driscoll has always been apologetic in his correspondence and this is a matter that previous committees have taken into consideration when dealing with penalty for other members and for other persons who have come before the committee. These are referred to in the committee's report.

Madam Speaker, I seek the House's indulgence to put before it a number of matters that are in the report, starting with, at page 15, No. 114, and I quote—

The committee noted that, in his letter to the Registrar dated 29 November 2012, Mr Driscoll indicated that his failure to register his roles as director of OCAP and ASBC was an 'unintended omission' and an 'oversight'. Mr Driscoll re-iterated these statements in his submission to the committee of 18 April 2013 stating "I sincerely regret this genuine oversight and apologise for it occurring".

No. 115 states—

In addition, Mr Driscoll stated in his submission of 18 April 2013 that his failure to register his wife's other income over \$500 was "... both a genuine oversight and also a genuine misunderstanding on my part, for which I sincerely regret and apologise".

On the same page, No. 116 states—

In his submission of 2 May 2013, Mr Driscoll asserts that until 48 hours before that date he was unaware that he was listed as a "Director" of QRTSA the company and he also stated that he accepted and acknowledged an "unintentional oversight" in not registering his role as "secretary" of QRTSA.

No. 117 states—

In his submission of 7 November, Mr Driscoll stated "At no point that I ever deliberately or knowingly complete my Member's Interest Register, or that of my wife, incorrectly."

To impose a penalty which may ultimately result in a term of imprisonment for Mr Driscoll has to be considered by the House to be an unjust penalty when one takes into consideration Mr Driscoll's health problems and the fact that he is now unemployed, possibly unemployable. I understand Mr Driscoll has also apologised personally to the House on a previous occasion.

Dealing with the penalty though, I have made some global comments regarding penalty and I will try to address each separately. In relation to the four counts of contempt referred to in relation to the Australian Small Business Coalition, where the committee calls for \$1,000 on each, amounting to a \$4,000 penalty, I submit that the House impose one penalty as this matter, on the facts as revealed by the committee, clearly has been a result of a misinterpretation by Mr Driscoll of what occurred with the organisation and it would appear to be obvious to all and sundry that Mr and Mrs Driscoll had involvement with the Australian Small Business Coalition and that these errors would simply have been corrected had it not been for Mr Driscoll's ongoing current health issues.

The next issue relates to 42 counts of contempt and the blanket reliance on the penalties imposed on the former member Nuttall. Mr Driscoll's matter has received an enormous amount of media coverage which has resulted in much anguish for both Mr and Mrs Driscoll and a loss of reputation in the community.

I now direct the House to the matter of the penalties facing my client. The House would be aware of the fundamental principle of justice in our legal system and that any lawful punishment should reflect the gravity of the corresponding offence. A person's offending behaviour is also contingent upon the charge levelled against them. As I have highlighted in earlier remarks, there is significant disparity between the present matter and the only similar incidents of alleged conflicts of interests in recent history.

On the maximum penalty of \$2,000 being opposed for each alleged count of contempt, I submit there is very little resemblance between the level of seriousness or dishonesty that involved the former member Nuttall. The House no doubt would agree in deterrence being an aspect of the consequences for behaviour of members of parliament of this type. However, rehabilitation and an ability for one to restore his reputation in these circumstances is also an important aspect of any penalty.

The House would be aware of the very different positions that Mr Nuttall and Mr Driscoll have, and unfortunately, although I may be repeating myself at this juncture as to refer to my earlier submissions, former member Nuttall was a senior member of the Crown at the time of his offending. He was a member of the executive branch of government, which holds great power and influence over the state. Furthermore, former member Nuttall spent 14 years as a member of parliament, including committee work and employment as parliamentary secretary, providing ample opportunity to appreciate the operation of the register of interests. In contrast, my client had been a member of Queensland parliament, as a backbencher, for less than a year.

In conclusion, I submit the way to deal with the alleged potential matters of contempt is as follows: that the contempt referred to as ASBC be one penalty of \$1,000 and that the 42 counts of contempt associated with Norsefire and associated entities be broken up into five instances and a penalty of \$2,000 for each instance be imposed rather than the suggested 42 counts at \$2,000. In relation to the misleading of parliament carrying one penalty of \$1,000, my client maintains his submission to the committee that he had ceased as a volunteer president and had not intentionally misled parliament. In conclusion, I submit the total penalty for all of the above would be the sum of \$12,000 and would adequately reflect what has occurred here.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Russo. Your client, Mr Driscoll, is now discharged from the order of the House. Sergeant-at-Arms, please escort Mr Russo and Mr Driscoll from the chamber.

Whereupon Mr Driscoll was discharged.

MOTION

Driscoll, Mr SN, Finding of Contempt and Fine



Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.22 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That this House—

- (1) notes the Ethics Committee report No. 139, tabled in the House on 19 November 2013, which reported to the House that Mr Scott Driscoll has committed a contempt of parliament on 49 occasions and recommended that Mr Driscoll be charged with those contempts by the House;
- (2) notes that Mr Scott Driscoll's response to the charges of contempt given from the bar of the House by his counsel today in response to a summons of this House on 19 November 2013;

- (3) in accordance with the provisions of chapter 3, part 2 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, finds Mr Scott Driscoll, a former member of this House, guilty of 49 instances of contempt of parliament for failing to disclose interests in the Register of Members' Interests and Register of Related Persons' Interests pursuant to clauses 7(2)(b), 7(2)(o), 7(2)(p), and 7(2)(m) of schedule 2 of the standing orders and for deliberately misleading the House, as particularised in the summons dated 19 November 2013;
- (4) in accordance with the provisions of chapter 3, part 2 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, fines Mr Scott Driscoll \$1,000 for each of the four instances of contempt associated with his failure to register his wife's appointment and cessation as director and secretary of the Australian Small Business Coalition and orders that the sum of \$4,000 be paid by 30 June 2014;
- (5) in accordance with the provisions of chapter 3, part 2 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, fines Mr Scott Driscoll \$2,000 for each of the 42 instances of contempt associated with his failure to register interests associated with Mr Driscoll's and his wife's roles in the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association; the conflict of interest caused by their involvement with the Regional Community Association Moreton Bay; and income received both directly from the Regional Community Association Moreton Bay and through Norsefire Pty Ltd from the Regional Community Association Moreton Bay and the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association; and orders that the sum of \$84,000 be paid by 30 June 2014;
- (6) in accordance with the provisions of chapter 3, part 2 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, fines Mr Scott Driscoll \$2,000 for deliberately misleading the House on 19 March 2013 and orders that sum to be paid by 30 June 2014;
- (7) notes that subsequent to the tabling of Ethics Committee report No. 139 Mr Scott Driscoll resigned as a member of the Legislative Assembly on 19 November 2013;
- (8) endorses the Ethics Committee's finding that the cumulative effect of Mr Scott Driscoll's failure to register interests and his deliberately misleading the House is conduct which is not fitting of a member of this House and conduct which would warrant expulsion from the Legislative Assembly;
- (9) orders that by virtue of the above findings of contempt Mr Scott Driscoll has forthwith forfeited any entitlements he might have had as a former member entering on the parliamentary precinct; and
- (10) directs that the Clerk ensure a copy of this order signed by the Speaker and the Clerk is served personally on Mr Scott Driscoll within 14 days.

In moving this motion, I find that Mr Driscoll's explanation provided to the House today does not discharge his gross and negligent behaviour. The parliamentary Ethics Committee fully, completely and appropriately investigated all matters in relation to Mr Driscoll's behaviour as the member for Redcliffe and in a bipartisan fashion has made recommendations that I believe are totally appropriate and well considered in relation to this matter before the House.

May I congratulate the chairman of that committee, Mr Michael Crandon, the member for Coomera, on his fearless and forthright deliberations in this enormously unusual matter. I believe the recommendation that he has made in relation to expulsion of the member would be the first in 144 years from this parliament. The reputation and authority of Parliament House must be of the highest calibre and any member who sullies that reputation by wrongful behaviour brings all members and this House into disrepute.

In this case, I believe the behaviour of the former member is up there with the worst behaviour ever seen in representing a Queensland electorate, and the Ethics Committee recommendations in total were exactly and entirely appropriate. I commend this motion to the House.



Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (11.28 am): I rise to speak in support of the motion that is now before the House. I have a few comments to make this morning in relation to the matter. Firstly, I would like to say upfront that I support the motion and the recommended penalties and actions contained therein. I thank the chairman of the Ethics Committee, Michael Crandon, the member for Coomera, and the members of the committee for their very thorough work on this matter. I note that essentially their work has been going for around eight to nine months. It has been lengthy and it has been exhaustive. A reading of its report that was tabled the other day in this House demonstrates that the committee has very comprehensively covered the matters therein.

I want to now talk about the way that this whole matter has unfolded, and I think it is important to review at least some of the key facets of the history to the matter. Allegations were made about Mr Driscoll back in late 2012 and matters other than these specific ones were investigated by the Crime and Misconduct Commission. I remind honourable members that no case was found in relation to those matters. I acknowledge that earlier in 2013 some very hardworking journalists from the *Courier-Mail*, particularly Mr Mark Solomons and Kelmeny Fraser, started to write a series of articles about the activities of the former member for Redcliffe. I will say upfront today that in the beginning the government and members of the LNP team felt that it was our duty to give our colleague every reasonable benefit of the doubt and, indeed, the good old Aussie fair go on those stages. I want to say very clearly that at no stage did we ignore those articles, at no stage did we internally sweep them under the carpet. It is a matter of public record in those *Courier-Mail* articles that the members of the LNP political hierarchy called him in to ask him questions. I can assure the House that I, my

staff and senior members of the government also asked him questions in relation to these allegations. I want to stress that he always had an explanation, he always had an answer. I guess that is why in those initial weeks we did defend him in this House. I feel today that it is again important to note that everyone deserves a fair go.

I do reflect on this today. This particular case has shown, frankly, the importance of a free, impartial and totally independent media. At times as political figures we do not like what has been written about the things we might have said or done, but on this occasion the *Courier-Mail*, the journalists I have mentioned and indeed others, and their team have done a great service to the Queensland economy. Let's not beat around the bush; they exposed what the member for Redcliffe was doing. Today I feel it quite appropriate to actually thank them for what they have done because they have done some very heavy lifting.

The critical dates for me are the dates around 18, 19 and 20 March because it was in that parliamentary sitting week that I changed my position. The particularly pertinent date is 20 March when the former member for Redcliffe stood to his feet in this House to make a statement of explanation about the matters. Indeed I, members of staff and senior colleagues on the front bench had urged him to come into the chamber and take his opportunity to defend himself against the claims that were being made in the media. I sat there and I waited and I listened and I waited and I listened. However, I never heard an explanation that satisfied me. That is why on 9 April—or around that date—we asked the LNP to formally expel him from our party. I note that on 19 April or thereabouts he resigned from the LNP. Essentially we then no longer had him on our team. I say that it was around 20 March that, frankly, as they say in the old movies, the jig was up.

I have listened to the explanation from his legal representative today and, frankly, it does nothing to change my views on the report handed down by the Ethics Committee. Again, I stress that I think they have been extremely diligent and comprehensive in their review of the matter. In terms of what Mr Driscoll has done, it is a breathtaking, staggering deception of this House and the people of Queensland. It is a staggering deception of me and others in the senior team who asked him direct questions on these matters and we clearly did not get a straight answer. I have been looking for some sign of remorse. I have been looking for some sign of contrition. When I saw reported stories of Twitter pages or Facebook pages seeking to almost mock this process saying that he was off to enjoy a happy retirement on the beach, I was further sickened by his actions.

The argument that the legal representative for Mr Driscoll has just made was in some way about proportionality, that the penalty is in excess of what should be meted out. A comparison was drawn with the former member for Sandgate, former minister Nuttall. I do not buy that. Former minister Nuttall was ultimately judged and fined by the parliament in his capacity as a member of the House, not as a minister. It was not a matter of ministerial accountability; it was a matter of his lack of adherence to the rules of this House, to the standing orders and to the customs and practices of this place. Mr Nuttall was found wanting and so has the former member for Redcliffe. That is why the mitigating statement that was just delivered to the House by his legal representative does nothing for me. I do not buy it one little bit. It is very clear in my view that there has been a breathtaking, staggering deception of the House and the people of Queensland. It is very clear to me that the penalty that is recommended is appropriate and proportionate and reflects the magnitude of what the former member for Redcliffe has done. It is, therefore, something that I have no problem endorsing today.

I conclude by thanking the fourth estate for the work they have done in exposing this matter and actually seeing that ultimately justice is done. I think it is very important that Queenslanders reflect on what they are seeing today. Often they are cynical and sceptical about what goes on in this House of parliament or, indeed, other parliaments at the federal level or in other states. I think this should give them confidence that this body can self-regulate, is determined to maintain confidence in our parliamentary system of democracy and will ensure that its own members meet the standards and comply with the rules of this House. That is why what is happening today is so vitally important.

In conclusion, I thank the member for Coomera and the Ethics Committee for their diligent work and for their findings and recommendations in relation to this important matter. Again, I recommend the adoption of the motion to all members today.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.37 am): I rise to support the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House this morning at this historic sitting of the Queensland parliament. From the outset I, too, join with the Premier in thanking the chair of the Ethics Committee as well as all of the members who have served on that committee. As the Premier

indicated, it was a long process. Having been a former chair of the Ethics Committee, I know that members of the committee never take these issues lightly. They are very serious issues and being a member of that committee places extra responsibility on them.

What a sad, sorry state of affairs this parliament finds itself forced to deal with today. What a sad, sorry, avoidable state of affairs the government finds itself in because it refused to act on one of its own members long after cracks appeared in his facade, long after extremely serious allegations had been levelled at that MP not only in this place but also in both the media and the public arena. Now it has come to this. It has come to a regrettable, avoidable moment when this proud Queensland institution is compelled to deal with the LNP's shame. That is the place we are at today, where we are compelled to call a former member before the bar of this parliament to explain himself. It saddens me very deeply personally to see this sacred place forced to deal with such a sad, sorry mess.

I rise to contribute to the debate on this motion because, as I said previously, this is an historic day. It is one of the few times in its history that, after consideration of Ethics Committee report No. 139, this House has been asked to consider the question of whether a member should have to appear at the bar of this House to provide an explanation in relation to very, very serious allegations. This matter is deserving of the utmost seriousness. It requires that from each and every member of this place. No-one in this place should consider this matter lightly. We must treat it with grim and sober determination because of the very nature of the matter that we are considering and because of the astonishing, shocking allegations that are at its core. It requires serious consideration.

Let us consider the facts. The former LNP member for Redcliffe has been found by the Ethics Committee to have committed a number of contempts of the parliament. It found that on 48 separate occasions the member committed the contempt of failing to declare an interest in the Register of Members' Interests and Register of Related Persons' Interests. The committee has recommended that an appropriate penalty for each of these breaches would be: in respect of two instances where the member corrected the register before being referred to the registrar, there should be no fine imposed; in respect of four instances of failing to register a spouse's interest in the register of related persons, there should be a fine of \$1,000 imposed for each instance; in respect of 42 instances of failing to declare an interest, the committee determined to impose the maximum penalty of \$2,000 on each count.

But these involve far more than merely failing to declare an interest, because those failures relate to receipt of funds from community organisations receiving funding from taxpayers and income to the Driscoll family company Norsefire. For example, the investigation undertaken by the committee disclosed that the Regional Community Association Moreton Bay made payments totalling \$151,331.44 to Norsefire, the Driscoll family company. The Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association made payments totalling \$139,434 to Norsefire. Norsefire paid \$215,670.02 to Mr and Mrs Driscoll's joint bank account. In addition, Mrs Driscoll was employed by the community organisation as a part-time administration officer between September 2012 and February 2013. For that six-month period as a part-time administration officer she received payments totalling \$15,831.23. In total there were 37 payments found that should have been disclosed totalling \$522,266.68.

This figure is absolutely astonishing. More than half a million dollars is involved in these transactions, which are a complex web of financial arrangements. What is particularly appalling, what is particularly sad, and what is particularly confronting is that these large sums of money paid to the Driscolls and their family company were from an organisation that provides help to Redcliffe's most vulnerable and most disadvantaged—people who are on the down side of advantage. I would like to quote from the Regional Community Associate Moreton Bay's website so that everyone in this place, particularly the Premier and each of the former colleagues of the former member for Redcliffe, knows what this organisation does with this money provided by government and from donations. It states—

RCAMB is a non-profit organisation and relies heavily on government funding, charitable donations and the help of volunteer staff. Our ultimate aim is to provide the maximum possible benefit to those members of the community who are experiencing a range of life's difficulties.

I would like to specifically list the services RCAMB provides with this money so that again no-one in this place can be in any doubt about the nature of this organisation, which has been so devastated by events outlined by the committee's reports.

With government funding and from donations RCAMB provides basic food, financial assistance and advice to those Redcliffe residents experiencing financial crisis. With government funding and from donations the community organisation provides counselling and assistance for victims of

domestic violence. It uses government funding and donations to provide counselling and support for those facing mental illness. With this money it organises activities and transportation for older people who would otherwise rarely leave their homes. It uses this funding for a child contact centre—a facility that gives parents who are experiencing custodial issues a safe, pleasant and supervised environment.

It fills me with great personal sadness, as it should with all of us, to think of those families who cannot put food on their table, the parents who cannot access their children, and the mentally ill who cannot receive counselling—all because the Driscolls and their company were receiving half a million dollars. I recall travelling to Redcliffe at Easter to meet with the staff and volunteers at RCAMB who had been told their jobs had been terminated, who had not received their pay and who had been told that there was no money to pay them their wages. I recall how they were surprised to hear a statement on that day in this place by communities minister Tracy Davis that her department was working hard with the community organisation. It was news to them, because no-one from the LNP government had bothered to visit them despite the widely publicised problems at the centre, and they had not been able to tell employees whether they would be. No-one from the LNP government, let alone the responsible minister, had visited to inspect documents or speak to staff and volunteers in the week since it became apparent that there were serious problems at the organisation. These members of the community organisation were in tears as they spoke to me about their concerns for the future of essential services for clients with mental health problems, the homeless and victims of domestic violence, for families who were facing some crisis and were having trouble providing the essentials for their children.

I listened with great interest to what Mr Driscoll's solicitor had to say. In a part of his statement he said very clearly in a question posed to members of this House: where is the public harm in the nondisclosure of the interest? Let me make it very clear that the public harm was to the community organisation that provides the essential services to the people of Redcliffe; that was the public harm. So for the solicitor, on behalf of Mr Driscoll, to pose that question to members—I refute that allegation completely. There was public harm to the people of Redcliffe who sadly missed out.

Of course we know who was to blame for this. The Ethics Committee report leaves no doubt about that: the former LNP star candidate and MP Scott Driscoll is to blame. He let the community down. He has betrayed each of those Redcliffe residents who had been looked after by the community organisation. He has betrayed each and every person who calls Redcliffe home. But the blame should not stop with Scott Driscoll. I blame the Premier for picking this man as the member for Redcliffe. I blame the Premier for maintaining full confidence in this man even when it was abundantly clear that something was very, very wrong. I blame the Premier for standing by this man despite the mounting evidence. I blame the Premier for this disgraceful episode, for creating this mess and then cynically attempting to emerge from it with clean hands. It saddens me to think that this wonderful institution that is the Queensland Parliament has been brought into such disrepute by the candidate who was endorsed by the LNP—and before it the National Party—for three previous state elections.

I recall Bruce McIver saying that the member for Redcliffe had misled the LNP's selection committee over the preselection. Why did the leadership team stand by this man for so long? The contempts relating to the registers of interests were not the end of it. On 19 March 2013 I wrote to the registrar of the Register of Members' Interests to complain about the noncompliance issues. On that same date the then member for Redcliffe rose in this House and defended himself, saying that he had 'ceased being a voluntary president of the QRTSA in September last year'. This was contrary to evidence that was presented to the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission on 30 May 2013.

Mrs Driscoll presented minutes and resolutions from a meeting that purportedly replaced Mr Driscoll with Mrs Driscoll as president of the organisation on 1 September 2012. However, the two other alleged attendees at that meeting—other than Mr and Mrs Driscoll—both gave evidence on oath that they did not attend the meeting. Consequently, the QIRC found that the purported minutes and resolutions of the committee were a sham and that the meeting did not actually take place. So the deputy president of the QIRC, Mr Adrian Bloomfield, wrote to the Speaker alleging that in making his statement on 19 March 2013 the then member for Redcliffe had intentionally misled the House. The committee found this to be the case and recommended that the maximum fine of \$2,000 be imposed on the member.

We are now called on to consider the recommendations of the Ethics Committee. That brings us to today. It brings us to this extremely sobering moment in the history of this parliament. It is rare that this House is called upon to judge one of its own members for such a serious range of breaches of the privileges of this House. This is the worst example that has been perpetrated in this House and it grieves me enormously.

The amount of money involved is far greater than any person in this House could possibly have imagined, but what makes this conduct even more severe is that it is against some of the most vulnerable people in our society—exactly the people to whom a member of this House owes a special duty to protect. This parliament has published a number of fact sheets which outline various aspects of the roles and responsibilities of different officers of the parliament. Fact sheet 3.17 relates to the role of a member of parliament. It explains the role of a member in relation to their constituents. The first of these is 'giving assistance and advice to those in difficulty'. Failure on this front alone means that the former member for Redcliffe is not fit to grace this House.

The committee looked at the entirety of the conduct of the member for Redcliffe. The whole of the conduct of the former member for Redcliffe is much more than the sum of its parts. What the committee referred to as the cumulative effect of the findings of contempt means that the committee found that Mr Driscoll has engaged in conduct unworthy of a member of the Legislative Assembly and, in doing so, has brought odium on the Legislative Assembly as an institution. He is deserving of the ultimate penalty of this House. More than this, those who put him here should hang their heads in shame. The photograph of the Premier and the Deputy Premier embracing their chosen one for the people of Redcliffe will continue to haunt the LNP.

I also recall that the solicitor for Mr Driscoll today once again raised the issue that—

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Excuse me, member. He raised the issue that perhaps Mr Driscoll should be treated differently from a minister of the Crown, as was the case with Mr Gordon Nuttall. On this matter I can agree with the Premier: it does not matter if you are a backbencher in this House, whether you are the Leader of the House or whether you are a minister; the same onus of responsibility is placed on every member of this House. There is no distinction between elected members of the House.

I note that the former member for Redcliffe resigned before the events that have taken place today. As the Premier and the Leader of the House have said, these are very serious allegations and the former member has been found guilty of contempt. The matter of the fines to be imposed by this House has not been taken lightly by the Ethics Committee. This is a very serious matter for the House.

In the future, the people of Redcliffe need to represent them someone they can be proud of, someone they can go to as a champion for their local community, someone who will represent their interests—not like the former LNP member Scott Driscoll, who fleeced the community organisation, who put at risk those people who needed help the most: people facing mental health issues, people experiencing domestic violence and people who struggle around Christmas time to put food on the table. Mr Scott Driscoll represented those people here in this parliament, and that is absolutely shameful and disgraceful.

The opposition had been asking numerous questions of ministers in relation to the conduct of the then member for Redcliffe. Those ministers refused at times to answer those questions. When we asked about the audits that were being conducted allegedly by the health department and the communities department there was almost a wall of silence. It took the courage of journalists from the *Courier-Mail* to go out and pursue these issues. They pursued these issues until the government was forced to act. The government did not act independently in relation to these issues; it was forced to act in the public interest because the issues were mounting and mounting.

Yesterday I was at Redcliffe and actually met with members of this former community organisation. They were relieved to know that their member had resigned, but they were shocked, horrified and absolutely appalled about the amount of money that was fleeced from their community organisation—an organisation they had built up over the years. Some of these members had been involved in that organisation for over 20 years. They know how people at Redcliffe feel. They know the daily struggles people face to put food on the table. The former member fleeced that organisation. He was not taking money from some big business organisation; he was taking money from a community organisation—

Mr Stevens: You don't get much bigger than Woolies.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That, too, Leader of the House. The community organisation sought to support the most vulnerable in his community. Not only that, he was their elected representative. It is absolutely shameful and disgraceful. The people who missed out were the people of Redcliffe. At the by-election the people of Redcliffe will have their chance to vote on what they think of the LNP's former member, Scott Driscoll.

(Time expired)

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (11.57 am): As the chair of the Ethics Committee I rise to say a few words in support of the motion before the House. It is indeed an historic day but also a very sad day for this House. It is not only sad because of the thing we have to do here today in relation to the former member for Redcliffe, Scott Driscoll; it is also sad because this matter has been turned into a political football by those opposite. Scammers get away with scamming because they are good at it. It is as simple as that. If they were not good at it, they would not get to first base. For you to turn this matter into a political football is an absolute disgrace.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, I ask you to address your comments through the chair and not use the term 'you' in regard to other members.

Mr CRANDON: Thank you for your guidance, Madam Speaker. I heard the address to the House today by Mr Driscoll's counsel and I make the following points in response. Firstly, Mr Driscoll states that he was not able to actively participate in the Ethics Committee process due to his medical condition.

Of course, the Ethics Committee had a duty to investigate and report on the matters referred to it. The committee provided Mr Driscoll with numerous opportunities to participate in the inquiries. However, in the main, Mr Driscoll declined to participate on medical grounds. The committee would have welcomed the full participation of the former member for Redcliffe in its inquiries. Indeed, Mr Driscoll attempted on more than one occasion to sway the committee through his legal professional by preferring documents purporting to give evidence from—would you believe—unidentified sources. The scammer tries everything, and in this case he tried to scam the committee by using unidentified sources in his defence.

As I alluded to in my brief comments in tabling report No. 139, the task of the committee was made all the more challenging due to the limited participation in the committee's process by the former member. However, as detailed in the report, the committee sought the advice from the member's medical specialists, with the member's consent where appropriate, throughout the process. The committee took the advice of the medical specialist on face value. The advice from Mr Driscoll's medical specialist was that he was unfit to participate in the committee's processes for an unknown period of time. The committee simply could not put its inquiry on hold indefinitely and wait for the advice that Mr Driscoll's health had improved. By analogy, one can imagine what state the court system might be in if any matter before it were able to be delayed indefinitely on medical grounds. Accordingly, the committee resolved to proceed on the information before it and advised Mr Driscoll and his legal representatives of that resolution. The committee sought senior counsel advice that confirmed that its processes were legally sound.

It should also be noted that Mr Driscoll's obligations to register interests began from within a month of being sworn in as a member on 15 May 2012. His deliberate misleading of the House occurred on 19 March 2013. So for a period of some 10 months we saw a situation where Mr Driscoll persistently and consistently misled this place. Accordingly, all of the offences the subject of the committee's report occurred well prior to diagnosis of Mr Driscoll's medical condition as advised by his treating physician.

Secondly, Mr Driscoll asks the House to take into account that his household is now without any form of income and that the House should take this into account when considering the recommendations regarding fines. There is some \$522,000 at question here and I would suggest to you that there might be a few dollars of that left in a bank account somewhere. The committee took the view, consistent with that taken by previous committees, that the penalties recommended to the House by the Ethics Committee should not be about punishing the person who commits the contempt but rather should be about setting standards. The committee was very conscious of its role in setting the standards that the Queensland community expects of its members of parliament. It is about keeping public life clean.

With respect to fines recommended by the committee, the committee looked to the precedent in the Nuttall case for guidance. Mr Driscoll's legal professional suggests that because Mr Nuttall was so many years in this place and Mr Driscoll was some months in this place they were different. I can assure the House that they were indeed very different, and the difference is quite stark. Mr Nuttall went to third parties and received payments from big business, and those payments made little difference to the people that he was receiving them from. On the other side of the coin with Mr Driscoll, two organisations—one in particular, RCAMB—were there to look after the people in the community who were most at risk and most needed to be protected and supported. Mr Driscoll, through his family company and income paid to his wife, ripped \$167,000 out of that system—\$167,000 just out of that system when those moneys were meant to be for people suffering mental illness, people experiencing domestic violence and so forth. The previous Ethics Committee found that Mr Nuttall should still be held to account for his contempts by way of fines, even though he was no longer a member at the time. The committee's recommendations are consistent with that precedent and today's motion before the House is also entirely consistent with the precedent set in Nuttall's case, as it should be.

As I outlined in tabling the report, the material before the committee in this matter was extensive and the issues to be considered were complex in nature. Accordingly, the committee gave very detailed consideration to the material and deliberated on it at length. With respect to the failure to register, as set out in its report, the committee felt that it was at somewhat of a disadvantage in not being able to call Mr Driscoll to question him under oath as to his knowledge of the requirements of the register. However, the committee was convinced on the information before it that Mr Driscoll was aware of his obligations to register interests and that he selectively chose not to register the interests that would reveal sources of income and conflicts of interest.

The committee was aware that Mr Driscoll, like most of the other 51 new members of the 54th Parliament, attended the new members' induction program, which included a session by the Clerk in relation to conflicts and register of interests on 17 April. At the end of that session the Clerk made an offer to make an appointment with all new members to go through each member's individual requirements regarding the register of interests. Mr Driscoll did not avail himself of the opportunity of an appointment with the Clerk. Given the findings of the committee regarding the veil used by Mr Driscoll to conceal sources of income and conflicts of interest, one can readily understand his motives for not taking that opportunity. As stated in report 139, the committee took the view that there is a positive obligation on all members to familiarise themselves with the requirements of the register and if in any doubt to seek assistance from the Clerk as registrar. I implore all current and future members to heed this advice.

The committee found a particularly damning fact was how Mr Driscoll demonstrated an understanding of the need to register such interests by correctly registering offices held in Norsefire Pty Ltd. However, at the same time the former member did not feel the need to register the offices held in other organisations which were significant sources of income for the company. Furthermore, the committee found the conflict of interest between Mr Driscoll's private interests in the receipt of his wife's income both directly from RCAMB and from RCAMB and QRTSA via Norsefire Pty Ltd were so obvious that his failure to register them had to be intentional.

With respect to the misleading of the House, the committee found that conduct was again aimed at concealing Mr Driscoll's continuing involvement with QRTSA. The committee placed great weight on findings of Deputy President Bloomfield at the QIRC regarding Mr Driscoll's purported cessation of president of QRTSA at purported meetings of that organisation. On 30 May 2013 Deputy President Bloomfield stated—

... it appears to me that any of the resolutions said to have been made on that day (1 September 2012) are a total fiction.

In addition, the committee found the statement of Mr Bruce Mills to the CMC was pivotal in supporting the findings of the QIRC. Mr Mills stated—

It was about this time, 1 September 2012, Scott became the self-appointed patron of QRTSA and used this as a shield to enable him to control QRTSA whilst distancing himself in his role in parliament (Scott advised me as the patron, he could still manage QRTSA) ...

The committee was conscious that Mr Driscoll's statements regarding his ceasing as president were not made off the cuff but as part of a prepared personal explanation to the House following the arising of certain allegations in the media. The committee was convinced that Mr Driscoll was aware

that the purported meeting on 1 September 2012 was a total fiction and therefore his purported cessation as president on that date did not actually occur. Accordingly, the committee reached conclusions that Mr Driscoll was aware of his statement to the House on 19 March 2013 was misleading and that he intended to mislead the House.

The committee also noted the failure by Mr Driscoll to advise the House of his continuing involvement in the management of QRTSA and relationship with RCAMB while at the same time advocating for those organisations in this House. Specifically, the committee notes that on 5 June 2012 Mr Driscoll made a speech in the House supporting independent retailers against the major retailers without declaring a pecuniary interest that the member and related persons had via QRTSA. In addition, the committee notes that Mr Driscoll made a speech on 10 July 2012 advocating for more federal funding for RCAMB without declaring his pecuniary interest.

Throughout its investigation the committee was continually presented with evidence that points to an intention on behalf of Mr Driscoll to conceal the receipt of income and to prevent the exposure of the inherent conflicts of interest of Mr Driscoll's private interests with his role as a member of parliament. On behalf of the committee I would like to thank the CMC, Mr Driscoll's medical specialist and Mr Peter Davis QC for the advice and assistance provided to the committee throughout the course of its inquiry. I also thank the other members of the committee for the way they have worked in sifting through the complex evidence presented to them, in applying that evidence to the elements of the charges of contempt before them and arriving at a considered and balanced consensus in relation to the finding and recommendations. We were one in that Ethics Committee when we came to the final conclusion that this was a report that we needed to present to this parliament, that this was a report that we needed to present to the people of Queensland, and a damning report in relation to Mr Driscoll.

The Code of Ethical Standards for members of the Legislative Assembly states—

The public's confidence in the institution of Parliament is essential.

Specifically, the code states—

Members are to strive at all times to conduct themselves in a manner which will tend to maintain and strengthen the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of Parliament and avoid any action which may diminish its standing, authority or dignity.

Mr Driscoll's conduct has diminished the standing, authority or dignity of this place. I would like to hope that the Ethics Committee report No. 139 has resulted in restoring and strengthening the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the Queensland parliament. I am sure that I speak for all members of the Ethics Committee in commending the committee's findings and recommendations to that end. I support the motion before the House.

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (12.12 pm): I just rise to speak in support of the motion. As a member of the committee, I find it important to say that Mr Driscoll has been found guilty and that it was a unanimous decision. The matter that is before us now is to decide on the penalty. The facts of the case have been comprehensively reported in report No. 139. I want to ensure all members of this House that these decisions were not taken lightly. All the information was researched thoroughly and items were discussed vigorously by all members of the committee. We sought advice from medical specialists and from senior counsel. We looked at precedents and we considered all the facts. I want to make sure that everybody understands that the committee had to consider the good order and discipline of this House and came to a decision that we thought best represented the members of this place.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr PUCCI: It was a unanimous decision. We have to remember that Mr Driscoll was in a position of trust. I disagree with Mr Driscoll's representation when he said that we had to consider that Mr Nuttall was a minister. The consideration of this matter and the decision was about a member of parliament. Any member of parliament who is in a position of trust, who goes out there and misrepresents the people he is supposed to be representing and who takes money from the most needy deserves the greatest penalty that we can give him. So I advise and recommend wholeheartedly that all members support this motion and that it passes through the House.

I want to thank the CMC, I want to thank Mr Peter Davis and I want to thank all the other members of the committee for the work that they have done on the committee throughout this period. It was a great effort. It shows that when people get together and work together for the good of our communities that we represent good things can happen. I support the motion.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (12.14 pm): Madam Speaker—

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, do you have a point of order?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: No, I seek leave to present a report to parliament.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted for the member for Gladstone to present a report to parliament.

AYES, 12—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszcuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

NOES, 67—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

Resolved in the negative.

MOTION

Order of Business

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (12.25 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That government business order of the day No. 1 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 19 November (see p. 3992).

Second Reading



Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.26 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

On Tuesday I introduced the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. These amendments are important for two reasons: first, they complement and strengthen the effectiveness of the important new laws the government introduced and passed in October to tackle organised crime in Queensland; secondly, the amendments make sure Queenslanders can be confident that when they are engaging or dealing with a licensed person working in a range of occupations they are not dealing with a participant in a criminal organisation. These amendments tackle the hard issues that sadly the opposition failed to address whilst in government. When the opposition was in power the best they could do was sit on their hands, fiddle here, tinker there, while the rest of Australia understood the problems being faced in relation to criminal motorcycle gangs.

Across Australia it has been no secret that criminal organisations have sought to infiltrate a range of industries and businesses. For example, liquor licensed premises, particularly those providing entertainment that tends to be patronised by young people, and the security industry have been attractive to organised crime, including criminal motorcycle gangs. Whether they are seeking access to these industries in an attempt to legitimise their ill-gotten gains or as a way of accessing young Queenslanders, this government is determined to stop these criminal organisations in their tracks. The opposition never took it upon themselves to do the hard work and to make the hard decisions that were needed. This bill makes those hard decisions and the right decisions to go toe-to-toe with criminal motorcycle gangs in Queensland and to show that they have no place in

Queensland. This government continues to be unapologetic about its determination to free Queensland of the scourge of criminal organisations. Part of this is preventing participants in criminal organisations from disguising themselves and their activities as legitimate businesses.

I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill. The committee tabled its report this morning. The committee has made two recommendations about the bill. The first recommendation is that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for this recommendation as we participate in this debate. By comprehensively addressing the problem of criminal motorcycle gangs, we make Queensland a better place for honest Queenslanders to earn a living and enjoy our great state. However, the committee has requested clarification on some points, including a second recommendation to further address fundamental legislative principle issues not identified in the explanatory notes. The committee has asked me to do this through my second reading speech. For the committee's purposes I will address the committee's request for clarification and address the issues raised in recommendation 2 through my summing-up speech at the conclusion of the debate.

This bill is important for Queensland. Firstly, it clarifies some provisions in the previous bill but, secondly, it adds new provisions, particularly the provision with respect to the Police Commissioner giving information of criminal histories for those criminal motorcycle gang members. It also amends the Bail Act with respect to clarifying the intention of the legislature with respect to the Bail Act. We make no apologies in terms of going after—and going after hard—criminal motorcycle gangs. We have seen over the last few weeks the direct positive impact these laws that were passed a few weeks ago by this House are having on ridding the state of Queensland of criminal motorcycle gang members. The intelligence shows they are running scared. They may be travelling interstate but we are now working with our interstate counterparts to address the problem at a national level, which has not been done for many, many years in this state.

The bill also directs the transport department to share information, particularly photo ID licence information, with ASIO. One of the failures of the Labor government over the last 12 years in this state has been its failure to share information in relation to going after criminal motorcycle gang members. In 18 months we have been able to debate and pass laws that will share information with Australia's crime fighting body, ASIO. Members would have thought, knowing the issue of criminal motorcycle gang members over the years, that the former Labor government would have attempted to address these issues. I have said on many occasions in this place that the Labor Party's answer to criminal motorcycle gang members is a piece of legislation that has not been effectively used. No organisations have been declared criminal organisations.

Mr Rickuss: Hear no evil, see no evil.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. That was their answer. They still hold that up as the great answer to ridding the state of Queensland of criminal motorcycle gang members, despite the fact that no organisations have been declared under the Labor Party legislation. Our legislation is having a direct consequential effect on criminal motorcycle gang members. They are throwing their patches in to their well resourced lawyers. My message to criminal motorcycle gang members, through these amendments that we are debating, is that you can run but you cannot hide. They can throw in their patches and leather jackets to their lawyers but they will not be able to get away with the criminal activity that they are conducting. We know that criminal motorcycle gang members participate in all forms of criminal activity in the state.

At a glossy level, at a high, bird's-eye view level, it may appear to Queenslanders that criminal motorcycle gang members are not participating in crime with the public face that we saw with the Broadbeach incident some weeks ago. However, the message that we clearly show through the intelligence operations of the CMC and the Queensland Police Force is that criminal motorcycle gang members are involved in all forms of criminal activity, including burglary and car theft. All the law and order issues facing the state in terms of drug offences and synthetic drug offences can be, to some important extent, associated with criminal motorcycle gang members.

On the Sunshine Coast only a few days ago, one of the heads of the Bandidos was arrested for car stealing at about 3.40 am at Cotton Tree. Criminal motorcycle gang members are engrained. They do not have '1%' or the number '13' tattooed on their foreheads for no reason. They are loud and proud, obnoxiously showing Queenslanders that they are criminals participating in criminal motorcycle gang activities. That is why Queenslanders have been so responsive to and so supportive of this government's tough stance on criminal motorcycle gang members.

The honourable police minister has confirmed that crime has decreased on the Gold Coast in the past four weeks since our legislation was introduced. That is a testament to the laws that this parliament passed some weeks ago. I look forward to the day that I will go to the Gold Coast and talk to the businesses that are thanking the government for these laws. The chamber of commerce has publicly stated that businesses are feeling somewhat more secure and safe in their business environments. We want to ensure that the tourists who go to the Gold Coast and all areas of Queensland feel that they can have a cup of coffee or a nice dinner without feeling the threat of fear and intimidation used by criminal motorcycle gang members.

The bill amends the Bail Act because different definitions are being used by different levels of the judiciary. The magistrates have taken a particular interpretation of the legislation and the Supreme Court has taken a different interpretation to the Chief Magistrate. This clarifies that the intention of the legislature in the original legislation is to ensure that criminal motorcycle gang members cannot simply throw in the towel by throwing in their colours and say to Queenslanders that they are no longer a criminal participating in the activity because their lawyers have, in safe custody, their leather jackets which have their patches on them.

I make a very serious point with respect to law-abiding citizens. We have seen the civil libertarians in this state and those opposed to these tough reforms, at all levels, including the opposition, attempt to say these laws are targeting motorcycle riders in this state. Nothing could be further from the truth. I know the honourable police minister and the Police Commissioner have met with the motorcycle association. As I understand it, they have devised a plan. One of their recommendations was that if there were going to be charity rides for law-abiding motorcycle riders, they would simply notify the police and the police would work with them, as the police have done for many years.

What the police and the government will not tolerate is criminal motorcycle gang members, such as those from the Rebels, the Bandidos, the Black Uhlans and all the others, trying to infiltrate charity rides, such as those for Christmas and other rides. We know those criminal motorcycle gang members do try to infiltrate the teddy rides. We will continue to support absolutely rides for charity by motorcyclists who do it because they love riding a motorcycle. As I have said in this place and publicly, my father has been riding a motorbike his whole life. He drives trucks and rides motorbikes. Like all Queenslanders who ride their bikes on weekends, he will not be impacted by these laws because he is not committing any offences. Such people are not associated with or participants in criminal organisations, as are some of the others who certainly do commit crimes.

The other thing that I want to address at the start of this debate is the publicity stunts run by the PR machines of criminal motorcycle gang members. A few weeks ago I was flabbergasted to read various articles about those PR machines and the spin doctors who work for criminal motorcycle gang members. I think a few Rebels members have said that they are not criminals; they are just a bunch of people who ride bikes. They are not. Now they have been declared criminal organisations. They participate in car thefts, drug and other offences that impact on the lives of Queenslanders in their homes and businesses and on the streets in our communities. That is who we are dealing with. We are dealing with criminal organisations and criminal participants who assault people, assault police officers, assault businesses, use fear, intimidation and threats and extort people.

In the past few weeks I have had reports from my own area of the Sunshine Coast about businesses that, over the past few years, have been too scared to come forward with information about criminal organisation gangs because they were worried about what those organisations would do to them if they did so. Now that they believe that the police force and the government are very much targeting criminal organisations, they feel a little easier about coming forward with relevant information. We have set up the Crime Stoppers hotline for people to dob in criminal motorcycle gang members and offer information that may assist in successful prosecutions. That has been going well. As I understand it, we have had over 500 calls.

I thank Queenslanders. I thank all members from the LNP side of parliament for talking to their constituents about this. As we travel around in our respective electorates across the state, the overwhelming feedback that LNP members are getting from their constituents is, 'Keep going; keep targeting criminal motorcycle gang members'. They are not wanted in the state of Queensland. Their activities are not wanted in the state of Queensland. The more we can target the criminal motorcycle gang members, the more we can focus on good law-abiding citizens who want to have a ride on a Sunday or gather in groups and ride their motorcycles without the infiltration of criminal motorcycle gang members. Therefore, I thank all honourable members on the government side for talking to their constituents about these laws.

Mr Rickuss: Attorney, some say it is only a small percentage of crime that motorcycle gangs are involved in. Can you give a response on that?

Mr BLEIJIE: Absolutely. I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer, who asks about criminal motorcycle gang members saying they only participate in a small percentage of crime. That is the reported crime. We know that, as Queenslanders would understand and the constituents of the member for Lockyer would understand, the underlying issue with criminal motorcycle gang members is, of course, that burglary, car thefts, stealing and assaults on the street are mostly biker related. I thank the member for Lockyer and all the other LNP members in this House for supporting these tough reforms and for selling these tough reforms in our communities. Certainly the Queensland community understands that this government is not going to stand around and let criminal motorcycle gang members take over our streets and our communities.

That might have been the Labor Party's objective. That is certainly not going to be our objective. These laws are tough and we have acknowledged that. We have also said that for the first period of policing there will be a level of inconvenience just as there is a level of inconvenience when we go to an airport and we are screened for bomb residue on our clothes and suitcases. It may not mean when I go through the scanners and do the testing that I am a terrorist, but it may very well be that the person behind me is. When I or other members of parliament get stopped for random breath tests we may not be a drunk and endangering the lives of Queenslanders, but the person behind us might be. That is one of the sacrifices we make as a society and as participants in a society for the general good of the community.

Honourable members on this side of the House have been selling the message that this government is tough on law and order when it comes to dealing with criminal motorcycle gang members. I contrast that to the actions of the Labor Party and the Leader of the Opposition. I very much look forward to the Leader of the Opposition's contribution to this debate.

Queenslanders really do not know where the opposition is on any of these matters. One minute the opposition is calling for tough reforms and then they say they are too tough. Then they call on us to stop doing anything or restructure the CMC. Then they announce a policy to split the CMC and restructure the CMC and split up all the positions in the CMC. Then they go on the different ABC programs that I have watched over the last few weeks and talk about these tough laws and how the legislature should not have to amend laws. For the last 150 years in Queensland the legislature has been amending laws.

If all the laws were right and if our forefathers got it right then we would not have parliaments. If all the laws were in place to deal with the modern issues of society then we would not have parliament. There would be no need for parliamentarians to come in here and continually amend laws. As society is changing so must parliament change. Parliament, the legislature, must adapt the laws to deal with the changing demographics and the modern criminals—the modern criminals who are part of the underworld and criminal organisations and make money out of the misery and financial losses of Queenslanders.

I am very keen to see where the opposition sits on this. Do they continue to support these tough reforms as they did in the parliament a few weeks ago? After supporting and voting on the laws they have bagged them for the last three weeks. Are they going to support these new measures today or are they going to oppose them? If they are going to oppose them that will be very interesting. We will make sure Queenslanders know that the opposition are on the side of criminal motorcycle gangs, paedophile rings and criminal cartels in this state.

We will let anyone who wants to listen know that the opposition has no interest in dealing with criminal motorcycle gangs. We will let everyone know that the opposition's only response to this issue over the last 14 years it was in government was to have a piece of legislation that did not actually declare any criminal organisation a criminal organisation.

The opposition leader flip-flops on this issue. In the last year and a half she has come into this place and said that this government is too tough and does not look at the civil liberties of individuals. Then she calls on the government to act decisively when it comes to criminal gangs and biker gangs in Queensland. When we act those opposite talk about how bad the laws are and then actually vote for the laws. After voting for the laws they bag the laws that we have put in place to protect their constituents and protect Queenslanders. So we have seen an abundance of flip-flopping.

The opposition leader's contribution is a test. The test for the opposition leader is to tell Queenslanders what the position of the Labor Party is with respect to criminal organisations. Are they going to continue to support criminal gangs and criminal organisations in Queensland and back up the civil liberties of these criminals or are they on the side of Queenslanders?

We on this side of the House are on the side of Queenslanders. We always will be. We will bring whatever legislation is necessary into this House to make sure that we are protecting Queenslanders, some of the most vulnerable in our state, from these vicious lawless associates. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.45 pm): Thank goodness this is the last day of parliamentary sittings for the year and we will not have to listen to the long diatribes of the Attorney-General. I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Let me make it very clear that it was the Labor government back in 2009 that recognised—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The Leader of the Opposition has barely begun her speech. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I know some members have not had much sleep. I will continue. It was the Labor government back in 2009 that recognised that there were issues in relation to outlaw motorcycle gangs in Queensland. That is why the Labor government at the time took the very serious decision to enact the criminal organisation bill.

I have listened to what the Attorney-General has said on many occasions in this House. I need to remind the House that the only person who spoke about the civil liberties of bikies when debating our legislation was the now Attorney-General and some of the other LNP members. He talked about the civil liberties of bikies. Here we are at the end of 2013 and he has changed his tune. If we want to talk about people flip-flopping, I rest my case—it is the Attorney-General.

We can also talk about the bumbles of the Attorney-General. There are so many. I obviously do not have enough time to go through all of the bumbles of the state's first law officer. The state's first law officer sat in this chamber and talked about a test. Let me issue a test to the Attorney-General. The real test is: will he stop talking about issues related to the PCMC when discussing motions that he has raised today when he is directly named in public documents that have been tabled as a person linked to the whole issue—

Mr DILLAWAY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would like you to rule on relevance with regard to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening to the Leader of the Opposition's speech. I did not pick up anything that seemed to be veering off the bill. I will listen intently. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I sat here for about 20 minutes and listened to the Attorney-General talk about a whole range of issues in the past and now. He was issuing tests. I issue the same test for the Attorney-General. It is very simple. If he wants to issue a test for us then there is a test for him.

The Labor Party and the Labor opposition will not be hypocrites because we recognise that there have been issues in relation to outlaw criminal organisations in this state and that is why the Labor government took—

Mr Choat interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: How are the racing pigeons going, member for Ipswich West?

Mr Choat: They are going very well.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is very good to hear. Before I go into the substance of the bill, I want to talk once again about rushing legislation through the House. What we saw the other day was an attempt by the government to rush the bill through the committee. I was surprised when the member for Rockhampton, the opposition's nominee on that committee, said outside the chamber that there was not really going to be a briefing at all and that it was going to be just the members of the committee going through the bill clause by clause. Then all of a sudden—I think it was maybe even less than 15 minutes after the member for Rockhampton stood up—we found out that in fact, yes, there was going to be a departmental briefing and that a departmental officer was going to come along and explain the aspects of the bill.

Mr Berry: Ooh, someone's in trouble!

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, no, no. That is what I have been told. It was public.

Mr Berry: It was not public.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am talking about public tweets.

Mr Berry: It was not public.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That was a private hearing. I understand it was a private hearing with some departmental people, and you have tabled your report. So it is absolutely all on the public record.

Mr Berry interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for Ipswich—

Ms PALASZCZUK: Is the member trying to intimidate me?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member for Ipswich wants to take a point of order, take a point of order. Do you have a point of order, member for Ipswich?

Mr BERRY: I rise to a point of order. The point of order is that the matters discussed by the Leader of the Opposition are privileged and were in a privileged meeting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order. The member will take his seat. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have recalled a press release that the member for Rockhampton issued. I understand that it was not a public hearing but there was a departmental hearing and you have tabled a report.

Mr Berry: We will see.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, we will see, because I understand it is all on the public record. But, once again, let me say that if this government were to be open and transparent why was a public hearing not called? What we have seen this week are allegations of cover-up and what we have now seen in relation to this bill that is currently before the House is that once again there was no public hearing—no ability for the Law Society and no ability for the Bar Association to come before the committee, to have a public avenue, to have their views heard.

Miss Barton interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. So I am very concerned that, once again, we had legislation introduced on the Tuesday, it went to a committee on the Wednesday and now we are here on the Thursday once again debating approximately 180 pages of legislation. These are laws that the government tells us are aimed at dismantling criminal gangs, making club members hand in their colours and get a real job, and protecting Queenslanders from the frightening actions of outlaw motorcycle gangs.

A government member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am not taking interjections. The Attorney-General, when introducing the bill late on Tuesday night, said—

... the Queensland opposition, the Labor Party in this state, has to work out which side it is on—criminal gangs or Queenslanders. Do members know what? The Liberal-National government will always choose the side of Queenslanders.

The Labor Party will always choose the side of Queenslanders against criminal gangs. It did so back in 2009 when the then Labor government introduced the Criminal Organisation Bill, the bill that the LNP voted against. It is ironic that that was the legislation being debated on the final sitting day of the year in 2009 and tonight, four years later, the LNP have had the biggest change of heart we have ever seen in Queensland. This is a flip-flop the size of which we have never seen before. Back in 2009 the LNP were the friends of outlaw motorcycle gangs and criminals. Our legislation, which required persons to actually be convicted of a criminal offence to be caught by it, was ridiculed and challenged as being a breach of the civil liberties of the bikies.

Mr Stevens: You caught nobody.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The LNP—champions of the criminal bikie gangs at that time. In fact, I think the Leader of the House actually voted against that bill at the time because your leader was talking about the civil liberties of the bikies.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Now, in order to prove they are tough on law and order, they have had to make laws that criminalise not just criminal behaviour but people associating with each other. The Labor opposition is not opposed to laws that seek to combat criminal behaviour.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! The leader is not taking interjections at the moment. The leader has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: People who commit serious criminal behaviour, who threaten and intimidate police officers and ordinary citizens going about their business, should face the full result of the laws. Laws that create harsh penalties for these people are not out of place. Laws that create harsh penalties for people who commit no criminal offence, who may never be charged with a criminal offence or who are not members of criminal organisations cannot be acceptable in our society. Anyone who says they do not agree with the extent to which these laws attack ordinary Queenslanders is not a supporter of criminal gangs; they are a supporter of Queenslanders.

The sentiment of these laws, if they applied only to appropriate criminal gangs and people convicted of criminal offences, would be commendable. Some of the provisions that take away rights of review or appeal are problematic. However, attacking criminal gangs is what governments should be about. The best way to do that is to attack their income—confiscate their ill-gotten gains. We should use the resources of government to infiltrate their organisations and remove the incentive for their existence by making sure they do not benefit from criminal activity.

Attacking innocent Queenslanders because you are bound to catch some of the real criminals if you cast the net wide enough may seem like a good idea until one of your family members is caught up in it. Then we might see the real LNP principles come to the fore—the principles that are embodied in your constitution such as the preservation of the Westminster system of government; parliament controlling the executive and the law controlling all; independence of the judiciary; freedom of speech, religion, association and the media; freedom of citizens to choose their own way of living and of life, subject to the rights of others and the laws of the land and the protection of private property.

There are some sensible provisions in this bill which will assist agencies such as police and the CMC to dismantle criminal organisations. That is where the legislature should be setting its sights, not on the scattergun approach we have seen thus far from the LNP. Again, we have the situation where the Attorney-General has brought a bill into the House and rushed it through the committee system without allowing what I consider to be due consideration and due consultation with stakeholders.

Much of the reason why we are here debating this bill today is that the first bill was flawed, and we are having to perform a fix-up for the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General accused me of hypocrisy when the opposition opposed the motion to require the committee to report back on the bill by 10 am today. He quoted what I said in relation to the previous bill. However, that was a different situation. That bill was introduced after lunch, and the Attorney's department provided a briefing shortly thereafter. Stakeholders were given copies—

Mr Berry interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Ipswich is rather rude. Stakeholders were given copies of the bill and were able to at least have a quick look at it that day and evening, and the following day. The Attorney-General introduced this bill at 10.23 pm. He claimed he could not do it any earlier because the opposition had called so many divisions on the IR bill. But he could have introduced it in the morning when he introduced his other bill or after lunch as he did the previous bill or after dinner as he did with his bills yesterday. It is extreme for the Attorney to have made such a false claim in the parliament. Without providing any evidence for the urgency of this bill, it is difficult to see why, again, we have been forced to debate a bill of some 175 pages, amending 23 acts, in such a short time frame.

In the debate on the previous bill, the Leader of Opposition Business quoted from a statement by Peter Callaghan SC, President of the Law and Justice Institute. Mr Callaghan has made a submission to the committee which I will take the opportunity to quote. He states—

Membership of the Law & Justice Institute (Qld) Inc includes some of the most senior and experienced lawyers in the State of Queensland. We would welcome the opportunity to make submissions on a Bill that, amongst other things, challenges notions which are fundamental to the rule of law.

Even with all the experience and ability at our disposal, it is simply impossible for this exercise to be done intelligently in the time that has been allowed for the purpose. Any attempt to assert that it is possible will endanger the reputation of the parliamentary committee process as a whole.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! Before we break for lunch, I give a brief reminder that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's AGM is on now at one o'clock here in the House. I ask the opposition leader to move that the debate be adjourned.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Report

Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (2.30 pm), by leave: I table report No. 140 of the Ethics Committee titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 25 October 2012 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of an estimates committee by a chief executive officer*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 140—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 25 October 2012 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of an estimates committee by a chief executive officer [4138].

I commend the report to the House.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Gold Coast Airport

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (2.30 pm): I bring to the House's attention today the proposed aeroplane landing system changes that the representatives from the Gold Coast Airport presented to me recently as a firm proposal going out to public consultation shortly. The Gold Coast Airport at Coolangatta has gone from strength to strength and is the fastest growing airport in Australia and has the status as the fourth busiest international airport in the country. Mr Paul Donovan, the Gold Coast Airport general manager, briefed me on the potential need to utilise the proposed instrument landing system for international jet services landing. This will be jointly implemented by the Gold Coast Airport and Airservices Australia. Approximately five per cent of all aircraft landings will use this new ILS system on a permanent basis throughout the year.

The instrument landing system will mean a change in the flight path of the ever-increasing aircraft traffic straight over my electorate of Mermaid Beach and adjoining electorates of Burleigh and Surfers Paradise. I totally understand the importance of the usage of this system during inclement weather to ensure planes are not diverted to Brisbane or, worse still, cancelled altogether. But when 300 days out of 365 days a year the Gold Coast and my electorate have glorious sunshine, this ILS system should have limited usage and be used only in times of bad weather requiring an ILS assisted landing.

The visual omnirange system currently in use is a very high frequency navigation aid which operates line of sight reception. With the increase in commercial aircraft to the Gold Coast, which has been significant with the restoration of the Gold Coast as an international tourism destination by the Newman LNP government, I believe the need for the instrument landing system in fine weather is not needed. The pain of noise inflicted on local residents by aircraft for no sensible reason when not necessary is an impediment that no resident should have to bear.

As legislation for airport operations and improvement lies with the federal government in consultation with CASA, I have been lobbying my federal counterparts—the member for Moncrieff and the member for MacPherson—to assist in a reasonable outcome and have voiced my concerns because residents from Surfers Paradise right down the coast to Burleigh will have the potential to be affected by the change in the flight paths that will come in over land rather than an ocean approach to

prepare for landing. This route will only get busier over the years ahead as more and more international flights come from Asia. Instead of changing the system completely to the instrument landing system, a combination of the ILS and the current system would reduce the number of aircraft that would have to fly over residential areas of the Gold Coast. It is that simple.

The Gold Coast Airport has indicated it will be conducting a consultation process. I urge all residents to put forward their thoughts and concerns and be part of the process for a successful outcome for all. There is a simple solution that the ILS gets used in inclement weather. We have enormous amounts of weather forecasting et cetera. For every other opportunity the ILS should not be used and the normal VOR system should be in place.

Currumbin, Australia's Cleanest Beach



Hon. JA STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (2.34 pm): It gives me enormous pleasure to rise to update the House on a very exciting announcement made this week that is a sense of enormous pride for the good folk of Currumbin. On Monday, 18 November at a ceremony in Perth, Currumbin was officially declared Australia's Cleanest Beach for 2013. I have to say that we love our airport as well.

This is a fantastic achievement and follows Currumbin being recognised as Queensland's cleanest beach in April this year. Stellar efforts of locals and stakeholders over many years have culminated in this recognition at a national level, and it is so pleasing to see the hard work of the community acknowledged via this title. We were up against some fierce competition from world famous beaches right around the Australian coastline. The beaches were judged on eight key criteria including community action and partnerships, litter prevention, young legends, heritage and culture, resource recovery and waste management, water conservation and energy innovation. That we topped the list on such extensive criteria is a real testament to those who love and care for our foreshore.

In Currumbin, we are well aware that we have something pretty special, and it is fantastic to see that Keep Australia Beautiful agrees. On Wednesday morning I hosted a ceremony to welcome home the cleanest beach trophy and acknowledge all those who have contributed to this excellent achievement. They include Friends of Currumbin, Currumbin Surf Life Saving Club, Currumbin Volunteer Marine Rescue, Councillor Chris Robbins, Swell Sculpture Festival, Bleach*, Gecko, Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary, Alley Boardriders, Surfrider Foundation and the Griffith University Centre of Coastal Management. As you can see, we are a pretty tight-knit community here in Currumbin.

I also wish to place on record my thanks to Rick Burnett, the CEO of Keep Queensland Beautiful, for his relentless support and passion in the field of sustainability. I extend an invitation to all honourable members to visit our little slice of heaven with our world-famous beaches and our world-famous airport. From our stunning foreshores to the hidden treasures of our valleys, Currumbin is blessed with natural attributes and caring, community minded residents.

As we salute our clean beaches, it is timely to recognise the efforts of our police to clean up our streets. This afternoon I wish to acknowledge the fine work of Detective Inspector Marc Hogan of the Gold Coast Northern Crime Group and his team. Marc oversaw the arrest of three criminal motorcycle gang members by his officers at Palazzo Versace on the Gold Coast. These were the first arrests under the Newman government legislation to crack down on criminal motorcycle gangs. I congratulate Marc for his significant work in this area, and I thank all police officers for the work they are doing day in, day out to clean up our neighbourhoods and rid the streets of these thugs. Clean beaches are associated with safe communities, and safe communities are supported by a government that acts responsibly and does not tolerate crime.

Asbestos Awareness Month



Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (2.37 pm): I rise today to bring to the attention of members in the House that the month of November is Asbestos Awareness Month. The catch phrase they are using is: 'Don't Play Renovation Roulette! Asbestos Awareness Month 2013.' That is the heading on a letter that I received on 29 October from John Jarratt. I think it is quite telling that in the first paragraph he states—

I'm writing to ask a favour and I'm hoping you will be able to help. You may not know it, but I'm an ambassador for the national Asbestos Awareness Month Campaign. Not because I'm an actor and not because I used to appear on the Better Homes and Gardens lifestyle program.

John Jarratt goes on to say that the reason he has become an ambassador is because he lost a great mate in Harold Hopkins on 11 December 2011 to this terrible disease. The terrible disease I am referring to, of course, is mesothelioma. Why am I bringing this to the attention of the House? First of all, it is Asbestos Awareness Month. Secondly, on 9 November I read with disappointment an article in the *Townsville Bulletin* that talked about a mistake being made on a document where homeowners have been exposed to dangerous, crumbling asbestos after an error in guidelines supposed to make houses and businesses safe.

Essentially, someone unknowingly changed the particular level for this material from a high grade to a low density. Why am I so interested in all of these things? My mother died of mesothelioma some 18 years ago. I see today that we still have a growing number of people suffering from mesothelioma in Australia. In 2012 there were 50 mesothelioma cases and in 2013 there were 57 mesothelioma cases amongst many others. The message I want to leave with all members is that there is no safe level of asbestos exposure. One gram is enough to kill. It may not kill you today; it will kill you in 10, 20 or 30 years time. Please, get the message out to your constituents that it is not safe to renovate and take the risk.

(Time expired)

Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, Report; Alleged Deliberate Misleading of a Committee, Referral to Ethics Committee

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (2.40 pm): I table a report of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee. In accordance with standing order 268(1), the committee resolved to refer the matter of the potential misleading of the committee by Dr Levy to the Ethics Committee. The resolution included the following—

- that pursuant to standing order 268(1) the matters concerning Dr Levy that the committee has been considering be referred to the Ethics Committee;
- that the committee authorise evidence gathered by the committee and the matter be provided to the Ethics Committee;
- that the committee report to the House on this position by way of a chair's statement to the House; and
- that the committee recommend to the House that the House appoint a select Ethics Committee to consider this matter.

Some of these issues have certainly been canvassed in this place over the past few days. For me, it is however regretful that this is the process that I as chair must use to report to this House on matters considered important and considered by the PCMC. It is a committee that has been seen by this House to have an important role and I believe over time it has discharged that responsibility as best as it can.

I would also like to place on the record my thanks to each member of the committee. Each one brings a different perspective and a different understanding and experience to the committee deliberations. Their work has been hard and concentrated, particularly over this year. I want to place on record my appreciation. Whether one agrees or disagrees with comments made, documents released or any other matter, I believe the fundamental value of the work done by both the CMC and the PCMC is not disputed. I would also like to place on the record the thanks of the committee to our secretariat—Amanda, Peter, Kym and others who have helped—and also to the Clerk, who has given advice on what have been, at times, very complex and difficult matters.

This place can be what was termed in times past robust. However, fundamentally we should be here to present truth, to present transparency as best as possible and to represent honestly the issues that are placed before us. As a committee—and I am sure the other committees find this as well—some of these more complex matters are not invited; they often become evident almost on a random basis. However, that does not make them any less important for us to continue to examine them as a committee and, in this case, report on, albeit in a heightened political environment.

Tabled paper: Report to the House from the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee in relation to a potential misleading of the committee by Dr Levy, in accordance with standing order 268(1) [\[4139\]](#).

Cleaning Up the Bay Campaign

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (2.43 pm): The Cleaning Up the Bay campaign run by Clubs Queensland is underway and is gaining momentum in Cleveland and Redland City. Last Sunday I had the privilege to be at the beautiful Wellington Point Reserve with three of the St George Queensland Reds who signed up to help out, together with CEO of Clubs Queensland, Doug Flockhart, and my Capalaba colleague, Steve Davies. The Queensland Reds players Eddie Quirk, a Redland City local, Greg Holmes and Jake Schatz are great ambassadors for the game, and I thank them for their support. It was a great community day with members of the local Redlands Sporting

Club, local rugby juniors, local sports karate and local Wellington Point families. Having the star power of the Reds players at Wellington Point Reserve was great exposure for the up and coming clean-up day.

The Cleaning Up the Bay day will be held on 1 December at 17 collection points throughout Moreton Bay. The Cleveland electorate shares a significant shoreline with Moreton Bay, so it will host four collection points. Two of these points will be on North Stradbroke Island, at Amity Point and Dunwich. The other two spots will be at the Wellington Point Reserve and the Cleveland boat ramp at William Street. At each of the collection clean-up points there will be a skip, bags and gloves provided for all the volunteers on the day. The operation will be on land and water, with people even committing their jet skis and boats. I will be at Wellington Point Reserve on the day along with the three Queensland Reds players and I will be ready to get into it. I encourage everyone to come along to lend a hand at any of the collection points throughout the bay.

I want to commend the Treasurer, Tim Nicholls, for accepting the role of patron of the inaugural Cleaning Up the Bay campaign. The Treasurer's commitment to improving our bay by helping establish this annual event with Clubs Queensland will pave the way for a better bay for us all to enjoy. It was an honour to be selected as an ambassador for the campaign in Cleveland. The role has so far given me the chance to promote the cause of improving our bay and river systems to keep Moreton Bay beautiful for our children and grandchildren. Living on the bay, playing in the bay, fishing or boating in the bay is a vital part of the Cleveland lifestyle. The local community is partly defined by its relationship with the bay. To be involved with a coordinated effort to improve the environmental outlook is important.

I commend the local sports and recreation clubs that have banded together under Clubs Queensland to clean up the bay. I would like to thank in advance the Redlands Boat Club, the Redlands Sporting Club, the Little Ship Club and the Amity Point Community Club for engaging the community networks to ensure that everyone gets out and makes a difference to the wellbeing of the bay. If honourable members are thinking of joining us they can contact one of those clubs or go to the Clubs Queensland website under 'events' and then 'cleaning up the bay'. Of course, I give a big thanks to the Queensland Reds for their valued support.

Mudgeeraba, School Leaders

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.46 pm): I rise to update the House on the great potential of our student leaders in Mudgeeraba. Throughout this year, I have hosted the school captains and vice-captains of schools from the Mudgeeraba electorate at Parliament House so that they could have an opportunity to explore and learn about this important institution. I was delighted that student leaders such as Ryan Hodson, Zoe Tully, Tristan Finnegan, Ellen Scott-Young, Joshua Capuano and Chloe Legg of Emmanuel College; Matthew Hager and Tessa Neethling of Kings Christian College; Spencer North, Holly Smibert, Liam Budd and Georgia Nicol of Robina State High School; Liam Rawson, Elizabeth Thomas, Darcy Morris and Caitlin Bourke of Somerset College; and Ben Oram, Jaimie Jaafar, Francis Wherby and Madaline Hartwig of St Michael's College were able to learn firsthand about their parliament.

The students began their day with a guided tour of the parliament before having lunch in the cafeteria and discussing their plans for the future. It was wonderful to hear of the impressive plans that these capable young people have crafted for their futures and the ways in which they plan to contribute to their community. Our lunch also gave the students an opportunity to ask questions about my experiences as their local member in this House and the realities and challenges entailed in balancing the needs of a diverse community.

When we had finished our lunch, the students and I visited the floor of the Legislative Assembly and they saw, many for the first time, the chamber in which our laws have been made for over 150 years. It was wonderful that, throughout the year, many of my parliamentary colleagues took the time to stop and meet with the students and share their insights and knowledge before the students took their seats in the gallery to watch question time.

In particular, I would like to thank you, Madam Speaker, for making yourself readily available on four separate occasions to explain to the captains and vice-captains the crucial and no doubt challenging role of the Speaker in maintaining order in this House. In addition, the students were delighted that the Premier, the Treasurer and the Attorney-General each made time throughout the year to meet with them and provide unique insight into the vast responsibilities of high office.

It was wonderful to have been able to meet with such outstanding young people as I was also reminded of the invaluable role that our teachers and educational institutions play in shaping the young lives, values and ambitions of our country's future leaders. We are very lucky in Mudgeeraba to have a group of talented, caring and experienced educators leading our schools and guiding our young ones. I thank them for their tireless service to our community. I am very much looking forward to continuing my close working relationship with all of my local schools and to continuing to update members on the achievements and successes of Mudgeeraba's student leaders.

Blackdown Tableland National Park

 **Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory—LNP) (2.49 pm): We heard the Minister for Tourism make mention in the House earlier this week about outback tourism. Today I have to mention that outback tourism is alive and well, but we are trying to invigorate it and encourage other players in the potential tourism market to take advantage of our tourism potential in outback and regional Queensland.

I had a representation made to me by a young man from Duaringa in Central Queensland, Dominic Stower, regarding the Woorabinda ecotourism proposal at the Blackdown Tableland National Park. Dominic has been attending a tourism conference in Brisbane this week and has been told off the record that he cannot start that tourism venture at Blackdown Tableland National Park because of its location. It is not in the national park or Woorabinda township. The unfortunate fact of the matter is that Duaringa, which is right on the Capricorn Highway, is adjacent to both the Blackdown Tableland National Park and Woorabinda Aboriginal township, and I think it is vitally important that people understand the geography of the country that we are working in rather than say 'no' before they get the politics of it right.

The real fact of the matter is that this is a wonderful initiative and one where the Indigenous people at Woorabinda, in conjunction with Dominic Stower, can take advantage of what they have there to promote Blackdown Tableland National Park as a tourist venture right on the Capricorn Highway going to Emerald and further west to places like Barcaldine, Longreach, Blackall and further out to places where many tourists do not venture because there is nothing there to encourage people to go.

I know the minister is in the House, which is great, and it is fortunate that one of the four pillars of this government's coming to power was tourism. It has been a great strength for many people in Central and Western Queensland, and it has been a great factor in promoting our great region. I appeal here today to the Minister for Tourism to see if we cannot assist Dominic Stower in making certain that we get this venture up and going, because it is certainly going to not only advantage the people of Woorabinda and across that region; it is also going to advantage the people of that small township of Duaringa with the opportunities that lay ahead for employment and tourism with their further flow-on effects.

I wish Dominic Stower all the best in his bid to get this ecotourism bid underway, and I will certainly assist him in every way possible to make it become a reality.

Alzheimer's Disease

 **Ms MILLARD** (Sandgate—LNP) (2.52 pm): I rise today to speak about a topic which is sensitive and serious in terms of its growing impact on thousands and thousands of everyday Queenslanders: Alzheimer's.

Recently I was honoured to join the Minister for Science, Ian Walker, for the launch of the Queensland Freemasons Senior Research Fellowship in Learning and Memory at our own Freemasons home in Sandgate. I applaud Queensland Freemasons for committing \$1.4 million from its Board of Benevolence, Aged Masons, Widows and Orphans' Fund and for partnering with the University of Queensland to establish a prestigious fellowship for the study of learning and memory. The areas of learning and memory are the weak links in minds afflicted with dementia which can deteriorate, along with the brain's capacity, into full-blown Alzheimer's. It is this type of research that is the source of hope that one day we may be able to find a cure.

I will shortly speak more on our government's commitment to this research, but first I would like to present the case for why we should target this illness, given the multiplicity of pressing health issues in Queensland. Alzheimer's is an insidious disease, known for its capacity to overtake someone that we may have known our entire lives to the point that we can barely recognise them but for their outward skin. Long before that they may no longer recognise us at all. Some have referred to

this as 'the long goodbye'. Beyond the personal cost, there is a social and economic price that we all pay. By current trends, more than 215,000 Queenslanders will have dementia by 2015, which will cost the state billions of dollars every year. In the Premier's own words—

If we do not conquer this debilitating condition, we will pay a very high price as a society because of its impact on families as well as our social welfare and health systems.

The good news is that scientists know the brain has a remarkable ability to heal itself, but finding out how to do this is a complex and costly task. The Newman government has acknowledged the crucial role of research—which has been vastly underfunded in Australia—if we are to ever find a cure for Alzheimer's. As a state government, our last budget committed \$9 million to research which was also matched by the federal government to support work being done by the Clem Jones Centre for Ageing Dementia Research. Importantly, this funding is being directed towards a research-driven approach rather than simply throwing resources at dementia and Alzheimer's care without exploring and addressing systematic issues. This funding will hopefully be a source of hope for Queenslanders across the state. Philanthropists in Queensland, including the Freemasons' fund, have also contributed a very generous \$2 million to this research on Alzheimer's, moving us yet another step closer to finding a cure, and I thank them for that.

As a daughter standing here before you today, I echo the sentiments of thousands of Queenslanders when I say that I miss my dad, and I wish I did not have to say that long goodbye. Standing before you today as an MP and representing an electorate with a number of ageing residents who are afflicted with Alzheimer's, we certainly do have a problem in this state. I thank this government and the federal government for the funding that they have given.

RACQ NQ Helicopter Rescue Service; Water Infrastructure; Mining Royalties

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (2.55 pm): The North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service's principal sponsor, RACQ, under the guidance of Alex Dorr, has fixed running costs of about \$1.23 million per year. The service also receives funding from police, ambulance and the fire rescue service on a fee-per-service basis, but this money goes to the owner of the helicopter from whom it is leased: Heliwest. We need the Queensland government to share some of the \$3.57 million allocated for night-vision goggles with the RACQ North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service. The rescue service should receive its portion of that \$3.57 million the government announced to buy night-vision goggles for six helicopter services from Mackay to the Gold Coast because the Mount Isa one raised its own funds to buy its own night-vision goggles more than 12 months ago at no cost to the government. So it would seem only fair that the North Queensland service should be reimbursed for those night-vision goggles purchased to the same value as every other rescue helicopter service in the state.

The government wants to revitalise front-line services, but this does not apply to north-west Queensland, because this certainly is a front-line service that has saved a lot of lives. In the past 22 months the helicopter service has performed 73 rescues and 60 critically ill patients have been airlifted. The workload is 75 per cent primary response—motor vehicle accidents, mine site accidents, station or property accidents—15 per cent search and rescue for the Queensland police and Australian search and rescue authority, and 10 per cent for interhospital transfers. Given its lifesaving workload, I would say it desperately needs some sort of assistance to keep going because it is in trouble at the moment.

I also need to make mention of the Royalties for the Regions program and the lack of funding for the Mount Isa project. I was very pleased that the projects in Cloncurry and McKinlay shires, which I have always strongly supported, will share \$6.3 million for three key projects, but Mount Isa missed out. This is the region which has delivered approximately \$90 million in royalties in 2011-12 to the state government, with Mount Isa's major miner Xstrata Copper winning Miner of the Year in Queensland's 150th year celebrations. A 2011 Infrastructure Australia report said the north-west minerals province is world renowned for its mineral richness, and its contribution to the national economy is best illustrated by comparing the export value per tonne. This region delivers \$1,391, but the Queensland export per tonne is \$208. It is an area that delivers great value to the state, but it is not being rewarded.

The government's failure to support the water recycling project that was partly funded by Xstrata means that the terrible drought conditions which threaten the viability of the mine at the moment make matters even worse. But this is a good, efficient program that can sustainably maintain our water supplies in the north-west and is a smart project that can be income producing for the council and pay back its wealth over the years.

Lockyer Valley, Flood Recovery

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (2.58 pm): I rise to make some comments about flood issues in the Lockyer. I just looked at the SOI index in the recent *Country Life* and I notice that it has become very positive, so I will be interested to see what the long-term predictions are again for this summer. Hopefully, it will be a wet summer without being a flooding summer. Forest Hill, Laidley and Murphys Creek, those sorts of areas, have actually suffered quite a bit over the last few years; Laidley and Forest Hill particularly, with two floods in two years, have been extremely damaged. Laidley had a lot of buildings and houses in town inundated with water and that sort of thing.

What we have tried to do here through the local government minister is add some resilience into the town. They are actually planning some levees and some better infrastructure locally to try to improve the area. This is a whole-of-catchment issue. The council has to involve the railways, DNR, landholders and the community. The whole community has to be involved in this. We require proper consultation with the community. We require the best design and the best work. It is not about blaming one another or working out whose problem it is; it is about actually doing the job properly. Consultation with the community is important. Then getting the engineering and the design works done properly is important. Then making a decision that is in the best interests of the majority of the people is important. Unfortunately, with all of these sorts of projects—I am sure that Madam Deputy Speaker Cunningham realises this from her time on the Gladstone council—you cannot please all of the people all of the time. You have to make a hard decision that is in the best interests of the majority of the people.

The SKM report highlights that the railway does not affect the area greatly, but a lot of anecdotal evidence seems to indicate that the railway does affect the area locally. Let us get the proper engineering work done. Let us ensure the levee will abut the railway line in the appropriate places. QR can then put the appropriate openings and culverts underneath the railway line to manage the water. DNR can then address issues so the water can actually flow through. A lot of the problem across the whole flood plain from Forest Hill right over to Glenore Road—10 or 15 kilometres—is that it is nearly dead flat. I am sure the Minister for Transport and Main Roads will realise that on Sunday when he drives up there. I have pictures of the Warrego Highway virtually covered with two kilometres of water because the area is dead flat and it takes days for the water to move. We have to have a whole-of-community, whole-of-local-government and whole-of-government consultation process to make that work.

Carbon Tax

 **Hon. MF McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (3.01 pm): I have good news for the people of Queensland. I can announce that earlier today in Canberra the federal lower house voted overwhelmingly to repeal the carbon tax. Those who supported the bill recognise that individuals, families, farmers and businesses are doing it tough. Removal of the carbon tax will reduce the impact on power bills. We should always remember: this carbon tax debate is more about the fact that Labor never had a mandate from the people to introduce it in the first place. In fact, Julia Gillard made it quite clear prior to the 2010 election that there would be no carbon tax under a government she led.

Despite the clear election result and the mandate Australians have given to our Prime Minister, the problem in relation to the carbon tax continues. The Labor-Greens alliance in the Senate refuses to acknowledge the will of the Australian people. In Queensland, fewer than one in every three people gave the Australian Labor Party their first-preference vote, yet the Queensland Labor and Greens senators are preparing to block the removal of this tax while they still hold the balance of power in the Senate. Senators Mark Furner, Claire Moore, Jan McLucas, Joe Ludwig and Larissa Waters need to stand up for the Queenslanders they are supposed to represent and vote in the Senate for the repeal of this tax. It is crucial that these senators stand up and act for Queensland constituents and give them certainty for power prices in 2014. Today as individuals, family members, farmers and businesspeople right across Queensland we call on the Labor Party to show they are listening and pressure federal Labor in Canberra to allow the repeal of the job-destroying, antibusiness tax. 'Electricity' Bill Shorten has shown he is quite capable of changing his mind when it is in his own interests—supporting Rudd, supporting Gillard, supporting Rudd again—so he can change his mind again to help rid this nation of the carbon tax.

The power sector is indeed a complicated area. It will take a long and detailed study to place downward pressure on prices, which this government is doing at this point in time. I repeat: one thing can happen this year—that is, we can repeal the carbon tax. We can remove that insidious tax from the records of this great nation and help put downward pressure on power prices for 2014-15. All members of the Labor Party in this state should be putting pressure on their federal leader to ensure that, when it comes to the Senate, the carbon tax is eradicated from the history books of this great nation.

Toowoomba North Electorate, Education

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (3.04 pm): I rise to update the House on some of the great things that are going on in the education sector in Toowoomba North. Recently I had the great pleasure of giving out over 500 certificates of achievements in the Premier's Reading Challenge. I thank Deputy Principal Gary Pascoe at Fairview Heights State School; Corry Pellicaan, the resource centre manager at Toowoomba Christian College; and Simon Flint, Principal of Rockville State School. The children at these schools had done a great job making sure they diligently read through all of the books so they could get their achievement certificates in the Premier's Reading Challenge. I thank the Premier for running the program. I also thank the teachers and parents, because I think they put a fair chunk of work into making sure the children got through the number of books they had to read. It was a great pleasure to be there.

There is so much going on in the education sector in my electorate of Toowoomba North. I thought I would give the House a bit of an update of some of the spending that has occurred in the backlog of maintenance left to us by Labor and which we have been clearing. The allocations are Fairview Heights State School, \$92,000; Harlaxton State School, \$123,000; Highfields State School, \$138,000; Newtown State School, \$160,000; Rockville State School, \$99,145; Toowoomba East State School, \$111,000; Toowoomba North State School, \$160,000; Toowoomba State High, the campus at Mount Lofty, \$160,000; Toowoomba State High, the Wilsonton campus, \$160,000; Toowoomba West Special School, \$88,000; and Wilsonton State School, \$160,000. The Labor members here should be absolutely ashamed that they left behind this maintenance that desperately needed to be done in my electorate. Altogether, \$1.4 million is being expended right now. We have just made available another \$600,000 to clear up some of the outstanding items.

I should add that we have had over \$8 million in Flying Start funding for schools in the non-state sector in the electorate of Toowoomba North, and we have now had close to a couple of million dollars worth of funding for the state high schools in my areas as well. In addition to that, recently released is another \$1.2 million for state capital assistance for a couple of schools. All of that is on top of the \$35 million we are investing in building the high school out at Highfields.

There are some great things going on in the education sector in my electorate. I thank the minister for all of the energy his department has put into making sure that not only are our schools nicely maintained and well presented but also they are prepared and ready for the future.

Health Services, Funding

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—UAP) (3.07 pm): I am disturbed by an article in the *Medical Journal of Australia* which states that the health minister, Lawrence Springborg, wants to silence agencies relying on funding from Queensland Health. I table the article.

Tabled paper: Document titled 'Perspectives, Building Queensland's human capital: the case for health advocacy', by Claire E Brolan and Jo Durham from School of Population Health, University of Queensland [\[4142\]](#).

It appears that the minister plans to insert into state funding contracts a clause banning those receiving funds from advocating for state or federal legislative change if more than half their funding comes from the Queensland government. What is most disturbing is that agencies will most likely comply because they fear for their jobs and services. Surely it is healthy that agencies be able to question government action which may be based on very sound knowledge.

When elected, Campbell Newman and this LNP government promised openness and accountability in government, but this new directive is the reverse. Queensland Health is placing controls on how the agency spends state funding and its other funding sources. This means that any project co-funded by Queensland Health and non-state-government or Commonwealth bodies will be subject to Queensland Health requirements and political priorities. And, as the *Medical Journal* states—and I agree—health promotion with marginalised populations is necessarily political. How will we distinguish political advocacy from service delivery? That will be a challenge. The directive will

silence state government funded civil society concerns about Queensland Health activities or constrain collaboration with other state based or national agencies able to raise public health concerns without fear of financial penalty.

There is a consistent pattern of this behaviour from the current Minister for Health on behalf of this state Campbell Newman government. The evidence can be seen most clearly in matters relating to the activities of the Gold Coast University Hospital and its CEO, Mr Ron Calvert. These were first raised in the estimates hearing by myself earlier this year. There has been a pattern of actions taken by Mr Calvert that are inconsistent with good governance, clinical excellence—in other words, a lack of clinical excellence, and that is what we need to do to actually make our systems better—and evidence on his part of an understanding of proven clinical management systems. He has actually taken them apart and destructured them and used overseas advice which has been shown to fail overseas. He is currently being investigated by a variety of investigators, including the CMC, yet he still has not been stood down. In fact, the health minister has stood by him and his patron, Gold Coast Hospital and Health Board Chair, Ian Langdon.

Today in a question on notice to the Premier I asked if the health minister continues to ignore all of the evidence, considering he immediately stood down the south-west CEO for probably lesser matters, whether the Premier will stand down Mr Calvert and formally empanel a full inquiry into serious matters that have had proven impact on unsuspecting patients on the Gold Coast. As a doctor I need members to clearly understand that these are life matters; they are very important. Whilst they may not be in their electorates, they can impact on their electorates if these models of care come into their electorates. To silence those scrutinising process and to offer nothing but silence in return is to admit fault.

Logan Electorate, Education Services



Mr PUCCI (Logan—LNP) (3.10 pm): It is undeniable that the Newman government has made the most proactive steps in developing the delivery of education services to Queensland in more than a generation. From cutting red tape, investing in viable programs and rebuilding our local schools, this government is ensuring that the failings of the former Labor government are not only rectified but positive growth will occur in the education sector. Recently additional funding was announced as we continue to clear the backlog of maintenance that is required to bring our schools up to scratch. Neglected by Labor, many schools fell into disrepair and reflected standards unbecoming of Queensland schools. Since the announcement of the school maintenance backlog funding, schools within the Logan electorate have received a culminated \$2,075,609. This figure represents every eligible school within my electorate that has been supported through our government's ongoing commitment to clearing the backlog, with schools like Park Ridge State High School receiving up to \$200,000-plus.

Labor took Logan for granted. It viewed the seat with contempt and a sense of entitlement. Whilst our students were exposed to dilapidated conditions and potential safety hazards, Labor continued to ignore our schooling community, creating a maintenance black hole of nearly \$300 million. The long-awaited maintenance funding from our LNP government is bringing our schools up to par and reflects the rightful standards that our students deserve. However, the school maintenance funding is not the only investment that Logan schools have seen. Through funding from other government endorsed initiatives, schools such as Yugumbir State School have received over \$18,000 to enhance tuckshop facilities. It is small tokens like these in conjunction with state-wide government initiatives that will see our schools physically develop to meet the needs of our growing community. Our government is actively shedding red-tape restrictions affecting our schools. With feedback gathered from principal round tables held with the Minister for Education throughout the state—like the one I held in Logan at Browns Plains State High School—we are receiving localised solutions to increase efficiency in our schools.

Schools across the state are saving thousands of dollars by using local trades and investing in their communities which, in turn, is stimulating our local economies and creating jobs. With a clear focus on our mandate to improve teacher quality, school autonomy and discipline in our schools, our government is wholeheartedly securing the education opportunities for the next generation of Queenslanders. As we edge closer to a new year, I eagerly await what lies ahead and look forward to continue working with our community to ensure the very best for all of the residents. Together we can make it happen.

I also take this opportunity to wish all of my parliamentary colleagues and their families, along with the parliamentary staff and their families, a very merry Christmas and happy holidays and the best for the new year.

Take My Seat Challenge

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (3.13 pm): It is hard to believe that viewing the world from half a metre closer to the ground can make such a difference. But after a few hours navigating Brisbane's CBD from the seat of a wheelchair, it has opened my eyes to some of the challenges and opportunities faced by Queenslanders who use a wheelchair. I recently joined members of Brisbane's business community, a journalist, a breakfast radio DJ and a Queensland Reds player in the Spinal Injuries Association's Take My Seat challenge. For a few hours I was chaperoned around the CBD by my wonderful chaperone, Wendy Lovelace, experiencing life from a new, unfamiliar and often confronting perspective. The tasks that challenged me most were the ones that I ordinarily consider straightforward and barely give a second thought. Trying to pull a door open towards me and then manoeuvre through the door made me feel completely helpless. I learned the hard way not to reach for my mobile phone in my shirt pocket whilst moving: removing one hand from the wheel led me very quickly in a direction I had not planned on going! The other particularly confronting aspect of the experience was the wide range of responses from people when confronted with two people in wheelchairs. Some people were very helpful and considerate. Others, unfortunately, treated us like we had a contagious disease and avoided us completely. However, I am willing to give the benefit of the doubt and say that in general we need to develop a better understanding of mobility disabilities.

The most encouraging aspect of the experience was the number of CBD buildings, streets and amenities that have been designed or modified to provide a positive experience for wheelchair users. Accessing the Brisbane Square council library was a positive experience. Many ATMs are now positioned in a way that provide access from a wheelchair. Some shops with steps at their front door have ramps available when needed. However, the further away you go from the CBD, the more accessibility issues you will find. When I look around Pine Rivers—as I have done from a new perspective in the past few weeks—there are challenges and issues that we need to address. As a community we have a responsibility to consider the accessibility needs of everyone in our community. I know the Take My Seat experience will help me to be able to better represent those members of the Pine Rivers community who do not have the luxury of only spending half a day in a wheelchair but for whom a wheelchair provides mobility every single day of their lives.

Sunnybank Electorate, Road Infrastructure

 **Mr STEWART** (Sunnybank—LNP) (3.16 pm): Today I rise to draw to the attention of the House the lengthy delays and unsafe road conditions that motorists are experiencing at the Logan Road and Miles Platting Road-Padstow Road intersection. These delays have reached such levels that the community has asked me to call on the greater support of the Sunnybank community to support a petition for immediate and effective change. With nearly 50,000 cars travelling through the intersection each day, as well as 16 reported crashes at the intersection in the last few years, the existing infrastructure is simply inadequate to deal with this volume of traffic. Inaction by the previous government is now having a significant impact on motorists. Year after year the traffic has got worse and worse and the previous Labor government promised and promised but failed to act.

Given this state's significant debt, I acknowledge that a major upgrade or bypass is presently off the table. However, I believe improvements can and must be made—and made in a way to maximise the use of the existing infrastructure by working smarter, not harder; by squeezing the best results out of the current roads; and getting the best value for money. We now have a situation where cars turning right from Logan Road onto Padstow Road queue back and block traffic travelling further down Logan Road. There are also a lot of buses now going through the intersection at peak times and there are also delays from vehicles performing U-turns. As I mentioned earlier, I know the government cannot afford a full intersection upgrade in this current fiscal climate, but if we target these three issues I think we can deliver some low-cost improvements for motorists and bus users alike.

In the past few weeks I have been speaking further with residents in Eight Mile Plains asking them to sign up to this petition which urges this government to undertake an interim upgrade and I have been overwhelmed by the level of support for the initiative so far. I will be hand-delivering the petition in affected areas over the coming weeks and I will continue to encourage the locals to get behind this push for change. As the local member for Sunnybank, I am working hard to ease the

pressures on the Logan Road and Miles Platting Road intersection, among other areas in the electorate, so that we are able to maximise the use of our existing infrastructure and get that best value for money outcome.

When parliament resumes early next year I will present a full list of signatories to my petition which calls for an extension of the right-turn lane for vehicles travelling from Logan Road into Padstow Road and for council buses to join Logan Road and Padstow Road other than via this intersection. I am hopeful that this government and the very supportive Minister for Transport and Main Roads will be receptive to these calls for change from the many motorists who use this intersection. Not only does the minister have such a passion for the area of Sunnybank; so does the Assistant Minister for Transport and Main Roads.

Townsville Electorate, Road Infrastructure

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (3.19 pm): I rise today to speak about how the Newman government is delivering on its commitment to fix Blakeys Crossing in Townsville. I welcome the fact that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads is in the chamber to share this. I will take a moment to explain to the House the significance of Blakeys Crossing to the residents of my electorate. The crossing is located on Ingham Road and is one of the main entry and exit points to the city and its northern outskirts. I think it carries about 15,000 vehicles per day. Up until about 13 years ago it was part of the Bruce Highway and the only northern entry point to the city. You would not have to point out to a Townsville resident where Blakeys Crossing is on the map. The road is renowned among locals as the road that goes under every wet season. This notorious floodway can be closed for up to six weeks each wet season, causing major delays for motorists. In short, Blakeys goes under with the passing of three angry clouds and, when it does, it forces all the heavy industrial traffic from the Bohle industrial precinct onto Woolcock Street, often causing gridlock.

It should also be noted that fixing Blakeys Crossing has been the often promised election commitment across all levels of government for the past two decades. In short, and getting with the Christmas season, Blakeys Crossing was the perennial chestnut. Can I say that this can-do Queensland government has taken that chestnut and will have it roasted it up nicely for next Christmas. That is why the member for Mundingburra, the member for Thuringowa, the member for Hinchinbrook and I made a pre-election commitment to provide \$24 million in funding to fix Blakeys Crossing. And yes, we are delivering on this important project for the community.

In fact, last month, the honourable Minister for Transport came to Townsville and joined my colleagues and me in launching the official start of the construction of the upgrade to Blakeys Crossing. The project will realign and raise about 800 metres of roadway and includes two new bridges, significant earthworks and drainage works. This upgrade will ensure that a reliable access to Townsville's industrial area is maintained during the wet season. This upgrade will also provide a very important link between the CBD and the growing northern beaches area. It will improve efficiency, capacity and traffic flow during the wet season. The project will be completed at the end of next year.

I am happy to say that we have now ticked off on two of three road projects. There was the upgrade to Blakeys Crossing, as I have mentioned, and also the upgrade of the intersection of Woolcock and Mather streets. I should point out that that project was delivered under time and under budget by \$1.5 million. It is another important project. Early next year there will be the commencement of the third and final election commitment to the people of Townsville and North Queensland, which is the signalisation and realignment of the Dalrymple and Banfield Drive intersection. These are three important projects that will be completed by this can-do Newman government. We are not about talk; we are about action. We are about providing infrastructure to the regions. I thank the honourable minister for his efforts and also those of his department.

Woodridge Electorate, Schools

 **Mrs SCOTT** (Woodridge—ALP) (3.22 pm): What an absolute joy it is to attend award presentations and graduation ceremonies in our schools at this time of the year. For the schools in my Woodridge electorate, there is the added pleasure of knowing that in the past four years there has been an incremental improvement in results, with many more students gaining entry to university, a greater number of students leaving school with vocational qualifications and most students having clear pathways for their vital post-school years.

Although I was unable to attend the awards presentation at Kingston State College last week, I attended the graduation of that school's year 12 students. And what a magnificent celebration it was. With a large number of family members in attendance, the students proudly received their certificates and with high emotion hugged their teachers, principals, families and each other, often with tears streaming down their cheeks at the thought of separating from their close friends with whom they had shared so much over the past years. These changes as they enter adulthood are daunting, but most students leave full of hope for the future.

Woodridge State High School has certainly the most diverse student body, with a huge percentage of students from refugee or non-English-speaking backgrounds. The principal, John Norfolk, has led his dedicated staff on an amazing journey where they have seen remarkable results right across all aspects of learning. As John has now been seconded to audit schools across the state, I want to thank him for the legacy that he has left and wish him well. We welcomed Mr Geoff Siddel to continue the good work.

We also farewelled Mr Mike O'Connor from Mabel Park State High School, who has been transferred to Browns Plains State High School. He has also led his team to accomplish great results for their students. Mabel Park State High School is a Beacon school, where students sign a pledge not to accept Centrelink payments but to continue on their pathway in education or training or into the workforce. We welcomed Mr Mark Pegrem, who will continue the good work along with the great staff of that school. Last Friday evening I also attended the St Francis College graduation ceremony. This Catholic college is a close-knit family and the pastoral care that this school provides is what sets it apart. The school's graduation ceremony is also always a very special event.

The issues we face in a diverse community where some families may struggle financially, where language may initially be a barrier, where there are some parents who have not taken a responsible attitude to the education of their children, can be a challenge. At times it is the teachers and staff who become like family and offer far more than guidance and encouragement. I implore the minister to ensure that these schools are not disadvantaged through funding cuts and are able to continue to improve their efforts to ensure a bright future for their students and the continuation of this education revolution.

Toowoomba South Electorate, Schools

 **Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (3.25 pm): I rise to continue the theme that was just shared with us by the member for Woodridge and to talk about educational developments in my city of Toowoomba. Like many colleagues in the House, over recent weeks I have had the significant honour to attend numerous year 12 award ceremonies throughout my city, including ceremonies at Centenary Heights State High School, Harristown State High School, Concordia Lutheran College, Toowoomba Christian Outreach College, St Joseph's College, Toowoomba Grammar School and Downlands College. I look forward to other junior and primary school ceremonies in the coming weeks. It has been most heartening to hear of the achievements of so many students throughout the city in the field of academic pursuits as well as sporting, social and cultural activities. I must admit that it is also most satisfying to see one's own child graduate at the same time.

I have noted during these ceremonies at state and non-state schools alike an increasing focus on the child—their development, their welfare, their future work experience, their study, their training and career options. It is always most important to recognise the role of the teacher and other school support staff as well as the sterling efforts of P&C associations and other volunteer supporters. I also take the opportunity to congratulate the Minister for Education for his leadership of education in our state and the significant achievements that he has delivered for school infrastructure, resource planning, staff development and, most importantly, student outcomes. That, Minister, is what we are seeing in Toowoomba.

Another rewarding commitment that any one of us here in this House can meet is to assist primary schoolteachers in the tuition of primary students on the nature and processes of the Queensland parliament together with its proud history. In that regard, I note the opportunity that I had to join with the year 7 students of Harristown State School in my electorate to discuss the Queensland parliament prior to their visit to this House in the very near future.

I also take this opportunity to make mention of the efforts of the University of Southern Queensland in establishing a new centre for agriculture and environment. Although the establishment of that centre has clear relevance for my department of agriculture, it promises to provide a great deal of support and contribution to the local Darling Downs region. Therefore, last September it was a pleasure to join Vice-Chancellor Jan Thomas at Ag Show to launch that new centre.

Whether it is preschool, primary, secondary, TAFE, agricultural college, university or other training education opportunities that exist in or around my great city, there is no doubt that now, alongside agriculture, health services and the developing resource sector, the Toowoomba education sector continues to provide excellent students and graduates for the future of our state.

Rural Fire and Emergency Services, Volunteers

 **Mr MALONE** (Mirani—LNP) (3.28 pm): I rise to give an update on the implementation of the Malone and Keilty reports in relation to rural fire and emergency service volunteers. As members would know, the Malone review was comprised of myself; Bryan Cifuentes, who is the acting superintendent for the peninsula; Andy Houley, who is the specialist environmental land management person for reef catchments; Mike Garrahy, who is the President of the Rural Fire Brigades Association of Queensland; and Ms Kerry Millard, the member for Sandgate. The committee has now been put in place to implement the recommendations of both the Keilty and Malone reviews. We also have a coordinator, Brigadier Peter Jeffrey, who is the Queensland support manager and operations officer for SES Queensland.

Just last week the minister and I signed off a further 15 recommendations. At a meeting next week hopefully we will sign off on quite a few more. The minister has given a deadline that most of the recommendations need to be finalised by Christmas and totally finalised by the end of March next year. There has been great progress in working through all of the recommendations and putting together the work behind them to make sure that it will stand up under strict scrutiny.

The other exciting part about my role as the emergency services assistant minister for volunteers is that we are working very strongly to implement the Emergency Services Cadet Program. We have opened emergency services cadet programs at Pomona, Inglewood, Hughenden and Hervey Bay. Next week I will open emergency services cadet programs at Biggenden and Childers. A couple of weeks ago I instigated an emergency services cadet program at Mackay. A more enthusiastic group of young people you have yet to see. It is really amazing to see these young people get fulfilment out of the emergency services cadet program. They can take on the Duke of Edinburgh awards working with the PCYC, police officers, the community, SES groups, rural fire groups, QFRS, VMR, lifesavers et cetera. Right across-the-board these young people will get involved in our communities and work towards being a very viable force when things do go wrong and we need these experienced young people to help out in our communities. It is really enlightening to see the way they are able to work in with the recognised permanent fire and emergency services to gain some real experience in their life.

Coolangatta Airport

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (3.31 pm): I left school in 1977, many might be surprised, at 17. A year later I started work as an apprentice aircraft engineer with East West Airlines in Tamworth. For the next 20 years I worked for East West Airlines, I worked for Ansett Airlines and I spent approximately 10 years working at the Coolangatta Airport. You would not find a person who is more enthusiastic about aircraft safety, airport safety and the arrival of people safely at our airports than this person standing before you here today. One can imagine my surprise this morning when, after three hours sleep, I woke up to find the front page of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* saying 'Plane crazy'. There is an article further in the paper titled, 'Flight fright stalling storm system', and there was an editorial that starts off, 'Is the Burleigh MP Michael Hart serious?' I table these for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents, including article from Gold Coast Newspaper direct titled 'Flight fright stalling storm system' by Andrew Potts and article from goldcoastbulletin.com.au, dated 21 November 2013, titled 'Plane Crazy' [\[4143\]](#).

Tabled paper: Article from goldcoastbulletin.com.au, dated 21 November 2013, titled 'Inspiring a world-class city is an art' [\[4144\]](#).

The articles allege that I have called for the installation of the instrument landing system at Gold Coast airport to be delayed. That assertion is completely incorrect. For the information of the House, at no time have I suggested the installation of an ILS at Coolangatta Airport be delayed. What I have, in fact, urged aviation authorities to do is to look at advancing the availability of

complementary technology that is capable of enhancing safety alongside an ILS at Coolangatta Airport. For those of you who do not know what an ILS is, what presently happens when an aeroplane comes in to land at Coolangatta Airport is they follow a VOR, which puts out a radio beacon directly off the end of the runway, and then they follow distance measuring equipment which allows them to see how far they are from the end of the runway. An ILS actually inserts a glide slope that the aeroplane can fly down. There is such a technology as RNP, which is required navigation performance, and I table an article from Wikipedia about that.

Tabled paper: Document from Wikipedia titled 'Required navigation performance' [\[4145\]](#).

That allows an aircraft to fly a specific path between two 3D defined points in space. That means that an aeroplane can fly down this path and intersect the ILS much closer to the airport. My major concern with an ILS at the airport is the noise that will be impacting on the people in the houses that are underneath those particular routes. This is another case of our newspapers, in this case the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, attempting to make the news instead of reporting the news and I condemn them for that fact.

Chang, Ms L



Mrs OSTAPOVITCH (Stretton—LNP) (3.34 pm): I proudly rise today to acknowledge Linda Chang, a year 12 student at the popular Stretton State College which is in my electorate of Stretton. Linda is set to study at one of the world's most prestigious universities, Harvard, after securing an outstanding near-perfect score in an incredibly difficult admissions test. Linda Chang scored 2,370 out of a possible 2,400 after sitting the United States SAT university entrance exam, putting her in the 99.9 percentile and easily surpassing the Harvard cut-off score of 2,100. The average score is about 1,500. She missed just one question on the test which 1.66 million people take each year with just a few hundred securing a perfect score. Being a perfectionist, the one maths question she missed plays on her brilliant mind. I quote from the *Southern Star* story in which Linda stated with humour—

I have thought about it a lot, but I'm not perfect. I make mistakes ... sometimes.

I was very happy when I saw my result and my parents were very excited as well. Law is such an integral part of our society so I thought it would be an important field to go into.

She will find out in April if her application to study at Harvard next September has been successful. She already has grand postgraduate plans. She said—

I think I'd like to go to law school at Harvard or Stanford which would be another three years after my undergraduate degree.

Linda Chang is without doubt a teenage prodigy. At just 16 she was accelerated through year 9. Outside of school she loves books and reads them at an incredible pace. She has read about 1,000. Stretton State College principal, Jan Maresca, said Linda was humble and did not tell her school about her accomplishment until months after. She said—

We looked at the results and thought 'wow'. We're not so much surprised ... We are however extremely proud of her quest for excellence and her achievement.

Linda lives in Stretton with her parents, who are both investment bankers. My heartfelt congratulations to Linda, her proud family, her proud teachers and classmates. I join this list as their proud member of parliament and I am sure all of Queensland is, indeed, very proud of our Linda, too. I might also add how proud I am of all of my schools in Stretton. I have attended awards ceremonies at Stretton State College and Calamvale Community College. Queensland is in good hands with all of our talented new graduates. There are still many graduations to attend and I am looking forward to sharing this special day with all of them.

LNP Government, Performance



Mr HOPPER (Condamine—KAP) (3.37 pm): The Queensland LNP often publicly states they are a conservative party which believes and values conservative principles. The public have been purposely misled by the LNP and hoodwinked into accepting the LNP as a conservative political party. I am here today to shed some light on this deception, thus exposing the LNP to be a neoliberal political force hidden under a conservative facade. I ask the true conservative voters in Queensland to listen and read this speech which I am presenting; moreover to develop an understanding that a vote for the LNP is a vote for neoliberalism, whilst a vote for Katter's Australian Party is a vote for traditional conservatives.

Neoliberalism has developed its political foundation from the writings and ideas of free-market economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman and philosophers such as Robert Nozick. The two central pillars which form the foundations of the LNP neoliberal ideology are the market and the individual. Heywood 2007 explains that the principal objective of neoliberalism is to cut back the involvement of the state in favour of the implementation of deregulated market capitalism, thus advocating for the market to deliver efficiency, growth and widespread prosperity. This is reflected by the Queensland LNP government advocating private enterprise over state enterprise or nationalisation. In simple terms, the LNP government believes private is good and public is bad. This is reflected in the LNP government's part sale of QR National and the deregulation of the electricity retail market and TAFE.

The actions of the neoliberal LNP can be associated with the individualism expressed in Margaret Thatcher's famous statement that there is no such thing as society, only individuals and families. This statement is founded in the legislation the LNP develops and implements in this parliament, thus tearing Queensland society into fragmented pieces to sell off to the highest bidder on the free market.

While Queensland citizens are struggling to keep their heads above water, the neoliberal ideology of the Queensland LNP throws them a how-to-swim handbook; thus it is up to individuals to stop themselves from drowning. I argue that the neoliberal LNP government does not believe in a traditional conservative society and advocates that each individual has to learn on their own how to swim in the unforgiving currents of the free market.

Unfortunately, neoliberal ideology has not only infected the LNP. It has also attached itself to factions within the Labor Party. On 4 October 1992, Keating announced the establishment of a major independent inquiry into competition policy in Australia. The Hilmer committee's report was delivered to the heads of government on 25 August 1993. It advocated six policy proposals, thus placing neoliberalism in the middle of Australian politics, where it has continued to infect the political thinking of future politicians. The evidence is clear, suggesting that neoliberalism has infested the two major political parties in Australia.

Katter's Australian Party was formed in opposition to neoliberal ideology, because we can see that conservative voters in Australian politics have lost their voice. We are a strong and ideologically traditional conservative political party and we will strive and endeavour to curb the neoliberal infection that has taken a stranglehold on our sovereign political system.

(Time expired)

Driscoll, Mr SN; Redcliffe Electorate



Mr GULLEY (Murrumba—LNP) (3.40 pm): On this historic day, I wish to speak about the former member for Redcliffe. Firstly, I will borrow some lyrics from a Ray Charles classic—

Hit the road, Scott, and don't you come back no more, no more.

Hit the road, Scott, and don't you come back no more, no more, no more.

I strongly condemn the actions of the former member for Redcliffe, Mr Driscoll, who has shown a complete disregard for his constituents who elected him to serve and represent them in this place. I fully support and commend the Ethics Committee and its report No. 139, which recommends his expulsion and fines for deliberately misleading the parliament and, by extension, his own constituents. I must admit that it would have been satisfying to vote for Mr Driscoll's expulsion, but that opportunity was taken away by his resignation before the inevitable.

As mentioned on previous occasions, I am aware of the sense of community that the electorate of Murrumba shares with Redcliffe, with residents from both electorates working, schooling and joining community groups in their neighbouring electorate. It is based on that commonality that I have undertaken many roles this year. I wish to acknowledge the pain that Mr Driscoll has caused to many in the community and offer my sympathy. From April this year, my door has been open to assist Redcliffe constituents and community groups and, as a neighbour, we will continue to actively support that deserving community until the next Redcliffe representative is elected. I believe that Redcliffe is a strong and vibrant community and will look back on Mr Driscoll as a painful, but fortunately short, part of its history.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the Premier's prompt urging to support the Redcliffe community. I thank the Attorney-General, who has visited the electorate on many occasions with me. I thank Minister Davis, who tomorrow will be visiting the Redcliffe electorate with me for the launch of the Talk Together Walk Together initiative between the Redcliffe Youth Space and Chameleon Regional Community Housing.

We need to do a compare and contrast between the respective LNP and ALP approaches to Nuttall and Driscoll. Both men deliberately set out to deceive. When the evidence became overwhelming, the LNP sought to expel our member, whereas the ALP shamefully recalled parliament and changed the law to allow lying to parliament. It is not so much the error, but how you set out to correct the error that is the measure of an individual and organisational character. I know which party the electorate should have confidence in.

Lastly, Madam Deputy Speaker, I wish to thank you for this year. I wish you and the parliamentary staff a happy Christmas and a pleasant new year.

Mundingburra Electorate

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (3.43 pm): This afternoon I want to speak to the House about a combination of two very exciting factors: one is the delivery of infrastructure and the second is better education. They come together for three exciting announcements in my electorate of Mundingburra. There are three applications under the state government's Capital Assistance Scheme and Building our Future Schools program. This afternoon, I wish to announce that the Annandale Christian College has been successful in obtaining a subsidy of \$665,000, which is the maximum amount under that scheme. That is to construct two general learning areas for year 7, including a language laboratory, a small group extension area, a computer lab and a covered outdoor area. There are some exciting things planned for that beautiful little school in Annandale.

The second announcement relates to the Cathedral School of St Anne and St James. This afternoon I spoke with the principals of both of those schools. In the case of the Cathedral School, I can announce the construction of two general learning areas, again to accommodate year 7 core learning, at a cost of \$575,000. There is an additional \$95,000 to construct a general learning area, veranda storage, covered walkways, provide furniture and equipment, and a bit of site works. It is exciting stuff.

However, the real excitement comes with an announcement that my electorate has been waiting for. The member for Burdekin and I share a great school, located right on the boundary of our electorates. I refer to the wonderful Southern Cross Catholic School, which my two daughters attend.

Mrs Menkens: It is in my electorate.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I am aware that it is in the electorate of the member for Burdekin, but I proudly say that the majority of the children come from my electorate, so I will continue to espouse it is as the great school that it is. It will become a prep to year 12 school, which is wonderful news. Currently, it offers classes to year 7. This is something that the community has been really wanting. There are some traffic issues that must be overcome. I know that council is working with the school to find the balance there. The subsidy is in two parts. The first part is \$5.058 million to construct three general learning areas and accommodation for science, two home economics rooms, a manual arts room, an art room, a temporary flexible learning area, IT facilities, et cetera. The second component is an amount of \$668,000 to create a pick-up and set-down area and to do some external roadworks. That is an important part of the project, because traffic is a real issue here. We must not let pass us by the opportunity to create what will be a dynamic school in a wonderful and growing part of my electorate. I believe the traffic issues can be overcome. I have every confidence that council can work towards that. I have every confidence in the future of what is a beautiful and dynamic school, of which I am proud to be a parent.

Motorcyclists

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (3.46 pm): Without significant community support, the police are unable to do their jobs effectively. Police rely on snippets of information provided by the public to compile intelligence profiles which may ultimately lead to the arrests of organised crime figures. Good

policing needs majority community support and goodwill. If members of the public lose faith with the government, they will be less likely to provide the assistance that police require to effectively combat organised crime. The situation will degenerate further into a them-and-us scenario, at times created for no good reason.

I fear the pressure from this government for members of the Queensland Police Service to get results has led to the wasteful and, frankly, unhelpful targeting of legitimate and lawful motorbike riders. It would be a great shame if legitimate motorcycling enthusiasts lost faith and decided not to pass on vital pieces of information to Crime Stoppers or the police. So far, the new laws have seen over 10,950 people sign a petition against the discriminatory targeting of lawful motorcycle riders. That was generated in just over two weeks following the passing of the first tranche of the VLAD legislation. The petition was presented to me when it contained around 10,000 signatures. I table this non-conforming petition for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Non-confirming petition regarding legislation that discriminates against motorcyclists [\[4146\]](#).

The police minister and senior police have met with legitimate motorcycle riders at Parliament House to broker some sort of peace deal and prevent some of the instances of what legitimate motorcyclists have been describing as harassment. The LNP has spent \$800,000 or so to tell motorbike riders they would not be targeted by the new VLAD laws and some members of the government state that they make no apology for being tough on crime. I note reports suggesting the police commissioner has indicated that inexperienced police officers were targeting the wrong people and that it was a difficult task to identify outlaw motorcycle gang members without their colours. If that is the case, the minister needs to beef up the intelligence and training functions to better combat organised crime.

Most members of this parliament would have been contacted by legitimate motorcyclists about things such as the raid on the Vietnam Veterans clubhouse, where Vietnam veterans were targeted; the targeting of funeral processions; charity bike riders being refused service at a pub; female bike riders on sports bikes being asked to remove jackets to expose any gang tattoos; firefighters being searched by the police because they look like bikies; and an elderly female bike rider being targeted. We know that recreational riders have left their bikes in the garages. I warned the government about the dramatic effect that this sort of crackdown will have on some small business. The turnover at some cafes is down by 30 per cent, which they attribute to the VLAD laws. I suggest the government takes note of the petition and takes a moment to appreciate the situation, without dismissing it out of hand.

Yorkeys Knob, Cruise Ship Infrastructure

 **Mr TROUT** (Barron River—LNP) (3.49 pm): Last week I was delighted to make an announcement in my electorate that will benefit a tremendous number of my constituents, and those in Gavin King's electorate of Cairns. The site of the announcement was Yorkeys Knob—a northern suburb fringed by tropical beaches and home to a marina that supports a large number of resident and visiting boats.

Over the years visiting cruise ships have moored well out to sea, due to their inability to access Cairns city via the Trinity Inlet due to insufficient depth clearance. Passengers from these luxury liners are transferred to shore at Yorkeys Knob in dribs and drabs on a small tender. Due to the fact that it takes so long to ferry them all back to the ship, these passengers were unable to venture further than Yorkeys Knob, where, at present, there is little for them to do besides stroll along the beach.

Cruise ships mooring off Yorkeys Knob will soon enjoy far easier access to Cairns following the announcement of substantial infrastructure improvements on the foreshore. Transport minister, Scott Emerson, viewed firsthand the problems faced by large cruise ships mooring off Yorkeys Knob, and our tourism minister, Jann Stuckey, later witnessed a huge crowd of largely elderly people waiting for hours in the afternoon tropical heat and humidity whilst the tender chugged backwards and forwards, returning them to the ship.

Thanks to the support of Minister Emerson, in April this year a working group was established to undertake a review of the cruise ship facilities at Yorkeys Knob. With over 25 cruise ships due to arrive next year, over 20 already expected in 2015 and with considerable time before the Trinity Inlet dredging is complete, something needed to happen. The working group's review identified and assessed ways of improving the current infrastructure to enhance the onshore experience for cruise ship passengers.

I commend the Assistant Minister for Public Transport, Steve Minnikin, for his great business acumen and for the way he helped steer the process for undertaking the first private-public partnership of this type in Queensland.

A government member interjected.

Mr TROUT: He is a legend. The result is that a partnership arrangement has now been developed between Ports North and Yorkeys Knob Boating Club which will see land and marine based cruise infrastructure works undertaken to effect significant improvements to cruise ship tender operations as well as public mooring facilities for small craft. Yorkeys Knob Boating Club will undertake the infrastructure works at an estimated cost of \$925,000, with Ports North providing financial assistance to the extent of 50 per cent of the estimated cost.

Ports North chairman, Brett Moller, said it was great and that with this agreement Ports North can work together with the boating club to fast-track, where possible, the DA approvals for the project. He looks forward to supporting the club with the delivery of this important cruise infrastructure for the region.

Andrew Tulloch, the commodore of Yorkeys Knob Boating Club, said the new infrastructure to help secure the cruise ships visiting our region into the future could be attributed to the work put in by the Yorkeys Knob Boating Club executive and management, me, and Ports North's Brett Moller and Chris Boland. He said the new infrastructure has been designed not only to provide an exceptional facility and amenities for the recreational boating population but also to deliver a truly world-class facility for the rapidly developing cruise industry.

Greenslopes Electorate



Mr KAYE (Greenslopes—LNP) (3.52 pm): The year 2013 has been an extremely busy year in Greenslopes, with many changes, from improvements to infrastructure as well as a couple of exciting new projects soon to begin. In the past year, I have been thrilled with a succession of announcements by the Newman government which will directly benefit the people of Greenslopes.

The Coorparoo transport oriented development will finally go ahead in 2014. Since 2007 residents have watched in horror as the old Myer building deteriorated and local businesses suffered, while the area became tired, neglected and rundown. Demolition of the old building will begin in 2014 with an expected completion date of 2019. There is a new buzz around Coorparoo and everybody is looking forward to our brand-new community hub. My thanks to the Premier for his can-do attitude.

This year saw another section of the bicycle veloway to Birdwood Road also completed. Mount Gravatt State Primary School can look forward to an improved pick-up and drop-off area, which should be completed by the time school returns next year. Every school in my electorate has benefited from much needed funding for their maintenance backlog. Two schools in particular are set for major funding to build new classrooms as a result of moving year 7 into high school. Cavendish Road State High School and Mount Gravatt State High School have received that funding. Local school students have continued to enjoy the additional safety provided by the flashing school zone lights installed outside the Cavendish Road High School.

The south side of Brisbane is home to several multicultural groups. It has been an honour and a privilege to join with our Muslim, African and Indian communities to celebrate their cultures and that we are all Australians. In 2013, I have met with schools, parents, students, P&Cs, P&Fs, neighbourhood watches, local businesses and other community groups to name a few. It has been a difficult few years but I am noticing new community confidence and a buoyancy that has been absent for many years. The people of Greenslopes are starting to see an improvement in the economy, improvements in their lifestyles and changes to the way our government is operating.

Changes to law and order to bring criminal gangs under control and to put more police into the community were vitally needed and in line with community expectations and as a result have been well received. After my representations, I would sincerely like to thank the Premier and the Minister for Education for the wonderful decision to transfer the spare Whites Hill State College oval to the Brisbane City Council to be preserved as much needed green space. The local community was very appreciative of this decision.

There is much more I could mention, but, unfortunately, I do not have the time. I am looking forward to what 2014 brings—more growth and change, but also more economic prosperity for the fantastic people of Greenslopes, whom I serve. I would like to take this opportunity to wish the community of the Greenslopes electorate, fellow members, parliamentary staff and, of course, my family a Merry Christmas and a happy and safe New Year.

Skills Reform

 **Mrs RICE** (Mount Coot-tha—LNP) (3.55 pm): One way to get the attention of a politician is to use a quote from a Roman statesman. I suspect that is because we all believe we have an affinity with them. So when a constituent ended an email to me earlier this year with a quote from an ancient Roman, I was particularly impressed. Admittedly, this constituent was criticising our reforms of TAFE. However, I was drawn to his use of this quote from the Roman author Petronius saying—

We trained hard, but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form up into teams we would be reorganised. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganising: and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress, while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralisation.

Petronius was right then and is right now. There is a time for reform—and there is a time not to reform. The most important question in all reform processes is: should we reform at all? Good reforms can only happen when you have answered this question correctly. When confronted with this question with regard to the vocational education and training sector, the Premier, the minister and I all agreed that reform was absolutely necessary.

Having made the decision to reform, one must size up the scale of the reform task. In doing so, one anticipates that there will be things within the system that are working well— islands of excellence in a system that might otherwise need reform. In VET there was no such luck. Broadly speaking, the core of the system had not changed for decades. While there were a cavalcade of reviews, no action was taken under Labor and the result was a lumbering Frankenstein of a system that would slowly become irrelevant when faced with the demands of the modern student and modern industry. Not only did we have to reform, we had to reform from the core.

The Queensland government has made a commitment to grow the state's economy and reduce unemployment to four per cent by 2018. To do this, we must boost productivity and increase workforce participation. By focusing our investment in training towards skills needed by employers, we will drive labour market productivity and realise the benefits that come from increased workforce participation.

In less than a year of government we established the industry led Skills and Training Taskforce, accepted the task force's interim and final report, and responded with a five-year VET action plan in June this year outlining how we will take those recommendations forward. We have set up a new TAFE—a statutory body so that government is not conflicted as both the purchaser and provider of training. We have established the new Ministerial Industry Commission of which, as assistant minister, I am chair. Small, medium and large industries will be given a voice through better consultation with government through MIC, which will directly influence the relative priority of every government subsidised qualification in Queensland—the key difference that other industry advisory arrangements have failed to deliver.

Perhaps most importantly, we are creating an effective, contestable training market which will build the sector's overall capacity and lift quality by encouraging innovation in service delivery, course content and training outcomes. As I said earlier, these reforms are not for the sake of reform, but rather, having realised how desperately the sector needed change, we have acted and acted boldly.

Bulimba Electorate

 **Mr DILLAWAY** (Bulimba—LNP) (3.58 pm): I rise this afternoon to highlight two great local businesses within the electorate of Bulimba. The first is Lanier Australia, which is located in Murarrie. Yesterday I had the great pleasure of opening their new technology and innovation centre. They had their staff from across Queensland, major customers and representatives from the CCIQ in attendance. Lanier was established in Australia in 1975, with beginnings dated back to the USA in 1934.

Lanier is recognised as a trusted partner by businesses and corporations who need smart managed technology services that will surpass their expectations. I congratulate and thank Mr John Hall, the managing director; Mr Joe Ciliberto, the general manager of sales and marketing; and Mr Joe Visentin, the Queensland state sales manager for their hospitality and invitation to be an integral part of their new beginnings.

Queensland is open for business, and Lanier Australia have confirmed with their actions of investing further in our great state with great opportunity that our government's policies to cut red tape, reducing the cost of doing business, maintaining Queensland's competitive tax status and speedier approvals that are growing our four-pillar economy thus creating jobs, do make this a great time to invest in Queensland, with business confidence surging.

The second business I would like to bring to the attention of the House is that of NOJA Power Switchgear, who are also located in Murarrie. I have had the great pleasure in visiting NOJA Power on a number of occasions—once with the Treasurer and Minister for Trade, the Hon. Tim Nicholls, and most recently with the Minister for Health, the Hon. Lawrence Springborg. I congratulate the entire team at NOJA Power but in particular the four founding directors—Mr Neil O'Sullivan, the Managing Director; Mr Oleg Samarksi, Mr Jay Manne and Ms Quynh Anh Le—on their continued success and award-winning business practices.

NOJA Power have been awarded multiple times. Some of the highlights include the Queensland Exporter of the Year in 2012, 2009 and 2007 and the Australian Prime Minister's Exporter of the Year Award in 2009, among many other accolades. It is without a doubt that NOJA Power have contributed strongly to the recent growth of exports in the June quarter of 1.7 per cent in Queensland, which was almost double the rate of growth in the rest of Australia.

NOJA Power are not only focused on the bottom line but have shown a tremendous commitment to their staff by signing up to the Workplaces for Wellness initiative driven by Queensland Health. On 15 October I joined the Minister for Health to award the first silver Workplaces for Wellness recognition in Queensland to NOJA Power for their commitment to workplace wellness. The focus of the program is to address the high rates of chronic disease in our state and support more than two million Queensland adults where they spend most of their time in the workplace. In a supportive workplace, with the right tools and resources, employees are more likely to make healthier choices, which leads to reduced risk and better health.

I wish both of these fine businesses all the best and thank them on behalf of all Queenslanders and the Bulimba community for their contribution to employment, investment and improved health outcomes.

PRIVILEGE

Ethics Committee Report No. 140



Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (4.01 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Today the Ethics Committee of the parliament in report No. 140 has exonerated my son, Ben Gommers, from all the slurs that have surrounded him over the past 13 months. I thank the committee for their consideration. These slurs resulted in my son attempting to take his own life—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Excuse me, member for Mudgeeraba. What is the matter of privilege?

Ms BATES: It is a matter suddenly arising in response to the committee's report.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Mudgeeraba.

Ms BATES: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Obviously you confused me with an IMS, so I probably did not make myself clear.

These slurs resulted in my son attempting to take his own life in the same week that this referral was first brought before the House. Defamatory, untrue and hurtful reports were perpetuated by Robyn Ironside from the *Courier-Mail*, and they were the direct cause of my son's admission into hospital. I put on the record that at no stage did Robyn Ironside ever contact my son or me as the former owner of the company Entree Vous. On 14 November, my son wrote in his diary—

2:30AM can't sleep. 8th night in a row I have had less than four hours sleep.

Yet another article about me in the Courier Mail ... I don't know whether to laugh or cry. This constant attack on all aspects of my personal life by the Courier Mail is again impacting on my mental health. How long must this go on? They want me dead and I feel like being dead just so all of this can stop.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, this is not a matter of privilege suddenly arising.

ELECTORAL REFORM AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (4.03 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1992 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013 [\[4147\]](#).

Tabled paper: Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes [\[4148\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. The bill proposes amendments to the Electoral Act 1992 to implement improvements to our electoral system. This government has been concerned at changes to Queensland's electoral system made by the former Labor government. These changes, made by the Electoral Reform and Accountability Amendment Act 2011, were implemented with too little consultation and consideration.

With this in mind, earlier this year, I released the electoral reform discussion paper and sought the views of the Queensland community on our electoral system and what changes could be made to improve it. Over 250 submissions were received in response to the discussion paper. I think this response demonstrates that Queenslanders are strongly committed to ensuring we have an electoral system that is effective and accountable as well as promoting participation. I thank those who took the time to make their views known through the discussion paper.

The government has reviewed and considered all of the views Queenslanders put forward. As you can imagine, those views were varied and sometimes conflicting, although on some issues there was clear community support for a particular option. There is strong stakeholder support for maintaining the compulsory voting requirement for Queensland state elections, and in line with this support the requirement will be retained. There is also strong support for maintaining Queensland's optional preferential system of voting, which is clearly understood by voters. Accordingly, this too will remain. Some stakeholders raised the possibility of increasing to four years the term of the Legislative Assembly and introducing fixed terms for state elections. This is still being considered by the government.

The bill proposes changes to the rules governing political donations, the public funding of elections and electoral expenditure. The government has decided to remove the caps on political donations and on campaign expenditure as unnecessarily restricting participation in the political process. The public funding of elections will revert to a dollar per vote model. Political parties will be paid \$2.90 for each formal first preference vote received by an eligible endorsed candidate and eligible candidates will be paid \$1.45 per vote.

The government considers this to be the fairest funding model as the amount of funding a registered political party or candidate is entitled to receive is directly related to their electoral strength. Parties and candidates will need to make their spending decisions based on an assessment of their prospects of success.

Minor changes are also proposed to allow a candidate to apply for election funding for which they are eligible, in place of their agent. The threshold of formal first preference votes for receiving public election funding will be increased to 10 per cent to protect public money being used to fund candidates with no realistic hope of being elected. The threshold is still at a level that enables full participation in the electoral process by candidates who have a degree of community support.

The bill also provides for annual policy development payments to be made in instalments to registered political parties with at least one elected member. The payment will also be based on a party's relative electoral support and will ensure parties can continue to engage fully in developing and shaping policy while continuing to effectively represent the community. The amount available for the making of policy development payments will be set by regulation.

As before the changes made by the Electoral Reform and Accountability Amendment Act 2011, the act will again rely on disclosure and reporting to promote transparency and accountability. In the electoral review outcomes paper, the government stated its intention to change the donation disclosure threshold to \$12,400, indexed annually for CPI. This amount is more closely aligned with the disclosure threshold currently applying at the Commonwealth level. Also proposed was a move from a biannual to monthly disclosure regime for donations. Unfortunately, during the drafting of the bill, it became apparent that the proposed monthly disclosure of donations was inconsistent with donation disclosure requirements under the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918.

Crown Solicitor advice confirmed that the proposal to move to a monthly donation disclosure regime would more likely than not be held to be inconsistent with the Commonwealth Act and to that extent invalid. I table a copy of the Crown Solicitor's advice on that particular matter with respect to continuous disclosure.

Tabled paper: Memorandum, dated 20 November 2013, from the Crown Solicitor to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, regarding Queensland and Commonwealth electoral acts [\[4149\]](#).

Consequently, the existing requirements in the Queensland act relating to the disclosure of donations have been retained and amended to increase the donation threshold and to align with Commonwealth requirements of the time frames for the disclosure of donations. The bill also amends the act to remove some existing disclosure requirements relevant to the caps on political donations and expenditure and to provide that a political party has complied with the act if it gives to the Electoral Commission of Queensland a copy of a return lodged with the Australian Electoral Commission in accordance with the Commonwealth act.

Providing for consistency in reporting requirements will promote certainty in relation to Queensland's electoral laws and ensure fairness, transparency and accountability are maintained. The amendments to remove political donation and expenditure caps, and associated requirements, and to implement new disclosure and reporting requirements will be taken to have commenced from introduction of the bill today. This will provide clarity for participants in anticipation of the next state election. Transitional administrative arrangements will facilitate the early implementation of the new fundraising threshold and avoid unnecessary duplication of requirements. The making of policy development payments will be backdated to January 2014.

Reforms to maximise voter participation are also proposed in the bill. Provisions to enable electronically assisted voting will be inserted into the act. The government supports offering electronically assisted voting to all Queenslanders, if associated security and integrity arrangements can be assured. In the short term, the priority is to make electronically assisted voting available on a targeted basis for blind and vision impaired voters and voters who require assistance voting because of a disability, motor impairment or insufficient literacy. Electronically assisted voting will, for the first time in Queensland, enable these voters to cast their votes independently and in secret.

In acknowledging continuous economic and social changes and an ageing population, the bill proposes removing the restrictions on who can apply for a postal vote. Voters wishing to cast a prepoll vote can currently do so without restriction and this change will make the requirements consistent. Changes to postal voting requirements will also be made to enable applications to cast a postal vote to be made online and to bring forward the deadline to apply for a postal vote to ensure voters receive their ballot papers in time to cast a valid vote.

The bill proposes reforms to enhance voting integrity. A proof of identity requirement on polling day will be introduced to reduce the potential for electoral fraud. The government acknowledges that not all voters will have ready access to photographic identity. A range of acceptable proof of identity documents, not restricted to photographic identification, will be set out in the Electoral Regulation 2013. A voter who does not provide proof of identity on polling day will still be permitted to cast a declaration vote. The Electoral Commission of Queensland must check each declaration vote made and only if satisfied of the voter's entitlement to vote will the ballot paper be included in the count.

In recognising the important information role how-to-vote cards play, the cards will now be required to be published on the Electoral Commission of Queensland website. This will provide postal voters with access to how-to-vote guidance while allowing greater scrutiny of the cards before polling day. The Electoral Commission of Queensland will also be given power to refuse to register a how-to-vote card that is likely to mislead or deceive a voter in casting their vote. These reforms will ensure Queensland has an electoral system that meets high standards of integrity and accountability, and promotes participation in our democracy through political representation and voting.

To clarify a few points for honourable colleagues, when the Labor Party was last in government it rushed through the electoral reform and accountability legislation. We have heard in the last three days particularly a lot about processes of parliament and rushing things and consultation. I might remind members in introducing this bill that the Labor Party introduced its electoral reform bill just before the last election. It was introduced at a time when senior parliamentarians from either side of parliament were devising the new committee system. We did not have a committee system where every bill used to be referred. If memory serves me correctly, a day before the new committee system came into effect, Paul Lucas, the Attorney-General at the time, rushed in here and introduced the

electoral accountability legislation, therefore alleviating the need for it to be scrutinised by a parliamentary committee. Not only that, when they debated the electoral reform and accountability act, which gave the Labor Party a lot more money than what they used to—

Mr Dempsey: Significant.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the police minister: significant additional resources. I remind honourable members that in 2009 public funding on expenditure for political campaigns was \$3.5 million. Under the Labor Party amendments, taxpayers forked out in the 2012 election campaign \$24½ million in public funding to political parties and candidates. In 2009 it went from \$3½ million to \$24½ million after the amendments they rushed through.

I thought it might be interesting for members to note that when they introduced this electoral reform and accountability, which introduced caps on expenditure and caps on donations, it was debated the day after the federal budget was handed down. The federal budget was handed down on Tuesday. The electoral reform and accountability legislation was debated on Wednesday. If memory serves me correctly, Gordon Nuttall was at the bar of the parliament on Thursday. They slipped it in under the cloud of Gordon Nuttall and the federal budget so Queenslanders would be distracted from the fact that they increased funding for political parties from \$3.5 million in 2009 to \$24½ million in 2012. What we are doing with this legislation is substantially reducing taxpayer funding for political parties and candidates in this state. Honourable colleagues will certainly see that reduction when the bill is debated early in the new year.

The other thing we are doing by referring it to the committee now—I suspect we will debate it early in the new year—is giving the legal affairs committee a good couple of months to look at this legislation, which is more than what was given for the former electoral reform and accountability legislation. The former electoral reform legislation introduced by Paul Lucas contained some of the most monumental changes in electoral fraud—I call it electoral fraud because it was electoral fraud by the Labor Party—in the electoral system at the time. We went from a dollar-per-vote value to recouping based on expenditure. Honourable colleagues elected in the 2012 campaign had an expenditure cap of some \$50,000. If you spent the entire cap, you were entitled to approximately \$26,000 back despite the number of votes you received. It was based on your expenditure.

I was the shadow Attorney-General at the time and I recall when Paul Lucas introduced this legislation. In the consideration in detail there was a very broad definition of electoral expenditure. If one has to prove that they have only spent \$50,000 on electoral expenditure, the next obvious question is: what is electoral expenditure for campaign purposes? I recall specifically asking the Attorney-General Paul Lucas at the time whether the A-frame that the corflute is attached to is considered expenditure or whether it is just the corflute. The Attorney-General, Paul Lucas, was so flustered at the time that he said, 'I don't know. Other people will work that out.' That was in the consideration of detail on a bill containing some of the most fundamental changes to our electoral system that this state has ever seen, and the Attorney at the time could not understand it. For the benefit of the toothpick-sucking member for Rockhampton, let me say this: he will go to the 2015 election with far more clarity and far less regulation, red tape and burden than he did in the 2012 election campaign, and he will thank the government for that.

A government member: Don't count on it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the honourable minister. I will not count on it, but I hold high hopes. The next election under these provisions will be similar to the 2009 election and prior elections where essentially the more votes you receive, the more public funding you will be entitled to based on \$1.45 per vote and \$2.90 per vote for political parties. So we are retaining the two elements of public funding. For some seats in Queensland there will be considerably less money. That is why the government is saying that we are saving the people of Queensland the amount of money that the taxpayer had to fork out under the Labor Party's legislative amendments.

Bear in mind that the Labor Party introduced this legislation just prior to the 2012 election campaign. I suspect, as I said at the time, they did it because donations were drying up. The Labor Party in Queensland were on the way out. They suspected they may have trouble at the election. What better way to make sure they had funding for their election campaign than to slog the taxpayers of Queensland and make sure the taxpayers paid for the Labor Party's administration of office and additional public funding.

Honourable colleagues will be quite surprised, particularly those elected in 2012, when they go to the next election at the reduction in the regulation of red tape. They will be quite surprised because of what they experienced in the 2012 election campaign with the Electoral Commission, which was

doing an amazing job under the circumstances with legislation that not even the implementers—that is, the Labor Party—could understand. Sometimes it took over 12 months after the 2012 election to get refunds to candidates and political parties because of the complexity around what was defined as electoral expenditure for campaign purposes.

There were all sorts of disputes. There were disputes in terms of what is expenditure, what is not expenditure and what is third party, because they had these ridiculous rules that candidates could spend up to a cap of \$50,000 in an election and a political party or a third party could spend up to \$75,000 in an election. There was a catch, though. If you were a third party what you could spend was capped. There was an exception, though, for unions in Queensland. Unions were not capped as third parties were because they did not fall under the third-party cap periods. We will change all of that. We will make sure there is a level playing field for all candidates, Independents and political parties in the state of Queensland.

Going to the next election there will not be caps on expenditure; there will not be caps on donations. Therefore, similar to a tax return, after an election candidates and political parties will be required to put in a return to the Electoral Commission. The return will be substantially less burdensome than what it is now because the Electoral Commission will make an assessment on the receipts that were issued for the expenditure on the campaign. Based on the number of first preference votes received, they will then be entitled to the financial contribution from the Electoral Commission once the application is lodged.

I am very excited by the opportunity that this legislation presents. I know the member for Gympie will be particularly excited by the opportunity that it presents for electronically assisted voting to be rolled out across the state, allowing those with vision and hearing impairments the opportunity to fully participate in the electoral system without the necessary assistance required currently. We have looked at jurisdictions around the world in relation to electronic voting. We would very much like to go to the next state election with some trial sites in terms of full electronic voting. However, I do have concerns with respect to some of the booths around the world in terms of electronic voting. Of course, when you go to electronic voting you do open it to the possibility of IT fraud. With 18 months until the next election, we would not want to proceed without discussing that fully and ensuring that all the ducks are lined up. We will proceed with the policy intention that we would like to see those booths operating at trial sites in future state elections. We also want to ensure that we will be able to offer electronically assisted voting to those suffering some sort of incapacity.

I wish to address the issue with respect to the disclosure regime. Currently, the disclosure regime in Queensland is such that if a donor donates \$1,000 or more to a candidate, they have to disclose that to the Electoral Commission. We are making it consistent with the Commonwealth electoral legislation, and that is where the \$12,400 comes from—indexed by CPI. We are increasing the donation threshold to that figure to make it consistent with the federal legislation. In the response to the discussion paper we also announced that we would envisage—and we have said it publicly—having a continuous disclosure regime. So anything over \$12,400 would actually be disclosed on a month-to-month basis. However, in the legal advice that I have tabled—and we would not ordinarily table legal advice in this House because there is a potential to waive certain privileges attached to the advice. However, I think it is important for the House to understand that during the drafting of the continuous disclosure regime we received advice from crown law that did indicate that if we were to implement a continuous disclosure regime in Queensland we may run into some issues regarding section 109 of the Commonwealth Constitution—issues of inconsistency—because the regime at the federal level is a yearly disclosure regime, not a continuous disclosure regime. Essentially, crown law advice is—this is the simple way to put it—that if the law about disclosure in Queensland is more burdensome than that at the federal level, it would likely be held invalid by the High Court. So we have taken the cautious approach; we have taken that out of our legislation. However, I would encourage the committee, chaired by the member for Ipswich, to look at that particular issue and the crown law advice. Our position is that we would wish to proceed to a continuous disclosure regime in the interests of transparency, and for the benefit of transparency I have tabled the legal advice so everyone can see what crown law has said and why we have taken continuous disclosure out of this bill. I am more than happy to keep that door open, depending on the committee processes, and to see if there are other ways around that.

This is about making sure that we have an electoral system that is of the highest integrity, one that costs the taxpayers of the state less money, one that people can rely on and one that encourages participation in the political process not only by candidates but also by those donating to political parties. It is about making sure that we have the necessary steps to get rid of the caps,

particularly for expenditure. I know on this side of the House we will have many very happy volunteer treasurers of our respective organisations. They will be very happy with the announcement and this legislation that will require them to do a lot less paperwork for the high pay that those volunteers receive! I think they will be very happy about that. This legislation makes sure that we have an electoral system that is modern and progressive and one that looks to the future as opposed to the Electoral Act that was amended prior to the Bligh and Fraser government leaving office in Queensland, which was all about what was in the interests of the Queensland Labor Party.

I thank people who have contributed to the discussion paper. Members will be able to see that our discussion papers are in stark contrast to those of the former government. We actually have Queenslanders tell us about these issues rather than just the politicians coming in here for their own electoral success and benefits and taking more money from the taxpayer. This went out for public consultation for a long period—back in December of last year and January of this year, 2013. The submissions were put in and then of course we responded to those submissions. Now we have the pleasure of being able to introduce this legislation.

I thank all honourable colleagues for their contribution and also those colleagues who made submissions with respect to the green paper. The public can have far more confidence in the electoral system going forward than they did under the Labor Party, which amended the Electoral Act for their own political gain. This is certainly not the case here. This will cost taxpayers less money, make politicians more accountable and will ensure that our politicians work for every dollar value per vote that they receive at the election. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (4.26 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (4.26 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 136 the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report to the House on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill by 24 February 2014.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 4206, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (4.27 pm), continuing: Prior to lunch and before the debate was adjourned I was finishing a quote. I will finish the last paragraph of that quote and then I will continue. It states—

The Law & Justice Institute urges you to request an extension of time within which to consider this Bill.

We do not see how your committee can claim to have applied intellectual rigour to its task unless it does so.

The last time the Attorney-General brought similar amendments to this House he asked for support for the government's approach to the response to outlaw criminal gangs. The opposition did not oppose that legislation. We certainly expressed our concerns about aspects of the legislation and doubted that, after it had the benefit of scrutiny by the courts, it would resemble very closely the legislation that had been presented by the Attorney-General. But what we made very clear was that the failures of the bill would fall at the feet of the Attorney-General. He alone would be responsible for its deficiencies. And what deficiencies we have seen so far, all in one month!

We take the same approach with this bill. There are certain provisions that are of enormous concern and we will be opposing those specific provisions. But, again, we will not oppose the bill. The Attorney-General will, again, have to take responsibility for the deficiencies in this rushed bill. It seems to offend the sensibilities of the Attorney-General, who appears to be quite sensitive about this matter. However, if he says he needs these powers to combat criminal organisations in Queensland, we will not stand in his way. What we will do, however, is hold him to account. If the Attorney-General thinks he knows more than the collective minds of the legal profession in this state, if the Attorney-General is unwilling to allow proper scrutiny by stakeholders, people who have been able to identify defects in past bills, then he must bear the brunt of any criticism of the bill. We will be watching with keen interest.

From the outset, we have offered our bipartisan support for an approach to tackling this problem in a calm and considered manner, to put our experience together with the experience of the government and members of the community, to come up with the very best solution to provide protection for Queenslanders.

The Attorney-General even asked for our bipartisan support for the laws, but then refused to even brief us or provide any information on what was proposed. What he was in fact asking was for blind support for something unseen. This is just posturing, Attorney-General, and we can see through what is not genuine. I will now raise the concerns we have with the bill.

I would like to now address the amendments to the Bail Act. Some of these amendments relating to the use of audio link and video link facilities are the implementation of the Costello audit to make better use of resources in the courts. Recommendation 121 of the Commission of Audit recommended that the government make greater use of ICT to drive cost savings and efficiencies in court operations by significantly expanding the use of video conferencing between correctional centres and courts for all bail, procedural and committal matters. A further amendment provides that where a bail hearing is being heard by the Magistrates Court in a district or division outside the one in which the bail proceeding would have otherwise been required to be heard but for a practice direction of the Chief Magistrate, that court can make any order necessary to dispose of the matter.

In relation to the next amendment, the explanatory notes refer to a decision of Justice Wilson in the matter of an application for bail by Michael Kenneth Spence. Justice Wilson found that if the show cause provision is to apply, the person must have been a participant in a criminal organisation at the time of the bail hearing because, under the October amendment, the onus was on the person opposing the bail to prove that the applicant was a participant in a criminal organisation. This current amendment changes that to merely require an allegation of that fact rather than proof. This is in keeping with the other reverse onus provisions in the Bail Act. Where it was the only part of the amendment it may be justified; however, the amendment purports to capture anyone who has ever been a participant in a criminal organisation.

The amendment made to the Bail Act in November was very clear in its meaning. It clearly referred to a defendant who 'is a participant in a criminal organisation'. That section could never be argued to have referred to a past participant. Because the Attorney-General got it wrong once again and rushed the laws through without the opportunity for proper scrutiny, that bungle was not picked up and he was placed in an embarrassing situation when the Supreme Court highlighted the bungle. Defendants who left criminal organisations after being charged, as the Premier told them to, were not caught by the provision. To cover that embarrassment, the Attorney claimed it was a grammatical error and said he would make amendments to fix it up. However, his amendments have gone much further than that. It is not an error of grammar; it is an error of policy. These amendments change the policy to apply to past participants in criminal organisations. They do not just catch people who were participants when they allegedly committed the offence and subsequently purported to resign; they capture everyone who was ever not only a member of a criminal gang, but a participant in such a group.

This provision has retrospective effect; not just from the time the original bill was passed, but since time immemorial. There may have been some justification for moving an amendment to provide that the show cause provision should apply where a defendant is a participant in a criminal organisation at the time of the alleged offence, but the Attorney cannot make an argument that his original provision stating 'is a participant' actually meant to say 'is or has ever been', which is what this amendment now seeks to do. This is a fix-up of a bungle, a mistake in policy, and the Attorney has taken the opportunity to go even further.

In its submission to the committee, the Queensland Law Society has made a similar suggestion. It said—

We are concerned with the broad nature of this provision, as there is no timing provision linking when a person was a participant in an organisation and when an offence was committed. This means that once it is established that you are a participant, it will always be the case and the presumption against bail will always apply.

It appears unfair that a person can be punished for behaviour which may have taken place a significant time ago, where no recent evidence supports the notion that a person is still a participant and despite any rehabilitation of the person which may have occurred since then.

We consider that these provisions should be time bound to the commission of an offence. We suggest that the provision should be changed to reflect that the presumption against bail should apply "if the defendant is charged with an offence and it is alleged the defendant was at the time of the commission of the offence a participant in a criminal organisation".

The Bar Association has a similar concern. The president of the Bar Association said—

Clause 7 has the effect of reversing the onus of proof for bail applicants for any person who has, at any time, been a member of a criminal organisation. Previously, s 16 of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013 was confined to a defendant who "is a participant in a criminal organisation".

This constitutes a widening of the provision. On one view the measure is contrary to one of the primary aims of the recent legislative measures, that is, to cause members of criminal organisations to dissociate.

Last month we saw legislation that sought to licence workers in tattoo parlours so as to ensure that participants in criminal organisations could not be employed in that industry. This bill extends the number of industries in which such participants will be banned from working. There has been clear evidence for years that certain industries have or attract an inordinately high number of members of criminal organisations. In the Criminal Organisation Act, introduced in 2009 by the former Labor government, people who were members of a criminal organisation and who had been made the subject of a control order were banned from certain prescribed activities. These included many of the industries included in this bill and in the bills introduced by the Attorney-General last night; however, this bill includes the building industry and the electrical industry. There has been no evidence that I can find that these are industries heavily infiltrated by organised crime gangs, and I want the evidence and so do Queenslanders. When the Attorney comes back for his reply, I challenge him to please tell the members of this House what the evidence is. What is the evidence against the building industry and the electrical industry?

A government member: CFMEU, that's what it's called!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that interjection. The CFMEU is a union, so once again is this purely an ideological attack on unions—which this government loves doing day in and day out? We have seen what has happened with the industrial relations laws this week: stripping back provisions, putting doctors and senior nurses on to individual contracts. We have seen what this government is capable of. Are these genuine provisions, or—the member for Ipswich said the BLF and another member said the CFMEU—are these targeted at specific unions? What I am saying today is I want the evidence. I want the evidence that there is a clear association with criminal organisations and gangs infiltrating these two industries. I am yet to see the evidence, so the challenge is for the Attorney to come forward and show the House that there is clear evidence relating to these two industries.

Even the Bar Association made mention of this in its submission to the committee. It said—

The areas of occupation addressed are: electrical licences; licences under the Liquor Act; adult entertainment permits; contractor's licences and supervisor's licences under the Queensland Building Services Authority Act 1991; certificates under the Racing Act 2002; permits under the Secondhand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003; licences under the Security Providers Act 1993; and licences and certificates under the Tow Truck Act 1973.

In broad terms, we understand some of the areas of prohibition to relate to the hydroponic cultivation of drugs, the sale of stolen goods, money laundering through betting and prostitution and extortion. The reasons for including the building industry within the regime are less clear than the other areas.

And that is from the Bar Association! I am merely asking for clarification from the government and this Attorney as to why the electrical industry and the building industry are now captured within the provisions. The opposition has a theory about this. The Attorney-General has a nasty, vindictive streak in him about any industry where trade unions have significant influence. I invite the Attorney to outline to the House the particular advice he has that the building and electrical industries should be included in this bill.

The bill also contains amendments to provide greater power to the CMC to conduct investigations into organised criminal gangs. It allows the CMC to give notice to require the production of documents, information or statements for an intelligence operation. It also extends the definition of 'participant' to include someone who was a participant in the preceding two years. Given the fact that investigation and prosecution of persons may take some time, this appears to be a not-unreasonable provision. These amendments strengthen the capacity of the CMC to dismantle the criminal groups by attacking their wealth and confiscating their profits. This is where the real energy of the legislature should be directed.

But the amendments to the Crime and Misconduct Act do contain some very disturbing elements. These relate to the capacity of the government to appoint acting part-time commissioners. Once again, this strikes at the very independence of what should be the most independent agency in Queensland. There is already an acting chair of the CMC. There are also two vacancies in the position of part-time commissioner. The Attorney-General has failed to fill those two vacancies in a timely fashion and has also failed to fill the position of chair. The acting chair was recently reappointed for a further seven months. This is a disgrace. Appointees should have security of tenure. How can the public have confidence in anyone who is reliant on the government for reappointment to their position?

At the public hearing on the bill we were advised that acting appointments are meant to be of a temporary nature. If that is the case, surely the appointments could be restricted to a certain period of time, such as three months, with no capacity for reappointment in an acting capacity. This would ensure proper steps are taken to fill vacancies.

We were told that these amendments are to bring things into line with the appointment of an acting chair. The fact is that one bad situation is not justification for replicating it. Reappointment of the chair on an acting basis also undermines the public's confidence in the position and should also have a similar time restriction.

But what is most disturbing is that the acting appointments are exempt from the consultation provisions, which include consultation with the Law Society and the Bar Association and the PCMC and requiring the bipartisan support of the PCMC. These amendments are typical of the LNP and its campaign against the CMC.

The thing the LNP hates most about the CMC is obviously its independence. It cannot stand that it cannot influence the CMC so it appointed its own hand-picked acting chair and then, despite controversy surrounding him, reappointed him for a further seven months amidst that controversy.

But the independent part-time commissioners are still standing in their way. At the public hearing of the PCMC with the CMC held on 1 November the chair of the PCMC, the member for Gladstone, asked the chair of the CMC about the filling of the vacancies. She said—

CHAIR: ... Mrs Judith Bell, her turn as assistant commissioner has ended, and Mr Nase is finishing, as you said, this month. To your knowledge has there been any progress in reappointments?

Dr Levy: I cannot say there has been any obvious progress, but I have again been in contact with the minister's adviser and he assured me that there would be an appointment made soon.

CHAIR: I have actually raised with the Attorney-General, too, that under the act there are certain functions with the CMC that you cannot carry out without a full complement of commissioners.

Dr Levy: I have mentioned that to his adviser also.

CHAIR: Do you see that as being problematic in the next—

Dr Levy: We will still have a quorum for meetings at the moment, but if we had to put out a public report we would not have a quorum, but there is no indication that we will be doing that this side of Christmas.

Despite this advice, there have still been no replacement part-time commissioners appointed. There has been ample opportunity, and I ask the Attorney-General if he might please update the House on when he intends to appoint these replacement part-time commissioners. Or is this bill just a ruse—an attempt to sneak in more of the Attorney-General's acting appointments who do not have to

go through the normal consultation procedure? The independence of the CMC is integral to the management of serious crime and misconduct in this state. The Attorney-General should stop playing politics with this institution that has proven to be so essential in Queensland.

The next amendments I would like to comment on are those relating to the restrictive management regime to be implemented in Queensland prisons for participants in a criminal organisation. Again, it is the very wide definition of 'participant' that causes concern. The Commissioner of Police has power to advise the Corrective Services Commissioner that a prisoner is an 'identified participant'. It is not for prisoners who have been found by a court to be such a prisoner; it is merely on the advice of the commissioner. And this is a mandatory provision. The chief executive must make an order if the commissioner provides that advice. There is no review of this decision—the usual review mechanisms are excluded—and that order stays in place for the duration of the prisoner's imprisonment unless the commissioner advises that the person is no longer an identified participant. There are no guidelines in place to assist the commissioner to make such a decision. There is no discernible way for people to disassociate themselves from a criminal organisation, which is the Premier's stated purpose with these bills. In fact, I understand that people have been posting questions on the Premier's website asking this very question—a question which has been met with a wall of silence. So this restrictive regime, which means a prisoner is confined for 23 out of every 24 hours, would apply mandatorily against any 'identified participant'.

The submissions to the committee from the Catholic Prison Ministry and the Prisoners Legal Service both refer to the lack of rehabilitation opportunities that would be available to prisoners under a criminal organisation segregation order. At present prisoners are being held under 'safety orders'. Those safety orders are for a maximum of 28 days, after which time they must be reviewed. It is the lack of opportunity for review that is concerning. The Judicial Review Act is expressly excluded. The only ground of review is the very limited ground of 'jurisdictional error'. There are review provisions in place for administrative decisions for very good reasons. No-one is perfect. No single entity of administration has a 100 per cent accuracy record. It must be recognised that errors can occur and there should be some avenue for review.

I now turn to the Bail Act. I appreciate that when criminal intelligence is involved there may be some complications. However, the Bail Act amendments require a defendant to prove that they are no longer a 'participant' to defeat the show-cause provision. If they can prove it for the Bail Act, surely they can have the opportunity to prove it in relation to these orders. The same applies to the truncation of the review process in the licensing provisions. The exclusion of normal judicial review processes must be a matter of concern.

One of the very interesting aspects of the bill that I would like the Attorney-General to provide information about is the capacity for a chief executive to 'order a corrective services officer to give directions to an offender to permit the installation of a device or equipment at a place where the offender resides'. The installation of listening or video-monitoring devices in the homes of a person on a supervision order in the community would ordinarily require the issuance of a warrant, subject to the usual protections that attend such an application. This bypasses those protections. I ask the Attorney-General to please explain to the House what systems will be in place to monitor those devices, who will be responsible for oversight and what reporting mechanisms are envisaged.

I turn to the Transport Planning and Coordination Act and regulations. The bill also contains amendments to the Transport Planning and Coordination Act and regulations to allow the chief executive of the Department of Transport and Main Roads to provide information from any transport information database to enable an approved agency to use the information for a law enforcement purpose. This would include information ordinarily held by the department such as details about vehicle registration, drivers licences or other matters that the department would hold information about, such as certain licences that may have been issued.

The explanatory notes explain that these amendments are made at the request of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, or ASIO. In reviewing its powers and procedures in preparation for the G20 summit to be held in Brisbane next year, ASIO has recognised a deficiency in its investigative powers. This information will be of benefit to ASIO not only for the G20 summit but also in its ongoing responsibility in protecting national security. I understand that the information will be provided from the chief executive to the head of the approved agency and a memorandum of understanding will be put in place to outline the conditions that will apply to the release of the information. The amendment to the regulations will declare ASIO to be an approved agency.

The Bar Association raised an issue which had interesting ramifications in relation to innocent people who are affected by such things as cancellation of licenses under the occupational licensing provisions. Its submission states—

In respect of licensed premises, the Bill has the effect of withdrawing approvals of relevant agreements (eg. lease, franchise agreement, management agreement) ... This will have an effect on third parties. For example, it appears likely that a lessor of hotel premises which has entered into a lease with a lessee who is a participant in a criminal organisation will have the lease effectively ended. Whether there exists for the lessor a right of legal recourse against the former lessee is unclear. It is unlikely. This and otherwise the unexpected loss of a lessee, licensee or franchisee may cause economic loss to innocent third parties.

There may also be a vast range of other innocent Queenslanders who will be caught up by these measures and suffer some financial disadvantage. What will happen where a wedding is booked for a premises and, the night before, the licence of the licensee is revoked, closing the premises? What will happen if a building contractor's licence is revoked and the 10 people working for him are suddenly out of work? I wonder whether the LNP has looked at these particular examples.

In conclusion, this bill has some worthwhile inclusions. It also has some very worrying inclusions. Once again I put on the public record that the lack of consultation by the Attorney-General is still generating great concern for people in the community. As I said earlier in my speech, the opposition will not stand in the way of the government in its preferred method of managing criminal outlaw gangs in Queensland. We offered our support to work through the issues to come to a workable solution for the people of Queensland. That offer was rejected. We are still prepared to work with the government. The problems of organised crime will not go away next week, so there should be a systematic approach to work through the issues in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation.

 **Hon. JM DEMPSEY** (Bundaberg—LNP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services) (4.52 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise this evening to speak on the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill is another instalment in the package of measures that this government has adopted to combat the criminal motorcycle gang menace in Australia. Recently I had the privilege of meeting other ministers from all of the states and territories in Alice Springs to highlight what Queensland is doing to ensure that our community is kept safe not just now but into the future. The other states and territories are looking to Queensland as a leading light in addressing the scourge of criminal gangs throughout Australia. Australian Crime Commission statistics show that since 2007 we have seen an increase of criminal gang operations across Australia by over 48 per cent. It has been left to grow unfettered while the scourge of criminal organisations has gone into different operations and networks. I spent almost 20 years in the police force in 12 different locations across the state and saw the pain and suffering that these criminal organisations bring to the people of Queensland. It ranges from a number of minor offences such as break and enters and stealing to drug offences. I have seen sons and daughters and family members who have been dragged through the gutter after being introduced to drugs, whether it be amphetamines, ice or other drugs right across the broad spectrum.

It is naïve for the opposition to think that these criminal organisations do not have their tentacles in some of the simple offences committed in our neighbourhoods on a daily basis. These types of offences—these break and enters, these minor assaults, these drug offences—lead to what these criminal gangs are: parasites that prey on the most vulnerable people in our community because they are motivated by one measure, and that is to get money from illegal gains. They are not like the 99 per cent of Queenslanders who go about their lives in a legitimate way by getting a job and earning money so that their families can live, work and play and do what every other Queenslanders aspires to—the honest way, the right way. No. They want to peddle their manifestations on the community and inflict their pain and suffering.

Queensland has certainly had enough. The bill before the House tonight sends a clear message that criminal gangs can run and hide and change their markings, but it will not matter because all of the forces that Queensland has will come their way. I thank the Attorney-General and his staff for preparing this bill over the last weeks so it can come before this House to send a clear message that these vermin have no place on our streets. We are a can-do government and will ensure that we have legislation and enforcement practices in place to fight these criminal gangs that have been able to get their claws into the Queensland community over the last 40 years and that have somehow been able to bring some form of normality and legitimacy to their illegal operations.

Legal operators—people doing the right thing—and legal motorcycle groups and enthusiasts have nothing to worry about with this bill. It really does send a message when Labor Party members come in here and support the bill while on their Facebook and Twitter accounts they undermine the work—

A government member: Two-faced.

Mr DEMPSEY: It is two-faced and it is hypocritical to say one thing in this House and then spread a whole different message in the community. It is almost like the drunk on a barstool who will say anything to stay in the conversation for the sake of popularity. The reality is that government has to make tough decisions, and these are tough decisions. However, these are decisions that will help the safety of many generations to come. I as the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and all other members on this side of the House understand the importance of ensuring that this legislation strikes at the heart of these criminal gang organisations.

I also want to recap on some of the other measures that the government has already introduced to combat organised criminal gangs, because we have seen results from figures as recent as Wednesday, 20 November this year. Criminal motorcycle gang statistics show that 302 CMG participants and associates were charged with over 630 offences to date, 99 search warrants have been executed and 132 traffic infringement notices issued. Some 466 CMG related reports have gone to Crimestoppers since 1 October this year alone. I want to mention the great work that Crimestoppers is achieving. It has never seen this amount of community support to rid our streets and our neighbourhoods of these vermin. That is vital and I do encourage people to continue to ensure that we get rid of these criminal gangs, because at the end of the day police are only as good as the information they receive. Working together as a community to ensure that these laws are enforced will be a significant step to show what Queensland is all about going forward—a great and a safe state with great opportunity. I want to give recognition to and thank Deputy Commissioner Brett Pointing as the commander of Operation Resolute, Task Force Maxima commander Detective Superintendent Mick Niland, and Task Force Takeback commander Superintendent Jim Keogh—a great team.

From a portfolio sense we are making sure that we get the best of the best for these task force operations. I know that these officers are very passionate about the work they do. But they are going to go about their work in a legal, legitimate way, backed up by legislation introduced into this House that supports their effort to get these vermin off our streets. As we have said, enough is enough. We will do everything in our power in a legislative way to ensure that we meet the expectations of the people of Queensland.

As I said before, we have introduced legislation to strike a major blow in the fight through the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. This bill creates new offences in the Criminal Code targeting members of criminal organisations. The provisions of this legislation prohibit members of criminal motorcycle gangs from meeting in groups, attending certain places or promoting or recruiting for their organisation. This legislation imposes severe penalties for these offences—a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment with a mandatory minimum period of six months imprisonment.

There have been a number of changes through the introduction of legislation, but the emphasis is making sure that we have legislation that supports the expectations of the community. The people of Queensland asked this government to get tough on crime and to make our streets safe. We listened to the people of Queensland. We enacted legislation. We gave police the resources—1,100 new police officers over the next four years, a new helicopter for the Gold Coast and another one coming on line in the coming months. We made sure that police received new equipment right across-the-board. We conducted the Keelty review. As well, I would like to thank the commissioner for conducting his own internal review to make sure that we have a fast, active but also forceful Police Service that is able to be proactive in its fight against crime across the whole of the state. These operations are not just confined to the south-east; they are spread right across the length and breadth of Queensland.

Labor wants to go soft on crime. For the past 15 years it has had a track record of not stepping up to the mark. That has resulted in the numbers that we have in the House today. We have a shadow minister who voted against increasing the penalties for assaults on police officers. Over past years, there have been nearly 3,000 assaults on police officers. We have seen a reduction in that number, but there is more work to be done and we are going to continue to drive down that number.

 **Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (5.02 pm): It is such a pleasure to follow the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services. I say that for the very reason that to combat organised crime you need to adopt a holistic approach. You need the police minister and you need the Attorney-General pulling in the same direction. You need them to be leading the government down a path where we get results, not as happened in past years where we were flip-flopping around and not entirely sure whether there was organised crime out there and for there to be major events before we did anything. It is a pleasure to stand here and know that the approach that we are taking is bringing about results.

The reality of life is that we know that there is a problem. For the purposes of the record, let us understand exactly where we are right at this moment. For the past five or six years our newspapers and our internet sites have been littered with stories of incidents involving not only criminal organisations but also organisations operating under the guise of bikie gangs. That is the reality. What do we have to do? Every bill we introduce has to adopt a holistic approach. We have to recite the reasons for why we are doing this, but we will do that, because it is important for Queenslanders to join us on this journey to get into the psyche of organised crime and make sure that we do something about it.

A murder occurred at Sydney airport. There have been drive-by shootings and gangland style murders. In Queensland, the Broadbeach incident was followed by the Southport stand-off, where the bikie gangs decided to confront police officers who were going about their lawful duties. Nobby Beach happens to be a place that I frequent regularly. An incident occurred there no more than about 30 feet from where I am on some weekends when not in my electorate, which involved the throwing of stools.

Mr Hart: You'll have to call in and say hello in my electorate.

Mr BERRY: Hugo's is my restaurant. Michael can come and join me sometime.

The reality is that we know what the problem is. It seems that we are at a difference. The contrast is how we perceive the action to be undertaken. The government's message is clear. I contrast that with the actions of the previous government. Although the same evidence was available, it just did not cut the mustard. It just did not front up. I might just say that it might come down to attitude, because the Leader of the Opposition felt affronted by the fact that I said that there is a link between some unions—and I think it was mentioned in Victoria—and extortion, standover tactics and organised crime. I need only go as far as the *Age* in Victoria and recite some of the article that appeared in that paper, because it is so pertinent as to why we are speaking today on this bill. This bill is the second of a tranche of legislation. Personally, in my view it is more holistic. If we look at the way we tackle organised crime, we see that it cannot be done just on one front. There needs to be a combination of effort to create a rolling effect. I think that perhaps through this bill we could identify participants who have started moving their assets to other areas. That is going to be the next problem that we are going to have to face. We are going to track down these people, find them and figuratively cut off their heads. The article states—

A senior Comanchero and two other members of the outlaw bikie club barged into the family home of one of Australia's leading builders in a suspected standover attempt to force the construction firm owner to pay a disputed debt.

I think that is newspaper talk for extortion. The article continues—

Master Builders Association federal vice-president Trevor Evans was at his suburban Melbourne home when the bikie trio, led by Comanchero sergeant-at-arms Norm Meyer, entered his house through an unlocked door and confronted him over money that a subcontractor claims he is owed.

Dramatic vision of what police have labelled an extortion attempt was recorded on CCTV cameras and has been obtained by Fairfax Media, prompting the Napthine government to say it was 'gravely concerned' about alleged infiltration of the building industry by 'criminal elements'.

The article goes on to state—

The head of Victoria Police's anti-bikie taskforce Echo

So they are doing things parallel to what we doing—

Mr Rickuss: Are they echoing our legislation?

Mr BERRY: No, in fact, they are not because we are ahead of their legislation. The member will find that other states will follow us. I will explain in a while as to why that may occur. I will continue to read the article, because it becomes more salient as to why the Leader of the Opposition is really just not on point in respect of this issue. You need to think beyond the square. You need to think laterally about how to tackle this problem. The article goes on to state—

That case and Mr Evans' story highlight the role of organised crime in the building industry and the difficulty that police and regulatory agencies have in confronting it. In both cases, the victims of the alleged standover tactics were disappointed with aspects of the policing response, having also been told that agencies such as the federal government's building commission were powerless to deal with criminality in the industry.

The article goes on to state—

Superintendent De Santo said Meyer—who is the enforcer for the club's Williamstown chapter—worked in the building industry and was a member of construction union the CFMEU. Fairfax Media has also obtained a photo of the bikie near the front of last month's CFMEU rally on workplace safety

How ironic! The position is that this bill is ahead of the game. It is getting at unexplained wealth. We know how difficult it is. It must be difficult because the last government's tranche of legislation attempting to account for unexplained wealth unfortunately came to a dismal end. It was not sufficient to tackle organised crime. It is a moving beast. It is one that creates havoc. We know the implications. We know how easy it is to make ecstasy, ice and other illicit drugs and the devastation it causes to our children, our families, our friends, when we find that they become addicted at young ages or, in fact, take adulterated illegal substances and end up dying. We have heard the stories. We hear them at Christmas time. This is a serious matter, one that needs to be addressed and addressed quite firmly.

Quite frankly, I can only restate—and I need to restate it because it has simply not been absorbed by the opposition—that this is serious. We need to tackle it and we need to be innovative. The position is that this ramping up of the penalties is the only basis upon which parliament is able to do anything about it. The main weapon we have besides police and intelligence is deterrence—that is, to make an organised crime member think very seriously as to how he conducts his operation because, with DFAT and the fact that cash is becoming more difficult with which to deal and the fact that we have ramped up in our first term of government the unexplained wealth laws, we are now in a position where this multipronged approach is going to work because it involves many factors.

The other factor, of course, is to prevent these people from getting into legitimate businesses. Let me give an example. Recently a constituent of mine approached me and said that his friend had attempted to open up a tattoo parlour. It was not in Ipswich. He received a friendly telephone call to say that he will not open up a tattoo parlour, that there are only two tattoo parlours in this place and there is not room for a third one. It was said to him in such a way, with such a threatening use of words, that the message to him was very clear: if he wanted to stay alive and in one piece he will go to another industry. That is the extortion that I believe the Leader of the Opposition was talking about. It permeates our lives from day-to-day.

I am sorry that my words will not resonate in the Leader of the Opposition's ears. I was particularly interested in talking with her because one thing that disappoints me very much is the fact that our committee worked diligently to hold a public briefing. I do thank my colleagues for the frankness and robustness with which we discussed this. One thing that concerns me is that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned a public hearing. We did not issue any direction about a public hearing. It was not mentioned outside our committee so how does the Leader of the Opposition know? I challenge the member for Rockhampton to come here and tell us how the Leader of the Opposition knows that we discussed a public hearing. That is what I want to hear. I am putting the challenge down now that that happen. It would be great to go to a meeting and find out that we have some sense of solidarity. So far I have praised the member for Rockhampton because he has contributed. We thank him for his contribution. But it would be nice to be at a meeting and to know that that solidarity as part of the meeting process would be honoured.

The remedies which this second tranche of legislation involves is about intelligence and funding the organisation. For instance, the bill refers to the CMC playing a part. For that part, \$7 million will be given to it. This does not sound to me like a government that wants to undermine the CMC. It is, in fact, the position that the CMC is a front-line service. We need for it to be effective and operating at world's best. We need for it to be at the front line with the police to combat this increasing scourge, this cesspool of crime. I will take a few words from the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services when he said that the majority of people, 99.9 per cent of people, are making a living honestly. They pay their taxes. They expect government to be at the front working hard on their behalf. This challenge that we have before us does not have only one facet. It requires the discipline of government to undertake this task. It also requires the resilience of the community to join us on this journey. It is a never-ending journey. Do we expect ever to rid ourselves of organised crime? Of course not, but we have to be attacking it when every tentacle is out there trying to usurp our community values, corrupting our young children and gathering illicit funds which they can then use to extend their tentacles into other ventures. Quite frankly, the concern that we have right now is the infiltration of organised crime into legitimate businesses. It makes it very hard for the unexplained wealth laws to work effectively if, in fact, criminal organisations are buying businesses to legitimise dirty money into clean—to launder at will. That is the challenge for us here today. How else do you do it? We have passed the unexplained wealth laws but that cannot do it alone. It is a very expensive procedure. Those tentacles need to be identified and tracked down.

The second prong that we have implemented in the last few months is the identification of participants—that virus, that scourge—to keep them away from our legitimate businesses. Are there going to be episodes where people may be disappointed? There may well be. It may be that the lawyers will need to build into their leases provisions for identified participants and what happens on those occasions. That is something for them. I am sure that they will respond to the challenge.

I make one slight departure from debate on the bill to thank Mr David Ford and Louise for making themselves available in the short time that we had available and assisting us by clarifying some of these matters. I thank them all for that participation. I also thank my team. Quite frankly, we are working as a team and we have robust and frank discussions. I have views and sometimes my views are not necessarily accepted by others. I reflect on that. I have my moments, but I like to be at a meeting where it is robust and where I am challenged and I change my mind on certain matters.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr BERRY: I can tell the member for Lockyer that that does not happen often, though. I do enjoy that process, because that is what parliament is all about: robustness, ideas and debate. We are very concerned with the way organised crime has infiltrated our society. We need innovative measures. As I said at the outset, it is my belief that, in fact, other states will follow our example. Since I have been in this place, I have noticed legislation from the previous government actually followed legislation of other innovative states such as Western Australia and the Northern Territory with the unexplained wealth laws, as I remember it. They are innovative, the legislation is thought about and they are making inroads. The data is on the table. They are moving. We did not necessarily go as hard as the Northern Territory, but it was measured and we can certainly ramp it up again if we need to.

The fact is that we need to track down and hunt these criminals so that we are not involving our society with this ongoing problem of illicit drugs, where seemingly wealthy people are preying on others. It is for us in this place to take steps that are reasonable. Deterrence is the main arm coupled with intelligence, which I believe is just as important, because, quite frankly, we need the covert operations. We need to know who are their associates. We need to know how they work and how they permeate legitimate society. We need to recognise them and expose them. Quite frankly, the measures in this bill do ramp it up. We are now at the coalface of all state legislation. We are at a place where, I believe, Australia will be in the next few years. The unfortunate part about our legislation is that if we become really effective, they will move to another state. If that other state does not ramp up its legislation, it will be subjected to the organised crime that we have scourged from our society. That is for them to do. We are leading the way and we will probably be in the third tranche by the time the other states catch up.

I thank the members of the secretariat: Brook Hastie, Ali Jarro, Greg Thomson, Gail Easton, Renee Easten, Marissa Kerr and Karl Holding. Quite frankly, what they have done in the past three days has been fantastic. Brook was up til 4 am this morning. We had a meeting at eight o'clock and we got this done. I congratulate them for the hard job they did. I support the Attorney-General's bill. We should keep going with this journey. We need to make sure that we keep up the challenge. I feel so exulted to be here, speaking to such an important bill. I think it is important.

(Time expired)

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (5.22 pm): Today I rise to speak to the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. I shall start where my colleague and committee chair, the member for Ipswich, left off. I congratulate and thank the very hardworking secretariat of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. We have been a very busy committee generally, as the House is no doubt aware. A unique challenge was presented to our committee and we stepped up. We accepted the challenge and we performed our duties in what I believe was an exemplary manner. I have no doubt that the reason for that was the great work of the committee secretariat. I touched on the fact that Brook Hastie, the research director, was up until about four o'clock this morning. I know that Greg Thomson worked with him until about 4 or 4.30 this morning on the report that we tabled. I know that Ali Jarro was up at four o'clock this morning proof reading the report. The member for Ipswich is right: Brook, in particular, did a stellar job. Not only did he stay here until about 4.30 this morning, but also he was back at eight o'clock this morning with a very comprehensive, well-written and well drafted report for us to scrutinise and adopt. I want to make my appreciation known to the technical scrutiny secretariat, particularly Renee Easten, Marissa Kerr, Karl Holden and Tamara Vitale, because they also have done an excellent job to make sure that our committee was able meet its time frame.

I suggest to the Attorney-General that, just because we were so brilliant at succeeding within the time frame that he gave us, it is perhaps not always advisable to offer a committee a 36-hour time frame. I note that in committee deliberations both the member for Nicklin and the member for Rockhampton had concerns about the time frame and whether or not the committee would be able to do its work. I also note that when this amendment bill was introduced on Tuesday night and the Attorney-General moved that the committee report by 10 o'clock today, the opposition had problems with that. The opposition said that that was not enough time.

Mr Hart: It was.

Miss BARTON: Clearly, the member for Burleigh is right: it was enough time for us. Later in my contribution I will go into further detail about how we were able to complete the report. On Tuesday night the opposition leader stood in this House and said that it was a disgrace. She said that it was terrible that we were going to be introducing a bill on Tuesday and the committee would be reporting back on Thursday.

Mr Hart interjected.

Miss BARTON: I will not take that interjection. However, I will say that this highlights exactly why the Queensland opposition is full of hypocrites. In Queensland the opposition is hypocritical. When the first tranche of bikie reforms was introduced in this House on 15 October, the Attorney-General moved that those cognate bills be debated urgently. Opposition members stood in this House and opposed urgency on the basis that it was an affront to the committee system to not send those bills to committee. The opposition leader said that it would be possible to put those bills to committee. She said if the legislation was introduced on a Tuesday, you could put the bills to committee on Wednesday and you could have the debate on Thursday. She is right: you can introduce a bill on a Tuesday, it can go to committee on a Wednesday, the committee can report on the Thursday and the House can debate the legislation on the Thursday.

Coincidentally, when it came to debating the time frame for this particular bill, the opposition stood and opposed it. They said that there was not enough time and that it was an affront to the way that parliaments work. On 15 October, the opposition leader said about legislation introduced on a Tuesday—

Once again I reiterate that there is no reason that these laws cannot be tested through the scrutiny of the committee system tomorrow and be passed by the end of the week.

If it was good enough a couple of weeks ago, why is it not good enough this week? Actually, I am a little bit offended that the opposition does not have faith in the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. Perhaps it is a bit reflective on their colleague, the member for Rockhampton. Perhaps they do not feel he would be able to execute his duties as a member of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee or that he would be able to effectively scrutinise this legislation.

I believe our committee did a fantastic job. Yes, it was a challenge, but in the time frame that we were presented with we received written submissions from 15 organisations or individuals. Also, we were able to organise a public briefing from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. I particularly thank those representatives and officials from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, because we did not give them very much notice. Within about an hour of our phone call, we were having a public briefing. That gave us, as well as the member for Rockhampton and the member for Nicklin ample opportunity to put questions to the department.

There was ample opportunity for organisations such as the Queensland Law Society, the Council for Civil Liberties, the Bar Association and the like to make written submissions. In their submission the Council for Civil Liberties noted that they did not really think that there was enough time for them to make a serious contribution to the debate. They felt there simply was not enough time. Their submission states—

The fact that your Committee has been given no time to consider the important issues arising from the criminal segregation order is an absolute disgrace—

Apparently, the fact that the bill was able to go to the committee and the committee was able to receive submissions and hold a public briefing equates to no time. It continues—

and an ugly blot reflecting the serious negative consequences of the current Government's huge majority in a unicameral Parliament.

This Council urges your Committee to refuse to participate in the farce and charade of being required within a total timeframe of 24 hours—

it was not 24 hours; it was 36 hours—

to call for submissions, investigate and report on such a large number of amendments to Acts but particularly the miscarriage of justice consequences of the amendment to the Bail Act and the very serious consequences of a criminal segregation order.

When I turned up at the public briefing, which I believe started at about 11.45 am, this submission was on the desk. We put a call out for submissions. We had the secretariat email all of the stakeholders. But we made a point of phoning particular stakeholders because we felt it was important that we point out to them that we wanted to receive their submissions. The Council for Civil Liberties was one of the stakeholders that we called. If I remember correctly, despite the fact that I am not a huge fan of the Council for Civil Liberties, I was one of the ones who suggested that we should call them. We should give them the right and the opportunity to comment.

Mr Dillaway interjected.

Miss BARTON: I know that the member for Bulimba was disappointed that I suggested that we give the Council for Civil Liberties the opportunity to make a written submission and comment on the bill. I think it is important as it is part of the committee's business.

Their submission was at my place at the committee table at 11.45 am when the public briefing started. They claim that it was terrible that there was not enough time to make submissions. They had another five hours to make a submission. The 14 other submissions that this committee received had content.

Mr Dillaway: Twelve.

Miss BARTON: I stand corrected, there were 12 submissions. The other submitters had ample time and opportunity, as clearly demonstrated by the detail in their submissions, to actually reflect on the content of the bill. I think it is a real shame that the Council for Civil Liberties makes a point of criticising the government for not giving them enough time when we gave them ample opportunity. This is demonstrated by the content in the other submissions.

I reflect on the comments of the opposition leader that there would be ample time for a committee to investigate a bill if it was introduced on a Tuesday, referred to a committee and passed on a Thursday. The member for Gladstone is someone in this House for whom I have a lot of respect. I am sure all members would agree with me. She is a person of integrity. She calls a spade a spade. She makes informed judgement calls.

The member for Gladstone stood up in this House and highlighted that the previous government, in which the Leader of the Opposition was a senior minister, conducted itself in a similar way. So it was okay when they were in government to introduce bills with short time frames and guillotine debate. What hypocrisy to come into this House and criticise the Newman government for giving a committee an opportunity—

Mr Hart: How do you spell hypocrisy?

Miss BARTON: How do you spell hypocrisy—A-L-P. They come into this House and criticise this government when we give people in our community an opportunity to comment on a bill.

I will turn to the content of the bill in the time remaining. This bill is a very important element of the suite of antibiotic and anticriminal gang reforms that we saw passed in recent weeks. This is about community safety and confidence. That is exactly why the opposition will not vote against it. They know that this is about community safety and giving the community confidence in the law and order system and in the justice system. They know that if they vote against it their communities will be absolutely appalled.

Quite frankly, as I am sure all members of this House are aware, communities right across Queensland are welcoming this legislation. That is particularly so on the Gold Coast. I am very proud to be from the Gold Coast. But I am even prouder to know that we have seen crime rates drop significantly since the original suite of reforms were passed in this House. I particularly thank the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services for ensuring that the police are well resourced and in a position to be able to fight criminal gangs.

That is what this is about. It is about fighting criminal gangs, to get them out of our communities so that people in our communities feel safe. That is why the good character provisions incorporated in this legislation when it comes to licensing schemes are particularly important. We are talking about tow truck drivers. We are talking about security guards, bookmakers or pawnbrokers.

There would be people in my community, and communities right across Queensland, who have accidents. The last thing we want is for them to be worried that the tow truck driver who comes to help them out in their time of need is associated with a criminal gang. The last thing that we want is 17- and 18-year-olds who are at schoolies at the moment in Surfers Paradise being concerned or their parents being concerned that the security guards who are working in the Surfers Paradise and Broadbeach precincts are associated with criminal gangs and organisations.

I think it is particularly important that we have enhanced and clearly illustrated show-cause provisions with regard to presumption against bail. The Chief Magistrate, the Hon. Tim Carmody QC, is a man for whom I have a lot of respect. He has made it one of his highest priorities to make sure that the people of Queensland are kept safe and that members of criminal organisations and gangs who are arrested for alleged acts as part of their association with those criminal organisations and gangs are not released on bail.

He issued a very clear directive to the magistrates of Queensland as to how he wanted elements of the first tranche of legislation interpreted. Unfortunately, as is the nature of the judicial system, there is always going to be a different interpretation. That is why it is absolutely critical and I am incredibly supportive of the moves that have been taken to enhance and clarify the show-cause provisions. We are making sure that it is a broad determination, not a narrow understanding. People do not have to still be a member of a criminal organisation or gang when the bail application is being heard. We want to make sure that there is not a narrow interpretation because a narrow interpretation in these circumstances may very well put at risk the safety of people in our communities. I am sure all in this House would agree that that would be an incredibly great shame.

One of the other elements of this particular amendment bill is that the Queensland Police Commissioner will have available to him a right to disclose the criminal history of a current or former member of a criminal gang or organisation where an application is made by an entity in the public interest. The committee looked at that in particular detail and we tried to flesh out some of the detail. I, in particular, tried to flesh out some of the detail of that during the public briefing from the department. Unfortunately, while there was no-one available at the time who was in a position to respond to the question on behalf of the QPS, I would like to note that the Director-General of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, Mr John Sosso, made a point in his response to questions on notice. He did make a point of responding to my questions, and I would like to thank him and the department for that.

One of the things that this committee has considered—and we did ask the Attorney if he might, for the benefit of the House, respond to some of the concerns—is that a public interest test could have a very narrow or a very broad interpretation. What is and is not in the public interest is always a very subjective test, and we are talking about potentially sensitive information. So we have sought some clarification from the Attorney-General, if he has time in his response to the debate, with regard to what the burden might be for the Queensland Police Commissioner. I think it is important to note that this is a non-delegable power, and I think that that is particularly important. When we are talking about the disclosure of such sensitive information to any entity from any jurisdiction, I think it is really important that the one person is always making the determination—that the one person is always making the decision. Given that the entity making the application can come from any jurisdiction, we have also sought some clarification as to what might happen if there is a misuse of information and the like.

In the amendment bill there is also a mechanism for the management of prisoners who are identified as members of criminal motorcycle gangs. This was something that the member for Rockhampton tried to flesh out during the public briefing. He was a little bit confused at some point because he tried to intimate that Corrective Services were currently doing this, which was clearly not correct, and a representative from Corrective Services was very clear about the fact that certainly there are safety provisions being used at the moment to exclude people. I appreciate that there are some people who might be a little concerned. In the submissions we received from some of the legal services—I think there was the Catholic prisoners' legal service and also the prisoners' legal service—they indicated that they had some reservations. At the end of the day, when it comes to the civil liberties of incarcerated persons who are members of criminal organisations, my sympathy for their liberties does not extend so far as my sympathy for the liberties of those innocent members of our communities who are at risk.

As a resident of the Gold Coast, this is really, really important legislation for my community. This is about making my community safer. This is about making communities right across Queensland safer. We have declared a war on criminal organisations and criminal motorcycle gangs,

and it is important that we do not look weak in the face of opposition. It is important that we take the fight to these organisations and that we stand strong and stand alongside the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police because, at the end of the day, this is about our communities. This is about keeping our communities safe, and I will always stand up for my community to be safe and I will always stand up for a strong and effective legal system. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—UAP) (5.42 pm): This bill is more of what this extremist LNP would have us all believe is absolutely necessary to save us all from the scourge of OMCGs. This is in spite of evidence showing that these groups are responsible for 0.4 per cent of all crime and 0.9 per cent of all offences locally on the Gold Coast. This piece of legislation is an expanded set of laws that draws in another group of people who the Attorney-General was not able to have included in the previous legislation or were the next group to be targeted.

The tragedy of the legislation is that, like other omnibus pieces of legislation, it changes the law relating to the CMC part-time commissioners that will weaken the CMC and other laws relating to bail provisions with a reverse onus of proof. This brings on issues that have already received a less than favourable response from the judiciary. Whether people like it or not, the public are in favour of the judiciary in Queensland, and I think the government is going to see that at the next election.

I have listened to the arguments of various sides here. In summary, they are strong on emotion, especially that of my learned colleague the member for Ipswich—who is not here in the parliament at the moment, but I acknowledge what he said—but they are far weaker on substance in support of a case to support this second tranche of legislation. I say so from reading what little evidence has been provided after the legislation was rushed into parliament, having to be reviewed Wednesday and ready for passage and debate here today—36 hours, I heard the member for Broadwater say. ‘Disciplined government’ was the term used by the member for Ipswich. If that were applied, it would mean that appropriate and considered approaches most commonly develop such legislation, and that sort of approach is a much more detailed approach that occurs over time.

I do see that \$7.5 million has been allocated to the CMC to assist in OMCG investigations as extra funds, almost as if to legitimise this approach. This is after the CMC had a lot of its funds removed and also had demanded of it forced redundancies. Has anyone here considered but for a moment that one of the major reasons the OMCGs rapidly filled the void that has occurred is that the Premier and the executive spent one year attacking the CMC? Has anyone considered that? Now they have turned their attention toward the oversight body, the PCMC—and that has had a great result, hasn’t it? To give some members some substance in the broader argument, in that year when the CMC was totally diverted to all of these other things there were no major drug lab busts in the Gold Coast hinterland, where most of the scourge of the ice production—which is the major problem and where these bikie groups are developing their funds—occurred in that time. There was only one in south-west Queensland. Up to that time there were routine major drug lab busts, but since then not one. So what evidence does one need to justify these sorts of changes when in fact these sorts of things have occurred before when we knew what we had was working already?

When the associations laws were originally proposed by the former government, and there has been some discussion about those, I was amongst many here—and I see the Deputy Premier, who is leaving, was also among those, and there are a couple of others as well—who did not support that legislation because we thought that legislation would be struck down in the High Court. It did actually survive the first try. For those who may not realise, the legislation was modelled on the South Australian legislation. It originally came out of some work that was done after a lot of submissions in New South Wales. But anyway it was in in South Australia because they had a significant problem where the bikies were meeting all at once and they thought that this was the best solution. So the South Australian legislation had some minor variations and it did not survive the first tryout.

Arguably, the problem with the associations laws is that there have been very few applications of it. That point has been well made by various speakers, including the Attorney-General. Interestingly, many government speakers have stated repeatedly that other states will soon follow the Queensland lead, or will they? In what other global jurisdiction—they have the same problems because these people are a global phenomenon; and I have been doing research since this came along and I cannot see any—does this type of approach apply? There are none.

Mr Mander: We are leaders.

Dr DOUGLAS: There are no current models that apply. Member for Everton, you might have a greater knowledge than me, but you know what? Being the first does not necessarily mean you will be successful.

Certainly, in contrast to the view of the member for Broadwater, most state jurisdictions, if they are indeed considering this type of legislation, are allowing many different groups ample time to submit their various inquiries—36 hours to do so with proactive telephone calls probably just does not cut the muster or acid test when one is saying that is sufficient time for meaningful considered submitters to submit. So if you want to get decent submissions and you want to get people to consider them, you need to basically have some time.

Rushed submissions are more likely when there is insufficient time for people who, for a variety of reasons, cannot fit that time frame that has been asked for. So you are not going to get the kind of detailed knowledge that you need to draw in from all of the people who might well be able to give you the type of legislation, particularly broadbrush legislation as is proposed here, that may well pass that acid test when it works; otherwise it will fail because you are dealing with people who are involved in complex criminal organisations.

These people are not amateurs. There is a perception that these people are stupid and they all look like boovver boys who are the foot soldiers. That is not the case. Whilst, yes, they are obvious out there; there is a massive evolution. If the outcome of such legislation is a mixture of extreme difficulty in application, community angst and judicial unrest without a measurable improvement beyond cosmetic changes—that is the idea that we are not going to see the bikies in their colours—then the legislative step is one step too far and it is probably the incorrect one. I raised the point with the former Attorney-General at the time of the introduction of the association laws. I actually went to speak to him and we had a detailed conversation. He listened to what we had to say, but they were determined to do it. The point I was trying to make to him was that one needs to be reaching faster for that criminal activity in terms of trying to address the pattern of behaviour instead of being reactive as their behaviour evolves, and they can evolve at a massive rate. The nature of their crimes may not change all that much; it is the pattern of how they go about it. The problem is that we have to have laws that will withstand that strong test. It is all very well to say, 'I'm tough on crime. I'm going to deliver a solution.' The trouble is that when you do not deliver a solution and you have promised solutions, things fall off a cliff. If you take a proactive approach you may well get on top of the problem.

I actually said to the former AG that their approach, on reflection, was a reactive one. He said at the time, 'It's always easy to say that in hindsight.' It is true, because you could say, 'You should have done this and this is one way to do it.' The trouble is that if you do not really look at what you are doing, you are not measuring it and you are not following the data, you will not get the answers you expect. Currently, it is very difficult to see accurate data. In fact, real detail is harder to find than boat arrivals of asylum seekers in Western Australia. If you want to propose solutions, you do need access to the data.

I support parts of the legislation, but I do not support those parts of the legislation that I think are unworkable. I have suggested that those are not satisfactory to a vast number of people in Queensland who support the current judicial approach. Certain parts of this legislation will, in fact—

Miss Barton: You are a disgrace!

Dr DOUGLAS: I take that interjection. The member for Broadwater continually interjects and she has had her fair chance to speak. She should go and check her facts before she starts interrupting other people. Having said that, I think the bill will fail in parts.

 **Mr CHOAT** (Ipswich West—LNP) (5.52 pm): I also rise to contribute to this extremely important debate on the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. Recently, this House debated and passed legislation that draws a line in the sand regarding the activities of criminal gangs that have, sadly, entrenched themselves into communities across this state. The laws have already been passed and indeed the ones that we are debating today are harsh, and there is good reason for that.

Miss Barton: What do people want?

Mr CHOAT: I take that interjection from the member for Broadwater because that is the feeling of my community. We have seen laws professing to deal with this issue passed in this place before by the Bligh government, and what effect did they have? Perhaps that is a question that would be best answered by the people of the Gold Coast—people like the innocent woman gunned down last year while out shopping, people like the families terrorised in a Broadbeach restaurant while gang members engaged in a violent rampage around them or perhaps the families of the police officers at the local station put under siege by criminal gang members following that brawl. What would those

people be saying? I could guess, but I know what my people are saying. The people of Ipswich West do not want to experience the acts of terror witnessed on the Gold Coast in our townships and suburbs. My people want a government that does whatever is necessary to rid our community of drug users, pushers and thugs. My people are smart and they understand that if we do not deal with this problem decisively it will spread like a cancerous scourge. We have all seen the footage on our televisions and the documentaries that show just how far this can go. We know about the links between criminal gangs and illegal drugs and, in turn, the links between drugs and crime on our streets. Put simply, these criminals do not get their millions from the sale of lemonade or, indeed, from changing locks. They get their filthy money through inflicting misery on our most vulnerable, whether through drug addiction, violence, stealing or even death. The crime associated with criminal gangs goes a lot further, including to murder and extortion. Perhaps there is not an area of crime it does not reach.

This information comes as no surprise to our community. Of that I am certain. I will say that out in the community there is an overwhelming sense of relief that finally we have a government that is prepared to change the system and make some tough and challenging decisions to ensure the rot stops. Some have labelled these laws extreme. I say that if the situation is not dealt with swiftly and with severity it will become extreme. We have seen what happens when criminal gangs grow unchecked. Could we see the Gold Coast or, indeed, any of our communities subjected to the bloody mayhem of the gang territories of South America?

The objectives of the bill are to protect our community and to combat the threat which criminal gangs pose to public safety and wellbeing. It also provides some regulation of some key industry areas. The bill amends a number of acts and regulations which relate to various laws and to a number of industries identified as significant with regard to the activities of participants in criminal gangs. Indeed, we have heard from the Attorney-General and other honourable members about the technical and legislative provisions contained in the bill. These are designed to ensure that the activities of criminal organisations and their participants are thwarted in their ability to both prosper and flourish. Importantly, it severely impairs the ability for criminals to launder and, indeed, make money under the pretence of running legitimate businesses. These punitive financial measures will hit these criminals where it hurts and this is the best opportunity to cut these organisations off at the knees.

There have been many revelations since September and some of them have been quite confronting in this area. Others have illustrated just how deep the infiltration of criminal gangs is. I remember somebody recently asking me at my local hardware how would I feel if my locksmith turned out to be a front for a criminal gang's operation? We have heard from the member for Broadwater about people having their cars towed et cetera, and this is something that we need to be very mindful of. This is the danger: these criminals are often wolves in sheep's clothing. Every day people have been unwittingly exposed to the activities of some of the worst criminals simply by getting a key cut or a vehicle towed. This is truly frightening.

This week many of our year 12s have been enjoying schoolies celebrations. I have had the pleasure of meeting so many of our local schoolies and also people from organisations like Red Frogs who do so much to keep them safe and to help them when they get into trouble. I have heard stories about the drugs concocted in the most crude and filthy environments with additives designed to save the crooks money. I am told that it costs the same amount of money to make high quality drugs as it does low quality ones. Drug criminals do not want to waste their efforts on perhaps the one-off drug users like schoolies experimenting; they want to provide higher quality drugs to regular users. So they cut corners for the batches brewed for schoolies and people like that by adding battery acid, rat poison and other substances which can provide the sensation of a high.

I was astonished to hear that they actually finely grind up glass so that when swallowed it will cut the insides of an unsuspecting young person, allowing substances like battery acid to better seep into the body to give the sensation of a 'high'. This year I am sure there is a lot less of that on the Gold Coast in particular.

I want to touch on the chorus from what might be called the intelligentsia—an interesting term, as you would be aware—the so-called social elitists, civil libertarians and general leftists, do-gooders—however you want to term them. What a bunch of out-of-touch imbeciles! They have no appreciation for anybody who has been the victim of a crime, and I can say that because I have not heard one of them speak up for those who have suffered at the hands of these criminal gangs. They bleat on about the rights of the criminals, and yet they will not lift a finger to protect our community.

I have heard a lot of comments which are trying to provoke fear: fear of people getting on their bikes to ride to work and being strip-searched on the corner or harassed and asked for photos of tattoos. What a lot of nonsense and rot! These are just scaremongering tactics of the intelligentsia, and it really makes me quite angry. We have some fantastic people in our community who do a lot of community work who happen to be interested in, and who ride, motorcycles. The Ulysses Club, for instance, now has two fantastic branches; of course our Lockyer branch, and also the new Ipswich branch.

I am very proud to say that I have a strong association with the Ulysses Club: I helped them fund raise. Last year I had the absolute pleasure of participating in their annual toy ride from Brassall through Ipswich to the showgrounds. Those of you who follow the local media such as the *Queensland Times* will know how that ended up, but certainly I can say that it was such a pleasure. I was a bit of an anomaly, I have to admit. Here we have about 800 nice big Harleys and my one little GPR 50cc scooter! It was a lot of fun; we gave out a lot of toys; and I really think that this is something we should all be proud of. In fact, I would encourage everyone to come out to Ipswich on 8 December and participate in that run. You do not have to preregister; you can do it on the day. If you would like to come out, please let me know and I would be happy to connect you with the right people.

The other night in this place I heard the Leader of the Opposition's reflections on the year that was, and I was chuffed to have made a mention in her speech. She said that I referred to myself as a 'Stalinist'. This really speaks volumes about the lightweight opposition that she leads. For the information of honourable members, the reference was made in my local media by a certain member of the Labor Party when referring to our tough criminal gang laws and locking up paedophiles.

Mrs Miller: Tell us about the racing pigeons!

Mr CHOAT: Oh, I am going to bring them up too. When asked by a journalist about that, I said I was not worried about being labelled a 'Stalinist' or 'draconian' if it meant doing what was required to protect my community. Let me reflect on the half-witted remarks by the Leader of the Opposition earlier during this debate. Oddly, she seems to have a fixation with pigeon racing—somehow trying to debase and ridicule pigeon fanciers in this place.

I will again remind honourable members of a great Labor man of this House, Mr Doug Sherrington MLA, member for Salisbury for many years and revered by all who knew him, including his fellow members of parliament and, of course, the members of his pigeon racing club. The late Mr Sherrington actually has a park named in his honour in the seat of Inala. He was a great man who the member for Inala insults with her juvenile statements, as she does the many hundreds of proud Queensland pigeon fanciers, including myself. What a disgrace this rail wrecking Leader of the Opposition is! She should know that Mr Sherrington's granddaughter was actually in this parliament today. What an absolute disgrace!

By discussing those issues I do not want to understate the importance of this bill in any way. You see, for me it is legislation like this that shows this government's courage of conviction. We make the tough decisions—something not seen in government in Queensland since 1998. This legislation will go further to ensure the government is able to seriously impair the ability of criminal gangs and their participants to commit crime, recruit members and avoid appropriate punishment. It ensures this most serious issue can be dealt with by the legal and corrective services systems. Queensland no longer represents low-hanging fruit for these criminals willing to take advantage of all and any situation they can to make a quick buck and who have no regard for those lives they ruin in the process.

I would really also like to thank the Attorney-General and his department, particularly those staff who came along to the hearings of our committee yesterday. I really thank you for your diligence, your openness and your frankness, and it really made the committee's job so much easier for us to come to the conclusions in our report. I would like to of course also thank my committee colleagues, not just for the work that we have done with regard to this bill, but also throughout the past year. It has been a pleasure to serve on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee with you all. That does actually include the members of the opposition and crossbenchers, because I believe it really reflects just how good this system is and how it really does work and make a difference.

I do have a particular thought for our secretariat who this week, not unlike ourselves, have put in some absolutely sterling hours to get things done to support us in our work. The work they do cannot be underestimated, and I know that my fellow members have the same appreciation for all committee secretariats of this parliament.

I would also like to take the opportunity to say to my people in Ipswich West that we have made some really tough decisions this year, but do you know what? Our community is going to be so much better for it in the years to come. I am very proud to be your member. I will go in to bat for you every day, and I will make sure that people who want to impact on your daily lives and the safety and wellbeing of your family do not gain an inch under this government.

Fellow members, I am very, very proud to support this bill. I trust that when it is debated later on under the consideration in detail, that you will listen diligently and pay particular attention to how the opposition conduct themselves.

 **Mr DILLAWAY** (Bulimba—LNP) (6.08 pm): It gives me great pleasure this afternoon to rise to contribute to the debate on the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 which was introduced last month. This bill will continue the reforms of the Newman LNP government targeting criminal organisations. I congratulate the Attorney-General once again for the introduction of this bill and acknowledge the timely work undertaken by my esteemed colleagues and the dedicated research team of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee over the past day and a half, particularly in examining the bill and delivering the report before time at about 9.30 this morning before the 10 o'clock cut-off.

I thank the committee staff—Mr Brook Hastie, our research director; Mrs Ali Jarro; Mr Greg Thomson; Mrs Gail Easton—and then, of course, the technical scrutiny secretariat, Ms Renee Easten and Ms Marissa Ker and Mr Karl Holden and Ms Tamara Vitale. They have put in a tremendous amount of effort and work not only in relation to this bill but, as the member for Ipswich West just touched on, certainly over the past 12 months. I commend them for the work they have been able to contribute to this debate by ensuring we have as comprehensive a report as possible delivered to the House this morning.

Of course, over the past 48 hours our committee has been able to call for public submissions and we have in fact actually held a public briefing with various departmental officials. I certainly thank all those who contributed to that process. There were 13 submitters. I may have confused the member for Broadwater. The one plus 12 is what I was trying to get at. Of course, the member for Broadwater mentioned the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, which, strangely and unusually, decided to attack the bill before the House. They had five-plus hours to come up with a more constructive submission than they made. Amongst the other 12 submitters that presented to the committee there was some really good, solid information that gave us the opportunity to deliver a very solid report this morning to the House. I thank the submitters who took the time and made the effort, even with the short time frame, to develop a submission that was able to give the committee something to work with.

We summoned the departmental officials, who were very forthcoming in appearing and talking to the committee. We had Mr David Ford, the deputy director-general of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General; Mr Tom Humphreys, Ms Jenny Lang—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Berry): Order! Member for Bulimba, I am just wondering whether you should be using last names.

Mr DILLAWAY: It was a public briefing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr DILLAWAY: Ms Louise Shephard, Ms Shayna Smith and Mr Dominic Tennyson. They were the only departmental officials who actually contributed but there was a cast of thousands in the room. They came very well armed and this gave us a good opportunity to grill the department on various clauses that had already raised some concerns.

I will move on to some aspects of what has happened in the past and why it has brought us to where we are today. Of course, I support the Newman government's crack-down on the criminal organisations and in particular the criminal motorcycle gangs. As we heard last month, for far too long these criminals have had it too good. We saw that the members opposite, some of whom were part of the Bligh cabinet, failed Queenslanders in their past attempts to stop criminal organisations. I certainly put on the record today that I am on the side of Queenslanders. I will always be on the side of Queenslanders. I am not really sure if we have heard from the opposition today whether they are on the side of Queenslanders or criminal organisations. I was a little confused about whether they were supporting the bill or not supporting the bill. There was certainly some confusion there for me, so I look forward to the consideration in detail to see how they in fact vote this evening.

Of course, on Tuesday the Attorney-General did lay down a very good challenge for the opposition. Again, it will be interesting to see if they do deliver on the expectations the community has of lawmakers—that it is our duty to protect them. We have certainly seen that the majority of Queenslanders feel that, being the responsible government we are, we have taken the appropriate steps to ensure these criminal elements—the gangs and their members—are kicked out of Queensland, not just today but once and for all.

Since the introduction of the first tranche of reforms just last month we have seen more than 280 criminal motorcycle gang members and their associates arrested and charged with more than 560 offences. Earlier we heard some statistics from the Minister for Police, the Hon. Jack Dempsey, indicating that just on the Gold Coast we have seen a six per cent reduction in crime. This is contrary to what the member for Gaven was suggesting. I think his numbers suggested that only 0.4 per cent of crime was related to criminal motorcycle gangs. Something there does not quite add up.

Mr Molhoek: He is always criticising the Gold Coast.

Mr DILLAWAY: He does criticise the Gold Coast. I am certain he would be the first one running if something happened in his electorate with regard to criminal motorcycle gangs. We are delivering for the people of not only the Gold Coast but also Gaven. We certainly have a can-do attitude. Our government is about being can-do. I also put on the record my thanks to the Queensland Police Service for their work in bringing about those arrests and charges to rid our streets of these undesirables, not just on the Gold Coast but right across Queensland. I congratulate the Minister for Police, the Hon. Jack Dempsey, and his team who are on the ground, in the trenches and making a difference.

I take this opportunity to touch on the main policies contained in this bill, which is quite broad. It represents the second tranche of what we are trying to deliver for Queensland—that is, safer communities for our mums, dads and kids out there so that they feel like they can go down to the shops or to their local restaurant without a bunch of thugs out the front manning up and having a bit of a gang battle on the streets, as we saw on the Gold Coast.

This bill seeks to amend section 16(3A) of the Bail Act. I will speak about that further. It will enhance the ability of the Crime and Misconduct Commission to deal more effectively with those criminal organisations. It will provide mechanisms to improve the management of remanded and sentenced prisoners who have been identified as being a participant in a criminal organisation. I think we all know that our prison system still has those elements that are working behind the scenes. We need to make sure we deal with them once and for all. The bill will further ensure the confidentiality of the criminal intelligence initiated under the Tattoo Parlours Act. And we are enhancing community safety by providing for the chief executive of the Department of Transport and Main Roads to give approved agencies some more information. We are also allowing the Police Commissioner to disclose to an entity the criminal history of a current or former participant.

The bill is quite broad but it gives very good tools to the police to get out there and combat what is happening. Submission No. 6 from the Queensland Police Union of Employees stated very clearly that they felt it was appropriate for the government to take the fight to these criminal motorcycle gangs and that the provision of legislative tools to assist in the disruption of these organisations is essential. That is what this bill allows us to do.

I will touch on a few key things that I think were of concern at the public briefing. I will not list the various and numerous acts that will be amended by this bill once it hopefully passes tonight. I will focus on the Bail Act 1980, the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Corrective Services Regulation 2006 and the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001.

I refer to the amendments to the Bail Act 1980, in particular clause 7 of the bill we are debating here tonight. I take this opportunity to address the concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association during our public briefing by the departmental representatives. The QLS and BAQ concerns were centred around the broad nature of the redrafting of section 16(3A). It now captures any defendant who has been at any time a participant in a criminal organisation to show cause why bail should not be refused.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr DILLAWAY: I am not going to give you a shot before dinner. I am sorry about that, mate. You will have to come back afterwards. The Queensland Law Society submission states—

We are concerned with the broad nature of this provision, as there is no timing provision linking when a person was a participant in an organisation and when an offence was committed.

I thought this issue was adequately addressed by the department during the public briefing by Ms Shephard when she stated that the redrafting of 16(3A) is consistent with the current approach in the Bail Act when a person is in a show cause situation. So we are effectively redrafting this to make it more consistent with what is already in the act. Again, that certainly clarifies it for me. The department also went on and further clarified the fact that the Crown may allege that the defendant is captured under section 16(3A), but the Crown still has to satisfy the court that it is not just a baseless allegation and that there is evidence that would need to be put forward, as it does now under section 16(3). This was adequately summarised by the member for Rockhampton, who of course was present for the public briefing but stormed out of the committee meeting earlier, but we will not get into that. He stated—

So you are saying that it is not simply an allegation in layman's terms; there will have to be material provided—

Of course, the department confirmed that. I certainly look forward to the member for Rockhampton's support of this clause because it certainly seems that he was satisfied with the department's response yesterday during that public hearing.

Before I move to the next part of the bill, I want to finish addressing one of the concerns of the Bar Association of Queensland in that it thought that the drafting of section 16(3A) would be a disincentive for a member of a criminal organisation to disassociate, and I heard the Leader of the Opposition touch on that earlier. The Bar Association of Queensland submission states—

On one view the measure is contrary to one of the primary aims of the recent legislative measures, that is, to cause members of criminal organisations to disassociate.

I believe to the contrary. I believe it is a very clear incentive to disassociate immediately—not to wait until you are about to go in for your bail application, not to wait six months down the track after you have created some more mayhem on the streets of the Gold Coast or Rockhampton or wherever it happens to be that you decide that you are going to disrupt. It is actually an incentive for them to stop doing what they are doing today and to start living the life of a good citizen. This amendment certainly does capture former members if they did the crime. If you are a member of a criminal organisation, if you do the crime then you should do the time. I think that is how it should be. They should be brought to account. They should be required to show cause as to why they should not be granted bail. Why should they not be accountable if they actually committed that crime whilst they were a member of a criminal organisation?

The second concern raised during consideration of this bill by the committee was raised by the member for Rockhampton and relates to clause 14. The member for Rockhampton claimed that model prisoners who had previously been members of criminal organisations were now subject to criminal organisation segregation orders. The department through Mr Humphreys, who was representing correctional services, put on the record that criminal organisation segregation orders would in fact only apply if the prisoner was still—and that is the key point—a member of a criminal organisation and would not apply if in fact they were no longer a member of the criminal organisation.

Mr Choat: More scaremongering.

Mr DILLAWAY: More scaremongering indeed; I take the interjection from the member for Ipswich West. There was further questioning by the member for Rockhampton, but it was confirmed by Mr Humphreys that this is an independent process. This is a process that Corrective Services and the Queensland Police Service undertake. They work very closely together and they know from their intelligence whether or not there is a model prisoner who may very well be appearing not to be part of a criminal organisation but in fact their activities are still very much in line with a criminal organisation and they are still associating with people in that same criminal organisation. I wanted to quote the member for Rockhampton in this regard, but given the time I will move on. Without quoting him, the member for Rockhampton was certainly very satisfied with the results of that particular response from the department. The member for Rockhampton certainly gave very clear indications in that public hearing that he understood that the criminal organisation segregation orders would only apply if a member was still a member of the criminal organisation. So I look forward to the member for Rockhampton's full support of that clause during the consideration in detail.

The third element of the bill I want to discuss today is the appointment of an acting part-time commissioner by the Governor in Council in clause 42 which amends the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001. Some concerns were raised through the submissions by the PCMC and the QLS on the process for appointing, but the department through Mr Ford's opening statement reiterated the current issues facing the PCMC and its ability to have appointments adopted. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Seeney, adjourned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (6.26 pm), by leave: Last night the House passed a motion with respect to Dr Ken Levy and matters subject to PCMC inquiries and the alleged perceived bias with respect to the PCMC and members opposite and the member for Nicklin. The House in its motion last night afforded Dr Levy the opportunity to present a submission to this House that was not afforded to Dr Levy by the PCMC in that when it had its meeting in the last 48 hours it resolved that it would send the matter to the Ethics Committee because it was not in an unbiased position to be able to deal with the matter. The second element of the motion of course was to table selective documents. More concerning is that I saw on the news tonight the member for Gladstone, the chairman of the PCMC, say that it has referred Dr Levy to the Ethics Committee. Colleagues, what has happened here is that the whole matter has been referred to the Ethics Committee, which I now will not talk about because it will be subject to the Ethics Committee's deliberations. But I think it is important to note that the matter was referred to the Ethics Committee because the PCMC could not hear the matter in an unbiased fashion.

Dr Ken Levy has now written to the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Neil Laurie, and has CCed me as Attorney-General and the mover of the motion last night and I now table a copy of a letter from Dr Ken Levy dated 21 November 2013. I also table a statement to parliament by KS Levy, also dated 21 November 2013.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 21 November 2013, to the Clerk of the Parliament from the Acting Chairperson, Crime and Misconduct Commission, Dr KS Levy, regarding a statement to parliament [\[4140\]](#).

Tabled paper: Statement to parliament, dated 21 November 2013, by Acting Chairperson, Crime and Misconduct Commission, Dr KS Levy, in relation to a motion moved by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice [\[4141\]](#).

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 4249, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (6.27 pm): I rise to support the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 which was referred to the legal affairs committee. I certainly thank all of my colleagues on that committee for the work that was done to ensure that we had an opportunity to ask questions of the department. I appreciate all of the staff from the department coming down here to make a submission and providing answers to our questions so that we could form our report. I certainly want to commend the members of the secretariat, who worked very hard to get the report done so that it could be considered on the time line we had before us. There are several elements to the bill. The area that I am most particularly interested in is how it affects the various licensing acts and the various licences that are available. This bill amends the Electrical Safety Act 2002, the Liquor Act 1992, the Queensland Building Services Authority Act 1991, the Racing Act 2002, the Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003, the Security Providers Act 1993, the Tow Truck Act 1973, the Weapons Act 1990 and the Work Health and Safety Act 2011.

Why do we have these acts? These acts are there so that there are particular requirements for people in these industries to be licensed. I want to be very clear what the thrust of this bill is trying to achieve. What it is trying to achieve is to make sure that Queensland is a safe place to bring up a family. It is targeting criminal organisations that might purport to get themselves licences to operate what, on the surface, seem to be legitimate businesses so they can operate them in illegal ways. The Attorney-General has been very busy, as has been our committee, with legislation, and that is because the law and order situation left in this state by Labor was soft. It certainly has been a growing problem out there and our communities want to make sure that they have a safe place to bring up their families. This is one of many bills that have been put forward to improve security for our families and to ensure that our environment in Queensland is the safest we can make it.

Sitting suspended from 6.31 pm to 7.30 pm.

 **Mr WATTS:** The primary objectives of the bill are to combat the threat of criminal motorcycle gangs to public safety and certain licensed industries and authorised activities through enhanced information sharing, licensing, interrogatory and correctional powers. We are trying to say that there is a group of people who think that it is okay to live outside the law. Hardworking people get an education, they then get a job, they work hard and they pay their taxes. Those are the people who we want to have a safe and happy life in Queensland. People who think that they can parasitically take advantage of other people through using threats of violence and intimidation have to be dealt with. That is exactly what this bill does.

I was particularly interested in hearing from the Attorney-General about one area in relation to prostitution and whether any of the provisions of this bill should be extended to that area. Other than that, I support this bill. I think these people are a parasitic mob in the community and we need to deal with them. This bill deals with them in the strongest possible way. Good, hardworking Queenslanders can have a safe and happy life here in Queensland under an LNP government as we promised that we would make Queensland the safest place to bring up children. That is exactly what we will do.

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (7.31 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. Madam Deputy Speaker, I echo the sentiments of the chairman of the committee and other members of this committee, including you, when you spoke to the bill earlier this evening. The chairman of the committee, Mr Ian Berry, spoke about the great work that our committee secretariat and support staff have done in preparing a report to assist members in their consideration of this bill. No-one should ever underestimate the capacity of our committee support staff to go over and above the call of duty. I know some members have said, 'We've been able to consider this bill in such a short period of time. Bring it on. Let's have some more bills that we can consider because we have showed how well our staff can work and how well our committees can work.' I simply say that I would be very disappointed if this becomes the norm when matters are referred to either this committee or to other committees in the future. I think it would be a shame if the government took for granted the superhuman efforts that our committee staff went to in trying to prepare a report to assist members in considering this bill.

In the short period of time in which we had to consider this bill we had a public hearing. In that short period of time we received a significant number of submissions from the community when there was the concern, 'What are we going to do when the government has given us a little over a day to respond and to prepare a report?' I want to put on the record my appreciation to all of those people who went to the effort of preparing a submission to the committee to consider and to enable the committee members to refer to their submissions in their deliberations.

I also want to thank the departmental staff who took the time to brief the committee. I realise that the time expired, but I certainly appreciated how frank the staff were with our committee and their genuine attempt to answer our questions.

I would like to take members to a couple of matters in particular. I do not intend to repeat matters that other members have already dealt with. I refer in particular to the issue involving the appointment of the part-time commissioners to the Crime and Misconduct Commission. The record shows that this week there has been quite a bit of argy-bargy about the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee that oversees the CMC. Can I say that the members of that oversight committee have done the best they can and they are all committed to making sure that we have a strong Crime and Misconduct Commission in Queensland.

I have heard the Attorney-General make a whole range of comments about the PCMC being dysfunctional, or whatever it might have been. The record will show what he said. I lay down the olive branch to the Attorney-General. If this government genuinely wants to work in partnership with the oversight committee, it should test the water by going out and advertising for a full-time CMC commissioner. It should test the water to see if the government can garner the support from the opposition for the appointment of a full-time CMC commissioner and part-time commissioners. I think the government will find that there is goodwill from the opposition, that there is goodwill from the crossbenches to get an appropriately qualified person to fill these positions. There is goodwill from the oversight committee to do the best the members can under the duties and responsibilities that are imposed upon them. I urge the government to seriously consider my request tonight to build those bridges that are very important for this oversight organisation.

The last comment I want to make is that I believe that committees need to have reasonable opportunities to consider bills. In my statement of reservation I refer to recommendation 21 of the original committee system review recommendations. That recommendation refers to giving the

committees the capacity to genuinely look into the bills that are referred to them. If the government wants to be genuine and not act in an arrogant fashion, the government should be seen to be giving committees a reasonable length of time in which to seek public submissions, for the committee to realistically consider those submissions and to come back with balanced and informed reports for the benefit of not just members of parliament but all of Queensland. In this instance, I believe that our committee has done a sterling job. I take my hat off to my fellow committee members. Whilst we have had some differing views in our deliberations, we are focused on doing the best we can under the requirements of our membership of this committee.

I want to reiterate that the secretariat has done a sterling job and that I would hate to see a repeat of this situation. I do not believe that there is an urgency for this bill, but I look forward to listening to the contribution from the member for Gladstone. I hope the government does not guillotine the debate on this bill, as I know that other members are keen to speak to it.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (7.38 pm): The issue covered by this legislation has shown itself over time to be reasonably divisive. On Tuesday I attempted to ask the Attorney-General a question that was relayed to me by the wives of two motorcycle gang members. I had had a general discussion with the Attorney-General at the previous sitting in relation to their concern about being able to congregate for family get-togethers. I think this issue is particularly pertinent now with Christmas coming. I refer also to occasions such as family birthdays. Often family and friends get together when aged parents have a birthday party. I had had a discussion with the Attorney-General about practical issues relating to the legislation. Although he had given an indication that he was quite happy to respond to a question without notice, it was deemed, as is a matter of record now, that the question was seeking an opinion.

They are the practical issues that are facing families who have family members who fall within the membership of named organisations. The practical issues are the reach of the legislation and the lack of clarity in relation to the prescriptive people who are being targeted. Much has been said in this chamber, in both this debate and previous debates, about who is directly being targeted by this legislation, but I think anecdotally in all of our electorates we have heard that the reach of the legislation and the impact has been broader than our debate indicates.

The major matter that I wish to raise in relation to this legislation is the amendment in relation to the appointment of part-time commissioners to the CMC. This bill is a response to a very practical problem that the CMC is currently facing. Proposed section 237A is intended to facilitate the ongoing operation of the CMC by allowing acting part-time commissioners to be appointed by the Governor in Council. Ms Judith Bell's term expired in May 2013 but her position still has not been filled. I know that the committee wrote on a number of occasions in order to expedite or to remind not only the Attorney-General but his department of the critical nature of that appointment. Mr Nase's term expired on 6 November this year.

The part-time commissioners are reduced from four to two and we have an acting chair as well. Just in that very senior area of employment and appointments, the CMC has a high degree of uncertainty. I do understand the responses and the comments that the Attorney-General has made in relation to a part-time appointment or an acting appointment for the chair given there are significant changes to the structure of the CMC mooted. However, it still does not give any certainty to the CMC staff throughout the organisation when not only is the chair acting but now there is a reduction to two part-time commissioners.

The reality is that the actual operation of the CMC is negatively impacted because a quorum of the CMC at ordinary commission meetings is three and for the CMC to issue or consider a formal CMC report the quorum is four. So the CMC as it currently stands is unable to operate. I understand that this is the impetus for this amendment, but given that Ms Bell's term ended in May it is one that could have been avoided or at least the extremeness of the situation could have been avoided.

The committee's submission to this committee hearing was to request consideration of consultation between the CMC and the PCMC in relation to these part-time appointments. It is easy for anyone in this debate to point to the disagreements that have been occurring and the criticism that has occurred over the last few weeks in relation to not only the relationship between the PCMC and the CMC, but the government and the PCMC. The reality is we are one committee for this time, but structurally I would hope that going forward the PCMC, the CMC and government will continue to have an interaction for the benefit of the state and in order to improve the operation of the CMC in particular.

I would hate to see consideration of consultation between the government, the Attorney-General in this case, and the PCMC jeopardised or not capitalised on simply because at this point in time there is a disagreement and a differing perspective over the roles of these two organisations, being the PCMC and the CMC and, of course, the Attorney-General. We should be looking at it in a much bigger picture than that. We should be looking at it in terms of what is best going forward, what is best to underpin confidence in the CMC and its appointments and what is best to ensure public confidence in the PCMC and the Attorney-General in his role appointing those part-time commissioners and the chair. Whilst it is legislated that the appointment of a full-time chair requires bipartisan support, as are part-time commissioners, these amendments will entrench what is currently the case with an acting chair: that no consultation is required. It calls into question in the mind of some committee members and also, I believe, the community whether that is avoidable, and I believe it is. It is avoidable by having a working relationship between the Attorney-General and the committee and the PCMC and the CMC—a professional, adult, working relationship.

I support 100 per cent the request of the PCMC to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I would hope that the Attorney-General can give mature and considered thought to the request that has been made because I do believe that the request in the long-term is a sound basis on which to appoint acting part-time commissioners. It is certainly a better way forward for the appointment of acting chairs so that all that is involved in the process of the operation of the CMC, the PCMC and this parliament can be done maturely, responsibly and transparently.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (7.46 pm), in reply: As indicated in my second reading speech, I will now address the matters raised by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee in my summing up. The first point of clarification being sought by the committee is the intent of the bill in relation to current and former participants in a criminal organisation. The committee notes the concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society as follows—

... licensing authorities may consider past participation in a criminal organisation as a relevant consideration. Given the operation of the relevant definition we consider it would be most effective if the Attorney-General undertook to ensure that affected licensing authorities only considered issues of current participation in a criminal organisation and no other irrelevant considerations.

In response, I would like to say that it is important to understand the amendments do not provide licensing authorities with any role in identifying participants in a criminal organisation, past or present. The amendments task the Commissioner of Police with this responsibility. Licensing authorities will be informed by the Commissioner of Police of participants in criminal organisations. This will ensure a consistent and centralised approach.

The second point of clarification is the level of probity checks required in obtaining a licence from the Prostitution Licensing Authority. The Prostitution Act 1999 is designed to ensure that the Prostitution Licensing Authority has full access to information needed to make a decision about whether a person is eligible and suitable to be issued with a licence under that act. This includes information about a person's criminal history, arrests and other relevant intelligence and information about the person. Therefore, the probity provisions appear wide enough to include consideration of whether the applicant is a participant in a criminal organisation. Also, the composition of the authority under the act, which includes senior police and senior Crime and Misconduct Commission officials, facilitates a very high standard of probity assessment of applications made for licences under the Prostitution Act. There was therefore no need to include the prostitution industry in the group of industries being targeted under the bill.

The third point of clarification is to address a concern raised by the Bar Association of Queensland in its submission. This issue regards the bill having the effect of withdrawing approvals of relevant agreements. Approvals under section 153 of the Liquor Act in relation to agreements to let or sublet, or enter into a franchise or management agreement for licensed premises, are currently subject to probity checks by the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation. The new provisions merely extend the probity considerations to prohibit criminal organisations, or their participants, from being granted or retaining such approvals in line with the government's policy in relation to criminal organisations. Whether the licensee has recourse against the lessee in such situations is a matter of contractual obligation between the parties.

The Bar Association of Queensland has also stated that the reason for including the building industry in these reforms is less clear than other areas. In looking at the occupations and activities identified as being influenced by criminal motorcycle gangs, the Queensland government wants to take a broad and comprehensive approach to ensure that such gangs cannot take hold in licensed

occupations. It may be the case that the net will need to be further widened or further adjusted to outmanoeuvre criminal gangs who will seek to take advantage of any unforeseen loopholes. The Queensland Police Service considers the building industry is attractive to criminal organisations and has determined that this industry should have protection under the new provisions.

This relates to the fourth point for clarification raised by the committee in its report. The committee raised a concern about—

... the extent of the burden of the public interest test to be applied by the Queensland Commissioner of Police when considering the disclosure of a current or former participant of a criminal organisation's criminal history ...

The government understands the case law indicates that the expression 'in the public interest', when used in a statute, imports a discretionary value judgement to be made by reference to undefined factual matters, limited only by the subject matter and the scope and the purpose of the Police Service Administration Act 1990, within which the decision power sits. Whether something is in the public interest will generally require consideration of a number of competing factors about the public interest and will involve weighing their respective benefits and detriments. However, how those various factors are weighed will be a matter for the commissioner. Imposing prescriptive criteria may unnecessarily restrict the commissioner's ability to consider the specific facts and circumstances of and other factors relevant to the individual case before the commissioner. Given the above, the government does not consider it appropriate to include any additional legislative guidance to the commissioner as how such a determination is to be made. As the committee has noted in its report, the power granted to the commissioner is non-delegable.

In its fifth point for clarification, the committee sought clarification of the intended scope of the amendments to the Police Service Administration Act 1990, addressing the concerns raised by the Law Society and confirming whether any interjurisdictional problems are foreseen. Under the amendments, the commissioner will be able to disclose to an entity. The Acts Interpretation Act 1954 defines 'entity' to include a person and an unincorporated body. The government's view is that this could include entities outside Queensland and media organisations. However, it is critical to note the commissioner is only able to disclose if satisfied it is in the public interest to do so. Further, the entity to which the commissioner discloses the information can only disclose or publish the information if authorised to do so by the commissioner, who can only so authorise if satisfied it is in the public interest to do so. Importantly, the commissioner has to consider public interest considerations at each stage, ensuring that factors such as the impact of disclosure and publication outside of Queensland, as well as the fairness to an accused in a trial, are given proper regard.

The committee also noted the Queensland Law Society's concerns about disclosures being made without the consent of the person and there being no opportunity for the person to make submissions to the commissioner regarding such release. The ability to disclose a criminal history is limited to persons who are or were a participant in a criminal organisation. It is highly unlikely that such persons would consent to the release of their criminal history information, rendering the clause ineffective. Further, a decision of the commissioner to release a criminal history is subject to the provisions of the Judicial Review Act 1991, similar to other disclosures currently made by the commissioner. Imposing a requirement for the commissioner to consult and receive submissions on disclosures may, depending on the circumstances, unnecessarily impact the commissioner's ability to disclose records where time is of the essence.

I now turn my attention to the committee's second recommendation, which is that I address any issues regarding fundamental legislative principles that were not raised in the explanatory notes. First, in relation to the audio visual amendments included as part of the bill, the parliamentary committee raised the fundamental legislative principle issue about the right to a fair trial, consistency with natural justice and the practical difficulties of using video or audio links in proceedings. I acknowledge that technology such as this is not failsafe, but the benefits of it are clear. Provisions in the Evidence Act 1977, the Justices Act 1886, the District Court of Queensland Act 1967 and the Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991 regulate how links are to be used and provide for what is to occur where links fail, namely, the court is to adjourn the proceeding and may make any other appropriate order. Even more relevantly, on a practical level this is not a new thing for the courts. Legislation enabling the use of video links has been in place since 1996. The technology is already used every day in the courts.

The committee also asked for further clarification if the audio visual amendments adversely affect the rights or liberties, or impose obligations, retrospectively. The amendments relating to the use of video and audio links in the courts, as well as the new Bail Act 1980 provision about bail proceedings heard outside of a relevant Magistrates Court district or division, apply to proceedings as

they are heard from the day of commencement of the amendments. The parliamentary committee has commented that the provisions have retrospective application and that no justification for this has been provided. It is correct that these provisions will apply retrospectively in the sense that they will capture proceedings commenced before these amendments are passed and irrespective of when the relevant offence occurred. However, this is consistent with the common law on the application of procedural laws. In the absence of an express provision to the contrary, procedural laws are construed so as to operate retrospectively and apply to events that have occurred in the past that are presently before the court. The general rule is that the procedural law applying in a court proceeding is the procedural law in place on the day of the proceeding, and the amendments are consistent with that.

I will now address the FLP issues raised in part 3.3 of the report in relation to enhancing the Crime and Misconduct Commission. The amendments in clause 26 allow the CMC to issue a notice to produce in a crime investigation, or a specific intelligence operation about a criminal organisation or participants in a criminal organisation. The amendments also provide that a person who is a participant in a criminal organisation may not rely upon fear of retribution as a reasonable excuse to fail to produce the stated document or thing. This amendment mirrors the amendments made in the October reforms and are necessary to allow the CMC to more effectively deal with the clandestine operations of criminal organisations and to protect public safety.

The amendment in clause 44 clarifies the current effect of this provision and does not create any new powers for the CMC. Contrary to the committee's view, this clause provides additional safeguards to ensure that the person's right to a fair trial is not tarnished if that person is required to provide information to or answer questions at a CMC investigation or hearing. The amendment in clause 53 does not create any new use of compelled self-incriminating evidence by the CMC or other body. The amendment, however, provides for a safeguard to protect a person's right to a fair trial in any current or later criminal proceeding by requiring that such compelled self-incriminating evidence is admitted only with the court's leave. Courts have inherent jurisdiction to take whatever action is required to uphold the integrity of the court process and ensure a person's right to a fair trial is not prejudiced. Again, contrary to the committee's report, the amendments in clause 45 and clause 38 do not operate to have retrospective effect, but ensure that compelled self-incriminating evidence obtained by the CMC, under its coercive powers, can only be used in a confiscation proceeding from the commencement of the initial amendment to section 197(3)(c), that is, 17 October 2013, and only in confiscation proceedings commenced on or after 17 October 2013.

The committee has also raised FLP concerns about amendments to the licensing and permit acts. In particular, the committee was concerned with receiving evidence and hearing argument in the absence of parties to a proceeding. For example, clause 186 provides that QCAT or the Supreme Court may receive evidence and hear argument about criminal intelligence information in the absence of parties to the proceeding and their representatives, and may take evidence by affidavit. The explanatory notes, on page 8, state that the bill provides for some reviews to take place without the applicant and some hearings may be closed. Clause 186 is one of those cases. The explanatory notes explain that these safeguards are—

“... procedurally necessary to ensure that an applicant for review does not inadvertently obtain criminal intelligence. Natural justice is still afforded to an affected person as they are able to proceed with a full merit review.

The Committee also raised concern with transitional provisions that provide that, if immediately before the commencement of the bill the decision maker has not reached a decision on an application, the decision maker must decide the application under the provisions of the bill. The new licensing requirements in the bill apply to both new applicants and existing licensees. There is a strong argument to apply the new licensing provisions to undecided applications to ensure consistent policy and to ensure there are no loopholes. It is not consistent with the policy objective of the bill to allow a participant in a criminal organisation to obtain a licence simply due to the timing of their application. In any event, even if a person's application was considered under the current law, once the new laws start the person will no longer be eligible to hold a licence and the licence will be cancelled. Administratively, it makes sense to consider all transitional applications under the new provisions of the bill. We need to ensure the community is protected from the activities of criminal gangs and thugs and those who put fear and intimidation into the lives of Queenslanders.

The Leader of the Opposition agrees with the legislation, although she has some issues with parts of it. The Leader of the Opposition talks in this place about the provisions of the 2009 Criminal Organisation Act, which they still uphold as the best thing to address organised crime in Queensland. We submit to the House that it is not. It has not been used. Not one declaration has been successfully

used under it, although there is a matter subject to the court at the moment, which that has its own problems. Under the 2009 legislation, no criminal organisations have effectively been classified as a criminal organisation.

The opposition leader also said that the best way to get criminal gangs is to go after their wealth. I can tell my honourable colleagues that that is something that this government and I have been saying for 18 months. That is why this Newman can-do LNP government passed the first unexplained wealth laws in this state. The Labor Party had 14 years to pass unexplained wealth laws. Now it is an issue for the opposition leader. Now she says the best way to go after criminals is to go after their wealth. That is why this LNP government, within the first year of taking government in this state, moved our first unexplained wealth laws. Ours is one of the few jurisdictions in the country to have unexplained wealth laws and, of course, serious drug trafficking declarations where the entire assets of an individual can be forfeited to the state if they cannot explain from where they got the money.

The opposition leader has also talked in this place about this bill being the bungling bill and the bill that fixes all the problems with the previous legislation. We said at the time of the introduction of the previous legislation that criminal bikie gangs will try anything with their cashed up lawyers to get around these laws. They will go to every extreme, length and degree in courts in every jurisdiction—the Magistrates Court, the District Court and the Supreme Court—to get around our laws.

We have had through the democratic process of our judicial system interpretations at the Magistrates Court and different interpretations at the Supreme Court. We are clarifying, particularly in relation to bail applications, the position of the legislature and the intended position of the legislature. We were very upfront. We said that we fully expected to come in here and move amendments to our legislation, just as parliaments for 150 years have been moving amendments to legislation as dodgy criminals—those who have more money than any of us in this place—go around with high-profile lawyers and public relations campaign machines and try to convince Queenslanders that these are just people who have a couple of tattoos and ride their bikes on a Sunday.

Queenslanders know that these people are criminal motorcycle gangs. Queenslanders understand the difference between a law-abiding citizen who wants to ride and participate in a charity event and those who have tattoos of '1%' and the number '13' all over their heads and foreheads. They have FTP on their foreheads. I am not going to explain to the House what that means but members can google it.

We have an opposition that, as I said in my opening remarks, is just flip-flopping on this issue. They do not know where they stand. They still hold so dearly onto the 2009 amendments in relation to criminal organisations. They have not worked. We had to try something different. Other jurisdictions in this country are now looking to our legislation.

I note the member for Gaven, who is sitting up the back, said he had a chat to a former Queensland Attorney-General. It might have been Rod Welford whom we were talking about in the parliament this morning. Maybe he went to a party with Rod Welford. I am not sure who the former attorney was. I take some guidance from the former Labor Party Attorney-General of South Australia who two weeks ago came out fully backing our legislation saying, 'We have the magic pudding right in Queensland.' This former Labor Attorney-General of South Australia I take some credit for because he introduced the first anti-association bikie legislation that actually did fall over in the High Court. In New South Wales legislation then fell over in the High Court. He is saying that with this legislation we have hit the nail on the head and got the magic pudding right.

That is not to say that the criminal motorcycle gang members will not challenge these laws. They have already indicated they will. We will fight them right to the High Court if necessary to protect Queenslanders and to protect the mums and dads and children in this state.

I thank all honourable members for their contributions. We are going after these criminals. We are going after them hard. The only way we can do it is with a very tough response to this issue of criminal motorcycle gangs. We will once and for all rid the state of Queensland of criminal motorcycle gangs.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (8.03 pm): I mentioned this quite extensively in my speech earlier this afternoon. This clause purports to address the deficiency the recent amendments made to the Bail Act identified by Justice Wilson in the Supreme Court. The amendment applies to a person who is a participant in a criminal organisation. The court found it applied to someone who is a participant in a group at the time of the bail application. The Attorney tried to argue it was a grammatical error.

It is a little difficult to argue that 'is' should have been 'was', but if there is an error in the way the policy has been applied I am happy to support the amendment. However, this amendment does more than fix this small problem. It makes the provision apply to anyone who has ever been a participant in a criminal organisation. Had the amendment merely been to provide that the show-cause provision should apply where a defendant is a participant in a criminal organisation at the time of the alleged offence, there might be some justification in supporting it. This is a suggestion that the Queensland Law Society also made. The opposition cannot support the retrospectivity inherent in this amendment.

Mr BLEIJIE: The grammatical error was a quote from Justice Wilson in the Supreme Court. But I take note as well that the Chief Magistrate had a different interpretation in the first instance. As our judicial system works, one of these matters went to the Supreme Court, which is a higher court in land than the Magistrates Court. So we take heed from the higher court in the jurisdiction. So we are simply saying that as a legislature we believe the Chief Magistrate, in his interpretation, was the intended interpretation. That is why we are changing 'is' to 'was'. If any member is a former participant in a criminal organisation and at the time of the bail application it can be shown they were a participant in a criminal organisation then they will not get bail.

Division: Question put—That clause 7, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 60—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 13—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Hopper, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—

Ms PALASZCZUK (8.15 pm): This clause inserts proposed new section 267A(3), which allows for people identified as a participant in a criminal organisation to be monitored in the community after release through a direction that the participant wear electronic monitoring equipment and also for the installation of listening and other equipment into the homes of released prisoners. We do not have an issue with that particular section.

However, part 4 of the Judicial Review Act does not apply to either decisions made by the chief executive. The only available ground for review is jurisdictional error. I have raised these concerns previously in my speech. However, supportive family members will be unlikely to want a participant to live in their home because they will not want to be subject to being electronically monitored by authorities. The government may be required to provide individual public housing to house released participants because it is an offence for three participants to associate together.

Mr BLEIJIE: If you do the crime, you do the time. Get out of the business, get a real job and do not go to jail and they will not have anything to worry about being a participant or wearing ankle bracelets.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—

Ms PALASZCZUK (8.17 pm): Clause 18 inserts proposed new section 35OA that provides for the protection of intelligence product considered by the Supreme Court upon affidavit by the police. The concern is the insertion of proposed new section 350B 'Application of Judicial Review Act 1991', which provides that decisions of the chief executive cannot be challenged, appealed against, reviewed, quashed, set aside or called into question in any other way under the Judicial Review Act 1991 whether by the Supreme Court, another court, a tribunal or another entity, except for jurisdictional error. This is the clause that gives the powers to apply clause 14 and clause 16.

Mr BLEIJIE: The opposition leader correctly notes the clause.

Division: Question put—That clause 18, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 61—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 13—Byrne, Douglas, Hopper, Judge, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 18, as read, agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Before members leave the chamber I seek the leave of the House for all future divisions to be of one minute's duration.

Leave granted.

Clauses 19 to 41, as read, agreed to.

Clause 42—

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (8.24 pm): Clause 42 is about the part-time commissioners of the CMC. This is an issue about which I recall the member for Gladstone and also the member for Nicklin spoke earlier in the debate. Essentially, this amendment makes provision for the appointment of part-time commissioners. The opposition is totally opposed to this amendment. I said this at length during my speech. It is unacceptable to attack the independence of what should be the most independent agency within Queensland.

Ms TRAD: The very important principle that is at play here is that the PCMC and, as a follow-on effect, the CMC are not captured by one political party in this state. What the opposition is seeking to prosecute here is that the temporary appointment of part-time commissioners is done so in a bipartisan way with the support of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee. This is about checks and balances in our system of integrity and of fighting misconduct and organised crime.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms TRAD: Attorney-General, you will get your opportunity. I have no doubt about it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for South Brisbane, I ask that you direct your comments through the chair.

Ms TRAD: As I was saying, there is a critical issue in terms of ensuring that corruption does not flourish in this state by having in place checks and balances that make sure that appointments, such as of part-time commissioners, of the CMC have the bipartisan support of this parliament. It has become apparent that the Newman LNP government is singularly uninterested in having a cooperative, bipartisan relationship in terms of the oversight and the management of the CMC in relation to issues that have recently come to light. What the opposition is seeking to do is to ensure that the checks and balances that Queenslanders have come to expect in a modern democracy are retained in our system. For the LNP government to vote against this is effectively for the Liberal National Party to be turning their backs on important checks and balances in our system that ensure that appointments to the very powerful Crime and Misconduct Commission are done with a bipartisan and collaborative approach, an all-party approach.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms TRAD: I will accept that interjection from the Attorney-General. I would like to see when the Keilty report was commissioned. I would like to see the terms of reference. Perhaps the Attorney-General should table for the benefit of the House exactly when he commissioned that review and exactly what the terms of reference are. I have had a look at that review and I think it is a sham.

(Time expired)

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: In relation to this matter, again I put on the record my concern that, without any consultation with the PCMC into the future, the confidence in the appointment of part-time commissioners of the CMC will not necessarily be undermined but it will also not be strengthened. Again I put on the record that this bill does not just deal with the current situation; it does not just deal with the concerns of the Attorney-General but it also deals with the concerns of many other people with differing points of view to the Attorney-General that have been placed on the record over the last few weeks—this is going into the future. I would hope that we would be looking to build capacity in the process for appointing part-time commissioners and also to build and strengthen the relationship between the Attorney-General, whomever that is now or in the future, and the PCMC, whomever they are now and in the future, to benefit the CMC.

Mr BLEIJIE: There is nothing out of the ordinary with this amendment. Let me be clear for the member for South Brisbane.

Ms Palaszczuk: Put your spin on it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. You have had your chance; you have had a say. I am now responding. You raised the issue. Now I am responding.

Ms Palaszczuk: You interjected the whole time that the member for South Brisbane was on her feet. You did not stop talking. You are a rude man.

Mr BLEIJIE: I interjected on the member for South Brisbane because I am about to get to the member for South Brisbane because she would be one of the most unethical and the member with the least integrity in this place—

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. I find the remarks personally offensive. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr BLEIJIE: Withdrawn. Has the member for South Brisbane resigned from the Ethics Committee yet? No. That is right, because it is everyone else's fault. She does not have to know the standing orders, but we will all stand condemned and judged by the member for South Brisbane if we are referred to the Ethics Committee. That is okay, no worries at all!

Let me get to the point because the member for South Brisbane does not understand integrity and does not understand the CMC. This is how it operates. Under the Crime and Misconduct Act there are three provisions. One is in relation to the appointment of the chairperson. It says that if the position becomes vacant the Executive Council, the Governor, the Queen's representative, can appoint an acting chairperson. We then have the next level down with the part-time commissioners. We then have the level under that, the assistant commissioners.

There is also a provision that if there is a vacancy in the assistant commissioner role, the Governor in Council—the Governor, the Queen's representative—can appoint acting assistant commissioners. For part-time commissioners that arrangement is non-existent. I would say that it was actually left out of the original legislation. What we are simply doing is saying that when a part-time commissioner's position becomes vacant, executive council—the Governor, the Queen's representative—can appoint an acting commissioner; just the same as with the acting chairperson arrangement; just the same as with the assistant commissioner arrangement. So it is okay for the assistant commissioners to have acting arrangements and it is okay for the chairperson to have acting arrangements—which is the legislation introduced by the Labor Party. The Labor Party merged the CMC together, set up the Crime and Misconduct Act, and I suspect they were the ones that put in the provision about the acting arrangements. So they are going on about Dr Ken Levy now and how it should be all bipartisan support. Well, I would suggest to you that they are the party that put the provision in allowing the acting arrangements in the first place. So it is simply for the CMC to operate effectively and with the governance restructure that we are doing, it is no secret that it is a restructure.

Ms Palaszczuk: And you put it in there for 14 months—disgraceful!

Mr BLEIJIE: I will tell the opposition leader what is disgraceful, and it is the member sitting in the back corner there, the member for Rockhampton. When I mentioned—

Ms Palaszczuk: No, it's not. Look at yourself!

Mr BLEIJIE: You will want to hear this in silence, member!

Ms Palaszczuk: Table the terms of reference!

Mr BLEIJIE: You will want to hear this in silence!

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Madam Speaker, I will wait until they are silent, because they need to hear it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Order!

Mr BLEIJIE: They need to hear this. When I was talking about the Mick Keelty report, honourable members will know that Mick Keelty is one of the most esteemed and trusted former Australian Federal Police commissioners that Australia has ever had. He is one of the most respected officers in the Australian Federal Police.

Mr Byrne: He cannot write reports!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection. He conducted a review into the CMC. When I was talking before about Mick Keelty and the great work that he is doing, the member for Rockhampton said that he is a sham. The member for Rockhampton, ladies and gentlemen, the member for Rockhampton, the shadow police minister, said Mick Keelty is a shame.

Mr Byrne: That's right!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. That is an interjection of inexperience that you will regret, member for Rockhampton. I take the interjection before when you said Mick Keelty was a sham. I note the member for South Brisbane was busy nodding away as well and accepting your position that Mick Keelty is a sham. I think you are a sham, member for Rockhampton! Keep talking, member for Rockhampton! What you have just done is one of the most inexperienced interjections that is now on the public record. We can assure you, member for Rockhampton, that Mick Keelty is one of the most respected people—

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: They do not get the point. What more evidence do they need to show that the CMC has become a dysfunctional body? They have their own—

Ms Trad: From a report that you have not provided us the terms of reference, you have not told us—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton) Order, member for South Brisbane!

Mr BLEIJIE: I was about to say that there have been a few reports into the CMC, one of which was by the PCMC, and I think the member for South Brisbane was on that committee. They conducted a report. Was the member for South Brisbane engaged in the report into the shredding of the Fitzgerald documents? Was the member for South Brisbane on the PCMC in relation to the unauthorised disclosure of documentation? The PCMC committee, which the Labor Party are represented on, tabled in this place a damning report on the CMC that said it is in major need of restructure. That was the PCMC. Just prior to that there was the Hon. Ian Callinan, former High Court judge. Member for Rockhampton, what are you going to say about Ian Callinan? Is he a sham? Member for South Brisbane, what do you say about Ian Callinan?

Ms Trad: I will tell you what I will say about you, Attorney-General. Do you want me to tell you what I say?

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, I would. Go for it!

Ms Trad: I am saying that you will not list the terms of reference—

Mr BLEIJIE: I am asking the member for South Brisbane—

Ms Trad: I am saying that you are withholding from the—

Mr BLEIJIE: I can see the opposition leader is cringing in front saying, 'Please be quiet, member for South Brisbane.' What does the member for South Brisbane think about Ian Callinan, former High Court judge? What does the member for South Brisbane think about Professor Nicholas Aroney, who commissioned—

Ms Trad: I will tell you what I think about you, Attorney-General—

Mr BLEIJIE: Madam Speaker, they asked the questions on the clauses; they do not want to hear the responses. The fact is that we have now had three damning reports of the CMC and its structure. That is why we are proceeding with the restructure, and that is why it is important that we have people down there who will make sure there is a cultural change in the CMC. Those opposite object to it because they believe we are still living in the 80s.

Division: Question put—That clause 42, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 58—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 13—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Hopper, Judge, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative

Clause 42, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 43 to 55, as read, agreed to.

Clause 56—



Ms PALASZCZUK (8.41 pm): Part 8 and the clauses that follow on from clause 56 are amendments to the Electrical Safety Act. I ask the Attorney-General what evidence or advice he was given in relation to extending the provisions of the act to the electrical area in terms of prohibited persons. What was the evidence? What are you basing it on? Where was your information coming from? Can you also please advise who you consulted?

Mr BLEIJIE: I am confused. Clause 56, which we are debating, states—

This part amends the *Electrical Safety Act 2002*.

That is it. There is no issue.

Division: Question put—That clause 56, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 64—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Katter, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 56, as read, agreed to.

Clause 57—



Ms PALASZCZUK (8.46 pm): Once again I ask the Attorney-General if he could please explain who he consulted in relation to the amendments to the Electrical Safety Act. It is a very simple question. Who did you consult and why did you put into this bill amendments to the Electrical Safety Act? Clause 57 specifically amends section 59 to allow the regulator to refuse to issue an electrical licence if the person is a prohibited person. Who did you consult and why now is the Electrical Safety Act captured as part of your bill?

Mr BLEIJIE: The opposition leader correctly notes the clause. She understands the clause, interprets the clause correctly and it applies to the Electrical Safety Act and those provided under that act.

Division: Question put—That clause 57, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 63—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 57, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 58 to 67, as read, agreed to.

Clause 68—

Ms PALASZCZUK (8.51 pm): Clause 68 amends the Electrical Safety Act to exclude the operation of the Judicial Review Act 1991. Part 4 of the act does not apply to the decision of the regulator. I have previously outlined my objections to this provision and have no further comment to make.

Division: Question put—That clause 68, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 61—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 11—Byrne, Cunningham, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszcuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 68, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 69 to 109, as read, agreed to.

Clause 110 to 126, as read, agreed to.

Clause 127—

Ms PALASZCZUK (8.55 pm): This is the first clause of part 14 relating to amendment of the Queensland Building Services Authority Act. This gives provision to amend it. However, once again I just want a clear answer from the Attorney-General: who did he consult in relation to these amendments and for the Building Services Authority to be captured?

Mr BLEIJIE: Clause 127 states—

This part amends the Queensland Building Services Authority Act 1991.

It is self-explanatory and it therefore requires no further explanation.

Division: Question put—That clause 127, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 65—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Knuth, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszcuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 127, as read, agreed to.

Clause 128—

Ms PALASZCZUK (8.59 pm): This issue is very similar to the issues that I raised in relation to the Electrical Safety Act. It is a very clear and simple question to the Attorney-General: who did he consult in relation to this?

Division: Question put—That clause 128, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 65—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Knuth, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 9—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Mulherin, Palaszcuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Clause 128, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 129 to 233, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.03 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill 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) (9.03 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I am very happy to announce that the member for Beaudesert and his wife are very happy to announce the arrival of their second son, weighing 3.65 kilograms, at 8.10 this evening. Both mother and son are well and, according to the member for Beaudesert, we are all very lucky that he looks like his mother.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEES

Select Committee on Ethics, Order of Appointment; Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, Membership

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.04 pm): by leave, without notice: I move that—

- 1 The House notes that the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee (PCMC):
 - (a) resolved that pursuant to standing order 268(1) that the matters concerning Dr Ken Levy's evidence to the PCMC be referred to the Ethics Committee;
 - (b) authorised evidence gathered by the PCMC relevant to the matter be provided to the Ethics Committee;
 - (c) reported to the House on the PCMC's decision; and
 - (d) recommended to the House that the House appoint a select Ethics Committee to consider this matter.
- 2 In accordance with the recommendation of the PCMC, the House establishes a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Ethics and that:
 - (a) the committee be charged with the responsibility of investigating and reporting on matters relating to the Dr Ken Levy's evidence to the PCMC;
 - (b) the matters relating to the Dr Ken Levy's evidence to the PCMC be discharged from the Ethics Committee and all material relating to the matter be transmitted by the Clerk to the Select Committee on Ethics;
 - (c) the committee comprises six members, three members (including the chair) appointed by the Leader of the House and three members appointed by the Leader of the Opposition.
 - (d) notwithstanding anything contained in standing orders, the appointment of members by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition shall be by writing to the Clerk. The Clerk shall table the letters of nomination upon receipt;
 - (e) every member of the committee has a vote in every question before the committee and the chair of the committee has a vote and a casting vote;
 - (f) no member who has a conflict of interest or previous involvement in the matter under consideration can be nominated; and
 - (g) the committee has the power to call for persons, papers and things.
- 3 That this House:
 - (a) immediately discharges the membership of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee;
 - (b) that notwithstanding anything contained in standing orders, the appointment of new members to the committee shall be by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition writing to the Clerk with their appointments;
 - (c) the appointments of members by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition must be according to s.300 of the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001; and
 - (d) the Clerk shall table the letters of nomination upon receipt.

Madam SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition is there a copy of that motion to be circulated? Could I have a copy, please? Thank you.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.08 pm): This is a very lengthy motion that has just been read out by the Leader of the House. On the surface it looked plausible, until I read page 3. At the top of page 3 is a clause that says 'immediately discharges the membership of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee'.

I think the government has an ulterior motive and I think that ulterior motive is very clear. That ulterior motive is that perhaps the existing committee will go completely and it will be up to the government to nominate four fresh nominees.

Let us go back through the history. Under the CMC Act, from memory the government appoints four members and the Leader of the Opposition nominates three. In the previous parliament the Leader of the Opposition nominated four, including the chair, and the government nominated three.

Mr Seeney: No.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is my understanding.

Mr Seeney: No, you're wrong. That's wrong.

Ms PALASZCZUK: And there was a recommendation—

Mr Seeney: No, no.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I stand corrected. I said that is my recollection. If that is not correct, I am happy to stand corrected, Deputy Premier. But I do recall that there was clearly a recommendation from a parliamentary committee to recommend to this House that the chair be appointed by the Leader of the Opposition and the government chose not to implement that recommendation; correct?

Mr Seeney interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. Thank you very much.

Mr Seeney: That's not right.

Ms Trad: That the opposition appointed the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That the opposition appointed the chair.

Mr Seeney: That's not right.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There was a recommendation of a committee. That is correct.

Mr Seeney: The recommendation was that it will be a non-government chair appointed by the Leader of the House.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, that was not a recommendation in the report.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Members!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to stand corrected, but I going by my recollection.

What we have seen here over the last few days has been a complete and utter disgrace. The Attorney-General should have absolved himself from any involvement because he was directly named in the correspondence. As I have said time and time again this week, and especially today, this is a cover-up. This is absolutely a cover-up. There is very clear evidence on the public record. I want to know what the government's motives are for discharging the membership of the PCMC. I want to know why those opposite do not have confidence in the PCMC. This is about trashing the reputations of members in this House. A note was tabled in parliament today in relation to the member for Bundamba. I want to know from the government did that come from her personal private file held by the department? If it did, is that a breach of privacy provisions? Where was that trawled out from? There is the challenge for the Attorney-General: come clean and tell us where that file note came from.

I have also sat here and heard the reputations of the members for South Brisbane and Nicklin trashed. It is absolutely atrocious. But the worst condemnation from this government is the way it has treated the chair, who is an Independent member of this House, the member for Gladstone, whose only crime, from what I can gather, was to be independent. The chair of the PCMC obviously did not do what the government wanted her to do. There are some questions here that need to be answered. At the end of the day the truth has started to come out. The truth is there on the public record. Those opposite can spin this as much as they want. They can come in here and pass motion after motion after motion and attack members of the House, but they are undermining the integrity of this parliament. These are committees endorsed by the parliament to do their job. This is what a massive majority in this state does. They just do whatever they want to do.

I have sat here today from the early hours of the morning for what has been the worst performance. There has been motion after motion attacking personal reputations. I think it borders on intimidation. If I were the members I would seriously think about how they have been intimidated, which is a breach of one of the immunities of this parliament and could amount to contempt. I will leave it up to the members to decide if they want to do anything about that. We have good, hardworking members in this House whose reputations have been shattered.

I do not know where the records of the member for Bundamba have come from, but I think it is appalling and unethical to table them. The Attorney-General has been vindictive, nasty and tricky and has shown more bias than any other member in this House because he is directly implicated. If there is one person who should stand aside in relation to all of this it is absolutely the Attorney-General. I am going to take the high moral ground tonight because someone in this state needs to stand up to these men opposite.

In conclusion, there is no way we can support this motion as it stands. This motion needed to be a bipartisan motion of the parliament. It does not have any credibility if it is not bipartisan. Not once were we consulted in relation to it. The Manager of Government Business just comes in here with his three pages—'Here is your parting Christmas gift'. My parting Christmas gift to those opposite is that the people of Redcliffe will make a passing judgement on them in the coming months.

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You can sit there and laugh.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is no way that we will be supporting this motion. It is a sham and unacceptable. The public now has access to the public transcripts that this government sought to cover up.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (9.15 pm): I rise to speak to this motion. I would like to put on the record my appreciation for parts 1 and 2 of this motion. I believe that in terms of the pursuit of justice and a good, clear, defendable, transparent and just result that there should be an independent select Ethics Committee to consider these matters. I have already said in this place that we as a committee believed unanimously that there were concerns that reached the threshold for reference to the Ethics Committee. There have been allegations here that we referred the matter to Ethics because we were not competent to do the job or we were agreeing with and acquiescing to bias. I am not going to get into that debate. We believed it reached the threshold in terms of the requirement for the Ethics Committee to investigate the matter.

I am obviously disappointed in the third part of this motion. I think it is disappointing that the politics of the last few weeks has led to this parliament now considering a motion that I believe reflects poorly on what is a unicameral system reliant heavily on the committee process. It will be a matter for this parliament. I cannot help but express my disappointment in the process and in the recommendation that this motion in part 3 makes. However, I do thank the Attorney-General for parts 1 and 2 and the clarity that that may provide to the matter in relation to Dr Levy. Again I am disappointed in part 3.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (9.17 pm): I, too, rise to make a contribution in relation to this motion that has been submitted to the House at 9 pm on the last sitting day of this year. Like the member before me, the member for Gladstone, Liz Cunningham, and like the opposition leader has articulated, the first two sections of this motion are obviously quite in order and reasonable in their intent and their execution. When one gets to section 3, and particularly 3(a), one sees what this is really about. It really is about ensuring that if you cannot control something you destroy it. The LNP, and in particular the Newman LNP government, is so arrogant with its overblown majority that it is prepared to do absolutely anything to get its way.

Late last year this government sacked the member for Gaven from the Ethics Committee and from the PCMC. That absolutely has to be attributed to the fact that the member for Gaven, regardless of his party political membership, would do what his conscience told him to do as opposed to what those opposite, the leadership group, told him to do. Whether it was in relation to a matter that emanated from the membership of the LNP party room or whether it was in relation to another matter, the member for Gaven had the principles and he had the conscience to do as he should do as the chair of the Ethics Committee and as a member of the PCMC. And what did this government do? It sacked him from both of those committees, because it could not control him.

Let us be clear about what happened in the lead-up to the public inquiry into the release and the destruction of the Fitzgerald inquiry documents. The Premier of this state publicly stated that the PCMC had become the lapdog of the CMC. He went on a campaign, and he ramped it up before that public inquiry commenced, so he could intimidate those members of the PCMC to get the outcome that the Newman LNP government wanted. It wanted an outcome where the former chair, Mr Ross Martin, was crucified. They wanted an outcome of confected outrage and chaos, so that members of the committee, particularly their members of the committee, could go hard in questioning. As the Leader of the Opposition has stated, the Attorney-General has been named in evidence to the PCMC, now in the hands of the Ethics Committee. He should have excused himself from commentary on this issue. It is fine for you to set the standards, but you do not want to comply with them, Attorney-General. You won't comply with them.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Member for South Brisbane, I ask you to direct your comments through the chair.

Ms TRAD: Of course, Madam Speaker. I apologise.

Mr Bleijie: Resign from the Ethics Committee?

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Attorney-General, I ask you to cease your interjections.

Ms TRAD: What is clear is that there was a dog—it was not even a dog whistle. It was apparent, it was very clear and it was very transparent that the Premier of this state went out. Mr Ross Martin was accused, tried and executed by this government before the public inquiry had even started. I urge those members opposite to have a look at the public transcripts of the public inquiry into the release and the destruction of Fitzgerald inquiry documents. I urge them to look at some of the questioning that came from government members on that committee. I want them to come back into this House and to reconcile with their own conscience whether the questioning that was apparent in that public inquiry was in any way different from the questioning that the Leader of the Opposition put forward in the public inquiry on 1 November to the acting chair of the PCMC, Dr Levy. I challenge anyone on the government benches to have a look at the questioning put forward during the public inquiry held earlier this year, to have a look at the questions that came from government members who sat on the PCMC, and try to distinguish between the tone and the temper of those questions put forward by government members and the questions put forward by non-government members that were apparent in the transcripts that were tabled last night by the Independent member for Gladstone and chair of the PCMC. I challenge every single member to make the comparison. The comparisons will speak for themselves. There has been a consistency in the questioning, in the tone and in the temperament. As parliamentarians, our job is to bring a level of scrutiny and a level of analysis when something is wrong. That is what we did earlier this year and that is what we did in November this year.

It is clear that this is part of the end strategy by this government to ensure that the cover-up continues. This is about disbanding the PCMC and ensuring that they get their way in terms of the membership of the PCMC. You do not have to be a maths genius to be clear about the constitution of the opposition and the crossbenches. You could even name the members who would be part of the reconstituted PCMC. You can make that guess already. It is clear that this is also an expression of no confidence in the member for Greenslopes, the member for Coomera and the member for Beaudesert, who is the other LNP member on the committee. I take this opportunity to congratulate him and his wife on the birth of their son. I find it disgraceful that this motion is up at the same time that that joyous news has been announced to the House, because quite frankly it is an expression of no confidence in your own backbenchers, your own members, on the PCMC. That is what it is. Let us be clear what this is about: this government, which promised to govern with dignity, humility and grace, is governing with complete and utter arrogance. You are so scared of a bipartisan—

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Please, member, direct your comments through the chair.

Ms TRAD: I will, Madam Speaker. I apologise. This government has 74 members. It used to have 78 members, but this time last year it dwindled down to 74. This government, with all of its members—

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members! There are too many interjections that the person with the call is not taking. I call the member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: This government knows it has the numerical muscle, but it does not have the intellectual muscle or the moral muscle to engage in this issue in a way that serves the people of Queensland and not the LNP. It is a complete and utter outrage that the government should come into the House after 9 pm on the last sitting day of the year with a motion to seek to disband the PCMC because it did not get the outcome that it wanted. That is a complete and utter corruption of the process and any argument to the alternative is just hollow rhetoric. The government will be judged for this. It will absolutely be judged for this.

I stand by my comments that the old National Party was on a vendetta to completely and utterly destroy the CMC by abolishing it. I think the MOU with the Police Union made that clear during the Mundingburra by-election. This government is a little bit more sophisticated now, although not too much more. The Newman LNP government is seeking to destroy the CMC, not by abolishing it but by controlling it, and that actually extends to the PCMC. The government wants to control it so it can control the outcome. Because that is its intent, it will destroy the bipartisan approach to deliberations on that committee. It will destroy—

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms TRAD: Because of this manoeuvre, they are taking the architecture that was put in place by Tony Fitzgerald in the report he wrote upon the completion of his investigation into the police and government corruption that presided during the last time those members opposite were in government for a long period. They are taking the architecture that was put in place for our modern democracy, for transparency and accountability in our system of government and the institutions within our democracy. They are taking that architecture and they are destroying it. They are absolutely destroying it.

Every single person who votes in favour of this motion as it stands now will be condemned. This is a slippery slope back to the bad old days. If people do not stand up against it now and stand up and be counted now then they stand condemned for allowing it to flourish.

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (9.29 pm): I would just like to say that this Attorney-General is simply unbelievable. I have seen a lot in this parliament over the years, but this is the lowest of the low. This Attorney-General has come into this parliament this evening and said to the chair and members of the PCMC, 'Merry Christmas, you are sacked.' That is what this Attorney-General has done. This is just like this LNP government did to thousands and thousands of public servants who were also sacked by this government this time last year. Whether they call them VERs or anything else, what it means is that they are sacked.

I put on the record that last night and in the early hours of this morning the fact that I thought that what this government was up to was nobbling the PCMC and the CMC, and I am right. This evening we find section 3(a) of the motion says 'immediately discharges the membership of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee'. This is a get square. This is being done for no apparent reason. This is a payback to the members of the PCMC and a payback to the chair of the PCMC, who bravely walked into this House last night and did what was right for Queensland. What she did was fought to be able to have the transcripts that the committee thought appropriate to go out into the public arena go out so that the people of Queensland could judge for themselves what was being undertaken by the PCMC.

I would like to congratulate the chair of the PCMC for the brave move she undertook on behalf of the membership of the PCMC. As deputy chair of the PCMC I stand here tonight proud of the work we have done on a bipartisan basis since the committee was formed after the election last year. We have worked together in a bipartisan spirit on some very difficult matters and some very difficult issues, including the release of the Fitzgerald inquiry documents. That took not just days, not just weeks but months.

This Attorney-General has a PhD in nobbling. That is what he has. What he wants to do by sacking the chair and the members of the PCMC is to put in place a 'yes' committee. That is what he is really after. That is what the Attorney-General wants. He wants to be able to put in place a committee that will simply nod when it is told to nod. That is what this government wants. It is

absolutely disgraceful. They also want to be able to control the CMC, in my view, through the continued acting appointment of the current acting chair when they have had plenty of opportunity to advertise the position of full-time chair of the CMC.

I would just like to refer to the comments of the Deputy Premier in relation to section 300 of the Crime and Misconduct Act. I know that the Deputy Premier does not like reading because he is more into thuggery. Recommendation 34 of the PCMC's three-yearly review of the CMC states—

The committee recommends that section 300(2) of the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001 be amended to provide that the chair of the PCMC must be a member nominated as chairperson by the Leader of the Opposition.

That was the recommendation of the three-yearly review. People thought that they were electing a government, but what they got was a dictatorship. There is a big difference between the people electing a government and the people electing a dictatorship. What we have here tonight is a government that is in fact a dictatorship. What they have done here tonight by moving this motion is run over the top of the bipartisan PCMC.

In relation to the cover-up I would like to place on the record that what we have is the Premier's 'Levygate'. I am sure people in this House tonight and people right across Queensland will remember Richard Nixon's Watergate. There will be many people, in a certain age bracket, who will also remember McCarthyism. That is also what we have in this state this evening.

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, I would ask you to address the motion before the House.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. What we had with the PCMC was a balanced committee in terms of the number of men and women. We had a female chair of the PCMC and we also had two other women on that committee, the member for South Brisbane and me. These women have vast experience in government. The chair of the PCMC has a lot of experience in local government from her previous career. The member for South Brisbane and I also have significant experience in other levels of government. My experience is in federal government as well as state government. I also have private sector experience. These women brought to this committee significant experience in government. Peter Wellington has significant experience in local government as well. I will not talk about the government members of the committee.

No-one in Queensland should have any doubt at all that what this is is a cover-up racket that has been established by this government in Queensland. They have now set themselves up as the Premier Campbell Newman's dictatorship. We now have a situation in Queensland where the PCMC has been sacked. We have a situation where the CMC has been totally nobbled. We have a situation where this dictatorship of a government says, through its actions here tonight and its other actions in relation to the CMC Act, that if the people who work there or the people on the PCMC do not do what they are told by this government then it is over. They will replace the good people on the committee.

I believe that the people of Queensland will see through this because we have to remember back to 1987. I have seen all this before, members. When Fitzgerald started off the inquiry in 1987 and it started to uncover a few things, one of the things that the then government wanted to do was try to shut it down after six to seven weeks.

However, what had happened was that the people of Queensland were so horrified by what Tony Fitzgerald was uncovering that the government then had no choice but to keep it going. And I say good on Bill Gunn at the time, because Bill Gunn stood up like the member for Gladstone has stood up and like the members of the PCMC have stood up to say, 'Open it up because the people of Queensland have a right to see what is going on.' So what happened after six to seven weeks of the Fitzgerald inquiry is that it actually went on for another two years, and I think it reported around June or July in 1989. And what happened after that? The LNP was kicked out of office.

What we have here tonight is another example of the fact that those people opposite who were part of the broom that swept through in 1989 have never forgiven the people of Queensland. They have never forgiven Tony Fitzgerald, and they have never forgiven Sir Max Bingham and the other chairs of the CMC. They have never forgiven EARC, the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, that was set up. They have never forgiven the Queensland Crime Commission.

What this is all about is total payback, and you have to wonder why. I will tell you why, and that is that members of this government and people who support this government want to get their greedy little hands on the money again. They want to get their greedy mitts on money, in my view, in a

corrupt way. That is what this is about. In a few years time what we are going to see is a judicial inquiry, an independent judicial inquiry, by another generation of Tony Fitzgeralds who will come through and have to clean up the mess and the corruption that this LNP government are institutionally putting in place tonight, because that is what it is about.

The interesting thing is that it does not take them long, does it, because there must be some sort of school of corruption or antimoralism—

Ms Trad: LNP membership.

Mrs MILLER: Or LNP membership. It must be born in them.

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr Rickuss:—protected paedophiles. I cannot believe it.

Mrs MILLER: Madam Speaker, I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. The member for Lockyer just called me a paedophile. I take that interjection.

Government members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members! Pause the clock. Members, I appreciate the debate is a heated one, but I am having difficulty not only hearing clearly the member but even some of the interjections the member is responding to because people are just starting to shout over the top of each other. I ask that you cease your interjections and I ask the member for Bundamba to address the motion.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to place on record the lowness of the member for Lockyer, who called me a paedophile and was screaming ‘paedophiles’ across this chamber. I find it offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr Bleijie: He didn’t say it.

Mrs MILLER: He did.

Mr RICKUSS: Madam Speaker, I find that assertion untruthful and ask that it be withdrawn. I find it offensive.

Madam SPEAKER: We have two members who have just taken offence to each other in the exchange. Members, I would ask for some common sense here. The interjections were so loud that it was not possible to clearly hear what was being said. Firstly, I am going to ask the member for Lockyer, did you in fact make that accusation in respect of the member for Bundamba?

Mr Rickuss: No.

Madam SPEAKER: Okay. With respect, I could not hear clearly and I did warn members that the matters were not clear. I am not going to ask either member to withdraw because I think that we have to have a bit of common sense here. The member has time on the clock. I ask people to please cease their interjections and I ask the member to address the motion.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is a very sad night this evening for democracy in this state. In relation to discharging the membership of the PCMC that in my view have done a magnificent job since this committee was put in place after the last state election, what this is about is getting square. As I said prior to being rudely interrupted by the member for Lockyer and his abuse, what I am saying here this evening is that, no matter what, in future years there will be an independent judicial inquiry conducted in relation to these matters. There will be, I have no doubt, an independent judicial inquiry in relation to the whole situation of what is happening tonight with the PCMC. There might even be a judicial inquiry into the actions of the Attorney-General. There might also be a judicial inquiry into the actions of the Premier and his office in relation to the matters that the PCMC has been conducting.

I would just like to say as well that a judicial inquiry, in my view, is the only way that these issues can be dealt with. What we have seen here tonight, which is ‘Merry Christmas, you’re sacked’ from the Attorney-General, is a juvenile response—it is a childish and petulant response—to the fact that the PCMC last night outwitted the government and easily outwitted the Attorney-General. Now, it is not too hard. But what the government was trying to do was to keep the proceedings of the PCMC

and to keep the transcripts of the PCMC under wraps so that it could all be covered up. That is what they wanted. They have also over the last couple of days tried to trash and taint the reputations of members of the PCMC.

The government have always—always—tried to trash the reputation of the member for Nicklin, and that is because the ‘national’ LNP government have always believed, quite wrongly in fact, that they somehow own the seat of Nicklin, and they have never got over it. Also, in relation to the member for Gladstone—the Independent member for Gladstone—they thought that the member for Gladstone, as chair of the PCMC, was in their pocket. Well, guess what? The member for Gladstone has acted independently. I have to say, Madam Speaker, that sometimes during the deliberations of the PCMC we have not seen eye to eye, but in the interests of democracy that is good because all of us on the PCMC are able to speak our minds, we are able to debate the issues and we are usually able to come together as one and make a decision for the good governance and for the good welfare of the people of this state.

In relation to the member for South Brisbane, we have seen an absolutely disgraceful performance by the Attorney-General in really trying to upset the situation with the member for South Brisbane and her husband’s employment. We have seen the situation here today and yesterday where they have tried to have a go at me in relation to my employment at the department of justice—

Ms Trad: That’s with humility, dignity and grace!

Mrs MILLER: I take that interjection—something that I find quite amazing because that was a period of my life that I had actually forgotten about. So I find it quite amazing. They have also tried to trash the reputation of the Leader of the Opposition, and that seems to be in the DNA of the LNP. It also seems to be in the DNA of this Attorney-General to run around like a two-year-old toddler, tramping his feet around the place: ‘If I don’t get my own way, I’ll put on a tantrum and come into this House with all sorts of nonsense motions and carry on in a very silly and a very juvenile way.’

It is no wonder that this Attorney-General has the reputation that he does in the legal fraternity. In fact, some of the legal fraternity have said to me that when he loses his seat in the next election he will probably have to move interstate because not only will no-one in the legal fraternity in Queensland offer him a job but also if he applied for a job they would not be seen to pick him up. That is what we have here.

In relation to a cover-up, that is exactly what we are seeing here. In relation to ‘Levygate’, I have never seen in this parliament before the efforts to which this LNP Newman government dictatorship has gone to try to trash the reputations of the members of the PCMC and also other members of this parliament. The members of the PCMC have discharged their duties in a very professional way. They have discharged their duties in my view in a way that I believe brings them great credit in the community.

If this Attorney-General has nothing to hide, he should immediately call for a judicial inquiry. He seems to have no worries calling for judicial inquiries when he thinks he is going to make political gain out of them; he does not seem to worry about things like that. His agenda is about controlling the PCMC; it is about controlling the CMC. The next election will be a referendum on the corruption or alleged corruption of this government. That is what it will be about. Hopefully, this government will be thrown out on its neck.

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.51 pm): I think the last three-quarters of an hour or so has been one of the least enlightening periods that I have ever spent in this parliament. In the last three-quarters of an hour or so we have been treated to a regurgitation of the same hysterical nonsense that we saw here last night and that we saw here again in question time this morning. We have seen from both the member for Bundamba and the member for South Brisbane what one would expect to see from people who know that they have failed and hysterically seek to blame somebody else. They seek to regurgitate the old conspiracy theories and present the parliament with their twisted perceptions of the past, in some way hoping that that will justify the failure that they themselves admitted to this parliament this morning.

We saw from the Leader of the Opposition an address that was a turgid repetition of the word ‘cover-up’. It was cover-up, cover-up, cover-up, cover-up, but she never explained once what it was that the parliament was supposed to be covering up. In fact, what has happened in this parliament over the last 24 hours is the exact opposite. What we have done is to ensure that this document was

not covered up by the members of the committee who were supposed to provide the author of this document with the opportunity for natural justice, an opportunity to have his say. We ensured that this was not covered up. We ensured that the member for South Brisbane and the member for Bundamba could not cover up this document. We ensured that it was available here in the parliament; that Dr Levy had an opportunity to have his side of the story heard, an opportunity to put his case, a basic requirement of fairness and justice that everybody would subscribe to—but not the member for Bundamba and the member for South Brisbane, who have demonstrated their political bias and political motivation more clearly today than was evident yesterday. Even today in question time and again here tonight you cannot but fully comprehend the extent of bias which permeated that committee. That is why the government has taken the action of moving the motion tonight. I rise to support that motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House.

It is important to note that the first two parts of the motion that has been moved by the Leader of House are exactly what the committee suggested when the chairman of that committee tabled this document in the parliament earlier this morning. It is exactly what they suggested. What the chairman of the committee tabled was a document that suggested a number of actions, all of which the government take tonight. What the chairman of the committee also did when she tabled this document was to concede and to admit that the committee could no longer do its job. That is what this document says. It says, 'The committee of which I am the chair cannot complete the task that this parliament has given us and we recommend that the parliament set up another committee to do our job for us because we cannot do it anymore.' That is what this document says. The chairman of the committee had to come in here and say to the parliament that 'the member for Bundamba, the member for South Brisbane and the Leader of the Opposition have demonstrated such bias that the committee can no longer perform its function. Therefore, we recommend to the parliament that the parliament sets up another committee to do the job that can no longer be done by the people who have responsibility'. Of course, the chairman of the committee was right. The committee had become so biased in its approach to the issue that it could no longer consider the matter, it could no longer be charged with the responsibility to act on behalf of this parliament. The third part that we have added to the motion tonight—the words that we have added to those that were suggested by the chairman of that committee—brings a solution to that intolerable situation.

Dr Douglas: Cowardice! You are a bunch of cowards. You above all, 15 years—

Ms Trad interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, pause the clock. Order, members! I can hear shouting from up in the back corner. Your interjections are not being received. There were interjections to my left as well that the Deputy Premier is not taking. I call the Deputy Premier.

Mr SEENEY: I always welcome interjections, but I cannot take them if they are as nonsensical as the ones that come from the member for Gaven. It is important that the parliament and everybody who is listening or who reads the proceedings of the parliament understand clearly what is happening here tonight. The government is moving to ensure that we do have a strong CMC and that we do have a strong and effective PCMC because the PCMC has come into this parliament and said, 'We can no longer do our job.' The reasons that it can no longer do its job have been clearly illustrated to the parliament by the member for Bundamba and the member for South Brisbane. Of course, in the debate tonight we have heard all of this hysterical paranoia and all of these conspiracy theories that somehow or other we are attacking the CMC and we are dismantling the PCMC—quite the opposite. This parliament has the responsibility to make sure that the composition of the PCMC is such that it can carry out the functions which this parliament charges the committee to so do. Clearly, the committee has indicated to us the obvious: that it can no longer do that.

It is gross arrogance, I would suggest, for the two members who have themselves conceded that they can no longer carry out those functions to suggest repeatedly in the House tonight that somehow or other no other members of this parliament can do it, that no other members of this parliament are fit and proper persons to sit on that committee, that the committee cannot be constituted by anybody else but them, that they are the only members who have the ability to carry out this role. Of course that is nonsense. There are a great many other members in this parliament who have the ability to serve on that committee, and that is the end result that this motion before the House will bring about.

I think we have had enough of the hysterical rantings and conspiracy theories that we have heard from the members on the other side. We have a situation here where the government has acted responsibly when it was clear that there was unacceptable bias in the committee that was charged with an important responsibility on behalf of that parliament. That bias was admitted by the chairman of the committee. She came into this parliament and conceded that the committee could no longer fulfil its function and recommended to us as a parliament that we appoint another committee to undertake that function. We have acceded to that request in every way, and we have also accepted the advice from the committee that they can no longer perform the function that the parliament expects of them. We will move to ensure that there is a committee in place that can fulfil that function.

It is important that that committee that we have set up on the recommendation of the member for Gladstone does have all of the information and all of the documents to consider this matter that are available. That is why we have provided the opportunity to Dr Levy to provide his side of the story to the parliament tonight; an opportunity that was denied to him by the committee, the members for South Brisbane and Bundamba and their majority colleagues on the committee. It is important for the parliament and for the completeness of the issue that those documents are available.

I am sure that the members, whoever they are, that will be appointed to that select committee can consider those documents and the situation that we have seen unfold here over the last couple of days and make a recommendation or decision on behalf of us all. That will be the task that they will be charged with. I do not think that there has been anything new added to this debate tonight. I think what we have heard from the other side is a regurgitation of what we have heard repeated endlessly yesterday, last night and again this morning and in question time. I would suggest there is nothing to be further gained by continuing to repeat that sort of hysteria and those sort of conspiracy theories, so I therefore move—

That the motion be put.

Speaker's Ruling, Motion Out of Order

Madam SPEAKER: I had an indication from the member for Gaven that he wished to speak, and under the standing orders it is at the discretion of the Speaker to consider whether the matter has been fully debated. I will call the member for Gaven but I would ask him, in addressing the motion, not to simply repeat issues that have already been put.



Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—UAP) (10.02 pm): I will be brief. I oppose the motion for many reasons. What we are actually hearing is two separate stories: one is the government's story, and they are actually seeking to protect what they believe is their delegate; from the other side we are hearing a story of what actually happened in a properly empanelled committee investigation. A recurring end-of-year pattern has tended to happen with this now midterm government with regard to serious committees that have been empanelled by the parliament itself.

The motion tonight clearly has elements of things that have been agreed to—elements of it—but there is a significant element because it seeks to remove existing people on the Ethics Committee and on the PCMC, and that is why this debate has come about. These are very important committees, and the Deputy Premier has said, yes, many people can serve on those committees. But it is a very, very extraordinary situation for that to occur. It is extraordinary that there would be a select committee formed. But in this case, in the interests of what the committee has decided is the appropriate way to go forward, that is exactly what it has come up with.

But the findings of that committee were very, very significant and no government and no opposition should ever ignore that. There is a wider argument going on in the community. The public are looking at this and they are deciding if the government of the day is fit to govern the state. That is what they are saying! And the current view is it is not fit because it does not believe that it needs to support honesty and ethics in governance in this state. This government is making a mockery of the legal system and it is being judged across the nation as a laughing stock. That is what is happening! Every member needs to understand that they need to look to themselves and their communities and say: what am I doing? Who am I representing? Am I representing a party that is basically looking like a joke, or am I representing my wider community? They need to say that this motion is appalling because it is removing people who are their genuine representatives who are doing their jobs. They have found that one person who was in a very serious position was unable to give them a story that was consistent—that is what was said—and it is a very, very serious thing. I know, because I have been on those committees over a long period of time, as some members here have, and they took their jobs very seriously.

When members vote on this motion tonight you need to really think hard about what you are doing, because it will probably be the most significant thing you ever do as a member. Do not underestimate the significance of it!

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

AYES, 64—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Kaye, Menkens

NOES, 12—Byrne, Douglas, Judge, Katter, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.12 pm): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 11 February 2014.

VALEDICTORY



Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (10.12 pm): It gives me great pleasure to address the House as part of the traditional end-of-year valedictory debate to reflect on some of the events of the year while also acknowledging the efforts of everyone who has played their part in the operation of the parliament.

The year, of course, started with the devastation and loss wreaked by ex-Tropical Cyclone Oswald that was felt across 57 of Queensland's local government areas at an estimated cost of \$2.5 billion. Many of these areas faced similar tragedy in 2010 and 2012. The Queensland government moved quickly to coordinate the recovery process. I am pleased to say that most communities are recovering well. The resilience shown by Queenslanders has, yet again, been nothing short of inspirational. However, some people still need help and we will continue to provide what help we can.

There is no doubt that natural disasters will continue to be a part of our future and, while we have to live with these risks, we can improve our ability to respond, to recover from any future disaster and to build resilience to mitigate the threats and impacts. Following the disasters earlier this year I expanded Minister Crisafulli's role to include the portfolios of community recovery and resilience. Since then we have been working with local governments and communities to look at practical, cost-effective and local solutions to minimise the impact of future disasters. Our goal is to become the most resilient state in Australia.

2013 has also seen solid progress on our action plan to make Queensland a great state with great opportunity. Our six-month action plans have set out the way forward by building confidence in our economic future, increasing certainty for industry and delivering on the five pledges we made to the people of Queensland. They also give the community the opportunity to measure us against what we say we will do and provide a report card on my government's performance. In July 2013 I released the government's third six-month action plan, for the July-December 2013 period. The latest report on progress up to December 2013 will be released early in the new year, but at this stage I can inform the House that, of the 268 actions agreed for 2013, 265 have been successfully delivered or are on track for delivery by the end of the year.

Ever since forming government I have been unapologetic in saying that supercharging the Queensland economy is of the highest priority. Current labour force and economic results demonstrate that our hard work is starting to pay dividends, with strong jobs and growth figures for Queensland. The government has been working hard to rebuild business confidence in Queensland by reducing red tape, cutting approval times and making it easier to do business here.

This year has also been one in which we have drawn a line in the sand when it comes to criminal gangs. After the disgusting acts of violence and intimidation by criminal motorcycle gang members on the Gold Coast, we responded in the strongest possible way. We developed and passed watershed legislation to provide the police and the criminal justice system with the tools they need to successfully disband and jail these criminal thugs. We have also moved to stop the influence of criminal gang members in businesses across Queensland. As we have shown this year, we are

determined and steadfast on this issue. Due to this government's tough stance on bikies and can-do support for our law enforcement agencies, we will work to ensure our streets are safe from the scourge of criminal motorcycle gangs.

2013 has also seen us look to the future. As a state we have been on a remarkable journey to develop a 30-year vision together for our great state. In February we set out with a genuine desire to give every Queenslanders the opportunity to shape our future. And it has become the largest engagement activity ever undertaken in Queensland, unprecedented in scope and scale. Communities from every corner of the state embraced the Queensland Plan and the opportunity to take part in shaping a positive future.

In coming weeks *The Queensland Plan: a 30-year vision for Queensland—our working draft* will be available for public review. I encourage Queenslanders to read the working draft once it is released and provide their feedback about whether it accurately reflects their responses to date. We will then use these contributions to finalise the Queensland Plan for release in early 2014. As the parliamentary year comes to a close, I thank all members for their efforts to date in developing the Queensland Plan. I look forward to continuing to work with the House as we deliver on the plan next year and into the future.

As with the Queensland Plan, this government believes in genuine community consultation and engagement, and 2013 has been a great success in terms of the community cabinet meetings we have held across the state. So far we have held community cabinet events at the Fraser Coast, Ayr and Home Hill, Thursday Island, Gladstone and Emerald. During these meetings my ministers, assistant ministers and heads of department were able to meet with around 700 separate groups of people and discuss matters affecting them locally. One thing is clear from these meetings: everywhere we went there was a strong willingness by Queenslanders to engage with government and find ways to make this state an even better place to live. We have not finished yet, of course, because the cabinet is going to Toowoomba this Sunday and Monday—24 and 25 November—for the last community cabinet for the year. My team and I are looking forward to Toowoomba immensely.

Madam Speaker, turning to the parliament itself, firstly I want to thank you for the efficient and fair way that you have presided over this chamber and also for your role within the parliamentary precinct more generally. I also take this opportunity to thank the Clerk of the Parliament, Neil Laurie, and all of the officers of the Parliamentary Service who make the day-to-day running of the parliament possible. Neil does a lot of work—particularly in the last few days—and provides a great deal of urgent advice, and I particularly thank him for all of his efforts. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of the Deputy Clerk, Michael Ries, and the Director of Corporate and House Services, Michael Hickey. I also thank all of the officers from the committee office, managed by Stephen Finnimore, together with all of the officers from the parliamentary Education and Communications secretariat. I also acknowledge and thank the Chief Hansard Reporter, Lucinda Osmond, and all of her staff who perform the important task of recording debates in this place. I also acknowledge the work of our librarian, Katherine Brennan, and all of the library staff, as well as the officers of Chamber and Procedural Services, managed by the First Clerk Assistant, Leanne Clare.

I am always impressed by the way that the parliamentary precinct is presented, and in this regard I acknowledge the Manager of Property Services, Darryl McCarthy, and all of his team, including the gardeners, cleaning and maintenance staff, for the work that they do. Talking of the precinct, I also thank the Acting Manager of Security and Attendant Services and Sergeant-at-Arms, Michael Watkin, and all of the parliamentary attendants and security officers. Michael has been acting in this role since Kevin Jones went on preretirement leave last year and following on from Kevin's sad passing in August. Our thoughts are especially with Kevin's family at this time of year.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr NEWMAN: I also thank the catering services team, led by Jaakko Ponsi, for keeping us all well fed again this year. They do a fantastic job. As I said to the staff in the cafeteria this afternoon, they make the best milkshakes of any place I have ever been in my life. I acknowledge and thank the Manager of Human Resource Services, Peter Morris; the Manager of Financial and Administrative Services, Craig Atkinson; the Manager of Information Technology Services, Mike Coburn; and all of their respective officers, including the Members' Executive Support Services staff, for all of the important work that they do. The parliament is a diverse operation and I again thank everyone in the Parliamentary Service for their efforts this year in ensuring that the parliament runs smoothly.

The House itself has been working very hard this year. The House has met on 40 days for more than 430 hours. Some 71 bills have been introduced into the parliament this year—60 by the government and 11 by private members—and 64 bills have been passed.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: I am not going to take that interjection from the Attorney-General. While I am talking about bills, I also want to thank the officers of the Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel, led by Theresa Johnson, for the work that they do in turning our policy decisions into drafted legislation for the parliament to consider.

I also want to take this opportunity to provide an end-of-year update on my thriving electorate of Ashgrove. I said I would lead a can-do Queensland government, and that starts in the electorate. I want to start by providing a brief update on my election commitments. I am very proud to say that I have been able to deliver on, or am close to delivering on, all of my 12 election commitments: resealing of the car park at Newmarket State School—delivered; lights for the oval and installation of flashing lights for Payne Road State School—delivered; funding for the breakfast program at the Mitchelton State High School—delivered; new storage sheds for the GPS Rugby Club and Valley Cricket Club—delivered; facilities upgrades for The Gap Little Athletics—delivered; Irvine Street-Samford Road and Glen Retreat Road-Samford Road intersection upgrades—delivered. Next year will see the completion of the \$5 million sports hall for The Gap State High School, new classrooms for Ashgrove State School at a cost of \$3 million, and the Samford Road and Wardell Street intersection upgrade worth \$65 million. All of these measures are helping to make the Ashgrove electorate a great place to live, work, play and raise a family.

Since being elected as member for Ashgrove I have met personally with over 200 local constituents. I have also had the chance to meet with locals at over 17 community corners throughout the electorate and at more than 80 local community events I have attended. Just some of the highlights for me have been the Dorrington Neighbourhood Watch 25th anniversary; doing runs with the volunteers from both Mitchelton Meals on Wheels and Ashgrove Meals on Wheels; and The Gap Pioneer Cemetery 140th anniversary celebration. The most recent event in my electorate was my first Can Do Awards ceremony and Family Fun Movie Night. I hosted a free movie in the park with jumping castles and face painters for children as an end-of-year celebration for the community and as a way to support local community groups in their fundraising efforts and promoting buying locally from our great small businesses in the area. I quickly want to take a moment to acknowledge the winners of the Can Do Ashgrove Awards: Can Do Award, Jo Ellice-Flint; Hero of the Year, Constable Mark Gammon; Senior of the Year, Trevor Ozanne; Youth of the Year, Mitchell Dunn; Community Organisation of the Year, Blue Care Respite Centre Ashgrove; and Small Business of the Year, Newmarket Caravan Park. It has been a great year in the Ashgrove electorate and I look forward to listening to and delivering for the community again in 2014.

To sum up, I want to send a very special thanks to every one of my parliamentary colleagues who have helped to make 2013 such a memorable year for Queensland. To my ministers and assistant ministers, to the Leader of the House and the whips, thank you for your can-do efforts. I also acknowledge the Leader of the Opposition and her team and wish them a restful holiday. I also wish to acknowledge my hardworking staff. Most importantly, to my wife, Lisa, and our daughters, Bec and Sarah, I thank you for your understanding and constant support. You mean everything to me. I love you deeply and I cannot wait to spend a little bit more time with you this Christmas. I acknowledge where Minister Cripps is sitting right now—next to my wife!

I wish everyone I just mentioned and all Queenslanders the most enjoyable and safe of festive seasons. Merry Christmas to you all and we will see you all again in 2014.

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.25 pm): We started the year with much of our state under water, and we have ended it watching in horror and despair and with a sense of helplessness as water and wind and calamity engulfed some of our nearest neighbours. I want to touch on both of these bookends to 2013 in a moment. But firstly, as we wind down for the year in this parliament and as we look back at the year that was 2013, it is a time for reflection, a time for thought and contemplation, a time to look back on our achievements—our highs and lows—on where our Queensland is at this time and, importantly, where we would like to be in 2014 and beyond.

For many Queenslanders 2013 was in many ways a year of almost seismic change as they experienced their first full year of conservative government. Time will tell how Queenslanders will judge that year, but in the end this parliament is the venue in which history will judge each of us. This is the place where we carry out some of our most critical work—the place where we represent and stand up for those who elected us to this place. In that respect I want to thank and pay tribute to my colleagues on this side of the House. We are small in number but we are united in our genuine

resolve and our unwavering determination to give the best representation to those Queenslanders who entrusted us to do so. That trust is not something to be taken for granted. It is something to be treasured and something that should never be regarded as anything less than a privilege.

I thank my deputy, Tim Mulherin, who every day stands up for the people of Mackay and spends most of his time away from his family. I thank him for his considered advice and good humour. I thank the Manager of Opposition Business, Curtis Pitt, who every day stands up for the people of Mulgrave as well as all of those communities in the state's Far North and I acknowledge that, as shadow Treasurer, he travels the state and spends many weeks away from his very young family. I thank the member for Bundamba, Jo-Ann Miller, who every day represents and stands up for all in her area—not only those bounded by her electorate but those right across Ipswich. She is a very, very passionate woman and a good friend to all. I pay tribute to the depth and experience of Desley Scott, who stands up every day for the electorate of Woodridge as well as those in all areas of Logan and outer southern Brisbane. Desley Scott, the member for Woodridge, is the most compassionate woman that I know. Every day Bill Byrne goes that extra yard to stand up for the people of Rockhampton and those in other communities right across Central Queensland. I acknowledge his strong military background that ensures that we are all sharp and always on time to meetings.

And each day Jackie Trad gives forceful representation for the people of not only her electorate of South Brisbane but also other areas of our capital city. She always has a great ability to get across a lot of portfolio areas and I know that she is very passionate about the environment and her family. I thank each of these members for their hard work and commitment and for their camaraderie. I thank them for their unity in not only standing up for all Queenslanders but also taking up the fight to the government and holding the government to account.

As I mentioned at the outset, many areas of Queensland began 2013 under water. We are not likely to forget the challenging images that brought in the new year back in January. Those who were at the epicentre as Queensland experienced its latest round of increasingly inevitable natural disasters are not likely to forget the very different, very terrifying experience of actually being there. In January, ex-Tropical Cyclone Oswald and a monsoon trough passed over parts of our state, bringing severe storms, flooding and even tornadoes. Our hearts went out to those Queenslanders in the Wide Bay-Burnett region—in Mundubbera, Eidsvold, Gayndah and Bundaberg. It is all too easy to capture the onslaught in cold harsh detail. In fact, the rainfall level set new records and the damage bill from flooding amounted to more than \$2.5 billion. Houses and businesses were ruined.

What is all too often forgotten is the very human toll—the stories of those people left homeless, wrenched from their homes and left bereft of their possessions, much of them precious, never to be replaced as the winds blew in and the waters rose. We should remember them still tonight as, 12 months on, they continue to attempt to rebuild their lives. We recall unprecedented scenes as 7,500 residents of Bundaberg, including patients at the Bundaberg Hospital, were evacuated, houses were ripped from their stumps as streets became raging waterways and transport, communication and water networks were wiped out.

Tully experienced massive rainfall during the same period. The town of Ingham became an island when it was completely cut off as the Herbert River rose dramatically over the space of three hours. We saw floodwaters in Gympie and Maryborough. Property damage was also experienced at Laidley in the Lockyer Valley and at Waterford in Logan City. These weather events took the lives of four Queenslanders. Tonight we remember the family of the three-year-old boy who was tragically killed by a falling tree at Gordon Park in Brisbane's north, the relatives of the man who was swept away by floodwaters at Oxley Creek as well as the two men who were killed at Gympie and Burnett Heads.

As we began the year witnessing these scenes of devastation and heartbreak in our backyard, we end the year witnessing scenes of misery and desolation in the Philippines in the wake of the overwhelming fury of a typhoon. As technology seems to make our world smaller and smaller and countries that once seemed far away now seem closer and closer, tonight I ask each member of this place to take a moment to spare a thought for the residents of these places. I ask everyone to think of the thousands who have lost their lives and those who have been left behind to grieve and to rebuild, not least the members of Queensland's strong Filipino community, of whom many lost friends and family in the tragedy. This is a proud community, a community that has acquitted itself with dignity and grace in the face of so much sorrow.

Tonight as we rise for the last time in 2013 it is a time also for thanks. Firstly, I would like to thank Queenslanders in all corners of the state and from all walks of life. The generous support that those of us on this side of the House have received from Queenslanders this year across the state

has been not only appreciated but also valued. This year the opposition's program of travel has been extensive, as it will continue to be in the year to come. I thank Queenslanders who call Cairns and Townsville home; people in Rockhampton, Mackay, Gladstone and Mount Isa. To the people of Roma, Charleville and Miles and Dalby and Toowoomba and Ipswich, to those people who call the Gold and Sunshine coasts and Logan home, I thank them.

I make special mention of the good people of Redcliffe who, despite experiencing a very difficult year with very little representation in this House, have stood strong. I have been to each of these places, some on many, many occasions this year, and I thank the people there for welcoming me and the other members of the opposition into their communities. They can each be assured that they will be seeing us again frequently in the new year.

I thank my own community of Inala. This is a thriving corner of our city—a vibrant, eclectic, multicultural community and a community that I am so proud to represent in this House. I would like to thank my electorate officers, Charles, Mel and Michelle. I would also like to mention that, of course, the brand-new railway station will be open on 2 December. I am looking forward very much to the opening of that station, which is much needed in the western corridor.

I also want to reflect that many families in my electorate will be facing quite tough times coming into the lead-up to Christmas. I know that it is going to be hard for many of them to cope, but I know that we have strong community organisations that will make sure that they are there to lend people a hand.

Tonight is also a time to thank friends who have passed away. I make mention of Eddie Liu, whose funeral I was sad to attend earlier this year. Mr Liu was rightly considered to be one of our city's founding fathers—a giant of our ever-evolving multicultural society—and his larger-than-life presence will be sadly missed. I also pay tribute to Mr Tai Do, who was the president of our Vietnamese seniors society, who sadly passed away last week. He was a very well-respected, very proud Vietnamese man. And I also want to pay tribute to Auntie Pamela Law, who was a very proud Indigenous woman who did so much to help disadvantaged young people throughout Inala and the rest of Brisbane. I thank the late, much missed Kevin Jones, the former Sergeant-at-Arms in this parliament, who passed away in August. Kevin dedicated more than 20 years of his life to serving this parliament and I for one will miss his fearless advice, his smile, his dedication to his job and his ability in all circumstances to remain calm and in control. I place on the record my deep respect for one of the leading lights of our party, Mrs Hazel Hawke, who passed away in May after a long battle with Alzheimer's disease.

This parliament is more than a place of work; it is a community within itself. It is a place where we work hard, sometimes for hours that defy belief. I think sitting until the early hours of this morning was testament to that. It is a place where we sleep and eat and, on occasions, some members can even find some time to enjoy a party or two—not on this side of the House. As a community, it takes a community to keep it running. In that light, Madam Speaker, I first thank you for overseeing the proceedings in this place. I thank the Clerk, Neil Laurie, for his valued advice and his ability to remain calm in all circumstances. I also want to thank the Deputy Clerk, Michael Ries, the First Assistant Clerk, Leanne Clare, and all of the other clerks who assist us here in this House. They are always very polite and they always help us whenever they can. I thank the Sergeant-at-Arms, Michael Watkin. For recording our words for the future so people can judge what we have done here when we may not be here in years to come, I thank the Chief Hansard Reporter, Lucinda Osmond, and all of the Hansard staff. Our Chief Librarian, Katherine Brennan, and her staff have been of invaluable help this year, as has the Parliamentary Counsel, Theresa Johnson, and her team. Jaakko, the Manager of Catering Services, along with head chef Sucil and his team ensure that we never go hungry, particularly during the late sittings. I want to thank them all. They are always so welcoming. They are always smiling and nothing is too much trouble for them. So on behalf of all members, I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Darryl, the Manager of Property Services, ensures that we have offices to work from and Head Gardener, Chris, keeps the precinct green and those magnificent roses blooming. I make a very special mention of our parliament cleaning supervisors, Azra and Sanja, who work so hard to keep this House presentable. And I have to mention all of the parliamentary attendants here. At times I do not know how they sit here with such a straight face. It must be very, very difficult and I would love to hear their stories in years to come.

I would also like to thank the members of the media who also play an important role in holding the government to account. We do not see eye to eye every day, but I pay tribute to the professionalism of the newspaper, radio, television and online reporters who cover the proceedings of

this place each and every day. I want to mention two significant people of the parliamentary press gallery who left us this year. Spencer Jolly spent more than 40 years reporting on the parliament for the Nine Network and retired this year to take a much deserved break. We all miss Spencer and his utter professionalism and dedication to his craft. I wish him all the best. Patrick Condren spent 11 years as the Seven Network's political reporter and I similarly pay tribute to Patrick's devotion to reporting the goings-on in this place. Patrick will now be the new voice of 4BC's morning program and I know that I will be tuning in to hear his insightful commentary, which I am sure will be delivered in his normal Patrick style. I actually think all members would agree with me that both Patrick and Spencer would have given anything to be here this week.

I thank my family and my friends for supporting me. I also make a commitment here in this House that I will be taking my father to the cricket this Saturday. I make special mention of my niece Annie who, during the very busy week that we have had, insisted on speaking to me to debate the swimming pool rules that I have set for the family christening on Sunday. I say to the Attorney-General that I think my niece Annie would give him a run for his money. She is a very, very bright young girl and I had to give in to her by the end.

I pay tribute to the opposition office. I am not going to mention everybody by name. We have an amazing staff. We have a very important job to do. We have skilled and dedicated staff who go beyond the call of duty. They work extremely late hours. I think a few of them even came in in the early hours of this morning to assist. These are incredible people. They work on weekends. Nothing is ever too much trouble. On behalf of the opposition team we thank each and every one of them. We all hold them in high esteem. We would not be able to do our jobs without them.

In conclusion, I acknowledge that a workday in this place is a workday like no other. This is a place of robust debate. It is not a place for the weak of character, for the feeble of spirit. But it is a place where I would hope that irrespective of politics each and every member shares a common goal and that common goal must be to never lose sight of the fact that each of us is here to make a better Queensland. We are each entrusted and privileged to have been chosen to represent our communities and I would hope that every member of this place never forgets that fact. I for one will not. Each of us on this side of the House will continue to stand up for Queenslanders, we will continue to take the fight up to the government and we will always hold this government to account.

That said, we each have our own lives away from work. We each have families we care about, friends we probably do not see often enough with interests outside of the job. I make these comments because I understand how tough this job can be and how much an effective member of parliament must put to the side to be effective in our electorates. I hope that each and every member of this place can find some time over the season to catch up with friends and family and celebrate Christmas and New Year. I wish the Premier, his cabinet and all of the team and their families a very merry Christmas. I wish all of the attendants and all of the parliamentary staff and, Madam Speaker, yourself and your family a very peaceful and prosperous Christmas and a very happy New Year.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!



Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (10.42 pm): At this last sitting it is a privilege on behalf of the crossbenches to thank those who have worked tirelessly in this precinct to ensure that we who come for parliamentary sittings have access to all we need to exercise our responsibilities. I am not going to attempt to list them because I am sure someone would be omitted, so again on behalf of the crossbenches we just say thank you to everyone for all your hard work. We also pass on our thanks to you and our appreciation for the fact that you make our time away from home more tolerable and, indeed, enjoyable so that we can achieve for our communities.

This Christmas many families will face difficulties here and abroad. Survivors of fires and storms, tsunami and cyclone, our thoughts and prayers are with all facing such trauma and sadness. To our electorate staff, I acknowledge the vital work you do in keeping that connection and flow of information with our communities. We thank you for your loyalty and support. To our wives, husbands, partners, children and families, you are our rock. Your steadfast love and care for us when we come home, often a little jaded, is so greatly valued.

Christmas is a time for faith, family, friendship and fellowship. To those in this chamber who we know have been unwell and to those who are dealing with their challenges more privately, we wish you strength. To those who are facing or have faced sadness or loss, we wish you hope. To those facing challenges, we wish you victory. On behalf of the crossbenches, to all we wish you peace. We trust you have a safe, happy and holy Christmas and every happiness in 2014.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!



Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, it is that time of the year when we look forward to some more harmonious reflections, good humour and celebration after very rigorous debates in this chamber. The star over our Christmas tree at the front of this parliament is a sparkling reminder of the message of peace, hope and joy, and may there be more of it as MPs leave here and return to their electorates.

The work of MPs is far from over at this time of the year, as our duties go beyond the parliamentary chamber and are entwined in our communities. However, as the annual sittings come to a close it is in this most visible and critical role as parliamentary representatives we pause and reflect on the last 12 months. Personally, I would like to think that the valedictory debate, this traditional end-of-year closing debate, be known as our own thanksgiving. I am grateful for the support I have received from colleagues across the chamber in the course of my work. I thank members for their commitment to service above self here and in the electorate.

The very nature of a democratic institution such as a parliament means that we do not always share the same ideas, but we should always share a respect for the right of others to hold and express those views. At this moment of reflection it is an opportunity to remember what we have in common across the political divide. I believe we all share a desire to serve our community and to improve our state for the generations that follow, even if we differ about how that should be done.

I extend my sincere thanks, as other members have before me, to the many who make possible the workings of this Queensland parliament. I wish to thank firstly the electorate office staff, those who are at the front line in our communities. Hansard—how they do their job when we test them in the course of these debates and with these very late night sittings; the Clerk, Mr Neil Laurie, and all senior management staff; Table staff; the cleaning and House staff; catering; gardening; property services; committees; security and attendants; community engagement; library; HR; IT; financial and other services; and key members of the service have been acknowledged here. The passing of Kevin Jones so soon after his retirement from the position of Sergeant-at-Arms was a sad moment for the parliament and a reminder to cherish family and friends. Our families are often the ones who provide us with strength and encouragement and provide a welcome smile or cheery phone call at the end of the day, and we value each of them.

I wish to thank the government through the Premier and also the opposition through the Leader of the Opposition. In addition, I thank Liz Cunningham, the member for Gladstone, and other members of the crossbenches, including members of Katter's Australian Party and the Palmer United Party. I also thank the parliamentary media gallery for the role they play, one which is a key part of our democracy. Two long-serving members moved on this year and we acknowledge Spencer Jolly and Patrick Condren and wish them well.

I would like to personally thank my own staff, both those in my electorate office, Julia and Wendy, and those who are in the Office of the Speaker, Ruth, Clair and John. I appreciate their diligence and their ability to maintain even tempers and retain a sense of humour in the midst of often busy days. Congratulations particularly to John and his wife, Kelly, who this afternoon welcomed the birth of a baby girl, a sister for brother Obe. Congratulations as well to our colleague in this place the member for Beaudesert, Jon Krause, and his wife, Kit, who welcomed a baby boy this evening. It is great news and we give thanks for those safe deliveries.

We also remember those who are experiencing tough times. We give thanks for those who bring practical support to ease hardship and provide hope, particularly to Queenslanders still recovering from the recent natural disasters such as floods or those who are still battling the devastating drought currently impacting more than 60 per cent of the state.

As we look to Christmas, I wish each member and all those listening my very best wishes for this season of peace and goodwill as our community acknowledges the birth of Christ. Members, may each of you find time to rest and refresh and be reinvigorated for a new year. I am sure you join me in praying that our state remains safe over the Christmas season.

As the sitting year draws to a close, we have a tradition where members help serve parliamentary services staff—hopefully, those who are still here at this time. We know they do a great job and it is our chance to serve them and say 'thank you' at the end-of-session function. This function will begin after the adjournment and will be held in the Speaker's Hall. I invite members, parliamentary staff and members of the parliamentary media gallery who are still present this evening to attend the function.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.50 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.51 pm.

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, Knuth, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszcuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young