



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>
 Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
 Phone (07) 3553 6344 Fax (07) 3553 6369

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 17 February 2016

Subject	Page
PETITIONS	129
TABLED PAPER	129
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	129
Cannonvale, Bus Crash	129
Exports	130
Australian Infrastructure Plan; Infrastructure Priority List.....	130
Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review	131
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements.....	132
<i>Tabled paper: Public Service Commission: Review of the Public Safety Business Agency,</i> November 2015.....	132
Gold Coast Commonwealth Games	133
Occupational Violence Taskforce; Paramedic Safety Taskforce	133
Yellow Canopy Syndrome; Agriculture Industry.....	134
Education, Achievements.....	135
North Queensland, Small Business Ideas Forum	135
Mining Industry	136
Rockhampton Courthouse	136
MOTIONS	137
Suspension of Sessional Orders	137
Order of Business	137
MENTAL HEALTH BILL; MENTAL HEALTH (RECOVERY MODEL) BILL	137
Cognate Debate; Order of Business	137
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE	138
Report	138
<i>Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 20, 55th Parliament—</i> Portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 15 September 2015 and 10 November 2015.	138

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 17 February 2016

ETHICS COMMITTEE	138
Report	138
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 162—Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings.....	138
HEALTH AND AMBULANCE SERVICES COMMITTEE	138
Report	138
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health and Ambulance Services Committee: Report No. 12, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 16 September 2015 and 13 October 2015.....	138
NOTICE OF MOTION	138
Amendments to Standing Orders.....	138
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	138
<i>Australian Infrastructure Plan</i>	138
<i>Australian Infrastructure Plan</i>	139
State Budget	140
Long-Wait Lists	141
Queensland Economy	141
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	142
Queensland Economy	142
Queensland Economy	142
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Community Cabinet.....	143
State Finances.....	144
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from ABC News online, dated 4 June 2014, titled 'Qld budget 2014: Asset sales won't be enough to restore AAA rating, Treasurer Tim Nicholls says'.....	144
Infrastructure Projects, Federal Funding.....	144
Noon, Mr A	145
Local Government Elections	146
Robina Hospital, Police Investigation	146
Business Confidence	147
Queensland Nickel	148
South-East Queensland, North-South Rail Corridor	149
Borallon Correctional Centre.....	151
Referendum, Fix Four-Year Terms	151
Townsville, Jobs.....	152
Advance Queensland	152
Smyth, Mr S	153
Maryborough TAFE	153
TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AMENDMENT BILL	154
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	154
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 20, 55th Parliament—Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, government response.....	154
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Research reports and journal articles, various dates, regarding reducing alcohol fuelled violence from the National Drug Law Enforcement Research Fund, the Society for the Study of Addiction, International Journal of Drug Policy, British Journal of Addictions and others.....	156
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated 15 February 2016, screenshot of Mr Daniel Andrews MP's Twitter profile, in relation to lockout laws	166
MOTION	176
Amendments to Standing Orders.....	176
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	182
Resolved in the negative.....	182
NOTICE OF MOTION	182
Member for Warrego, Unauthorised Disclosure of Committee Proceedings	182
MOTION	182
Order of Business	182
DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	183
Photographs in Chamber	183
TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AMENDMENT BILL	183
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	183
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Gold Coast Bulletin</i> , dated 19 June 2015, titled 'D'Ath Vader—Exclusive: Attorney-General using the force to keep the peace ... and keep you sober' by Jack Houghton and Ryan Keen.....	184
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated January 2015, titled 'Alcohol Industry Donations to Queensland Political Parties: 2011-12 to 2013-14'.....	193
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	213
Same Question Rule.....	213
TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AMENDMENT BILL	213
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	213
Division: Question put—That the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.....	251
Resolved in the affirmative.....	251
Division: Question put—That Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.	251
Resolved in the negative.....	251

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 17 February 2016

Consideration in Detail	251
Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill	251
Clause 1, as read, agreed to	251
Clause 2—	252
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Mr Rob Katter's amendments.....	252
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	252
Clause 2, as amended, agreed to	252
Clauses 3 to 17, as read, agreed to	252
Clause 18—	252
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	252
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments.....	253
Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to	253
Clause 18, as amended, agreed to	253
Clauses 19 to 28, as read, agreed to	253
Clause 29—	253
Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to	253
Clause 29, as amended, agreed to	253
Clauses 30 to 33, as read, agreed to	253
Clause 34—	253
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	254
Clause 34, as amended, agreed to	254
Clauses 35 to 37, as read, agreed to	254
Insertion of new clause—	254
Amendment agreed to	254
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	254
Clause 38—	254
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	254
Clause 38, as amended, agreed to	254
Clauses 39 to 47, as read, agreed to	254
Clause 48—	254
Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to	255
Clause 48, as amended, agreed to	255
Clauses 49 to 52, as read, agreed to	255
Insertion of new clause—	255
Amendment agreed to	255
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	255
Clauses 53 and 54, as read, agreed to	255
Clause 55—	255
Clause 55, as amended, agreed to	255
Clauses 56 to 61, as read, agreed to	255
Clause 62—	255
Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to	257
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Mr Shane Knuth's amendments.	257
Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) agreed to	257
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to	257
Clause 62, as amended, agreed to	257
Clauses 63 to 74, as read, agreed to	257
Third Reading.....	257
Long Title.....	258
ADJOURNMENT	258
Albert Electorate, Traffic Arrangements	258
Abbey Museum, Abbeystowe.....	258
M1 Upgrade	259
Ferny Grove State High School.....	259
<i>Spirit of Buderim</i>.....	260
<i>Tabled paper:</i> <i>Spirit of Buderim</i> , community newspaper, undated.....	260
Greenslopes Electorate	260
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance.....	261
Mount Archer State School, Parliament House Visit	262
Outback Queensland, Unemployment	262
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Queensland—Unemployment rate by Labour Force Region'.	262
Pope, Mr M.....	263
ATTENDANCE	264

WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2016



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Peter Wellington, Nicklin) read prayers and took the chair.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, lodged by the honourable member indicated—

Coolabunia Malar Region, Tick Line

Mrs Frecklington, from 203 petitioners, requesting the House to leave the free zone Coolabunia Malar region as tick free and not move the tick line [\[163\]](#).

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, sponsored by the Clerk—

Kingaroy, Public Hospital

From 147 petitioners, requesting the House to build a new public hospital for Kingaroy [\[164\]](#).

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

Robina Town Centre, Police Resources

Ms Bates, from 134 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the current Police Beat at Robina Town Centre to a 24 hour manned Police Beat [\[165\]](#).

Benowa-Bundall-Ashmore, Police Resources

Mr Langbroek, 107 petitioners, requesting the House to support an increased police presence in the residential areas of Benowa, Bundall and Ashmore [\[166\]](#).

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

Gold Coast Health and Hospital Services, Workplace Assault Reporting

From 490 petitioners, requesting the House to launch an awareness campaign within the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service to encourage nurses, doctors and paramedics to report incidences of assault in the workplace and allow these offences to be prosecuted [\[167\]](#).

Gold Coast University Hospital Precinct, Police Resources

From 102 petitioners, requesting the House to deliver a 24 hour manned Police Beat at the Gold Coast University Hospital precinct [\[168\]](#).

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPER

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Nanango (Mrs Frecklington)—

[169](#) Non-conforming petition regarding tick line movement in Yarraman/Cooyar area

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Cannonvale, Bus Crash




Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.02 pm): I rise to extend my sincere condolences to the families of those affected by yesterday's bus crash in Cannonvale. All 12 passengers on board and the driver were injured in this serious crash. Tragically, a young 19-year-old man lost his life. We also know that three passengers are still listed as being in a critical condition. My thoughts are with the family of the young man who was killed in the crash and the families of those who have been injured. Many of the injuries are very serious and our thoughts are with the

passengers as they continue to receive treatment and care from medical staff at the Proserpine Hospital, the Mackay Base Hospital and the Townsville Hospital. I would also like to pay tribute to our emergency services, the Queensland police and Queensland Ambulance Service, and hospital staff who responded quickly to this accident and treated the passengers and driver. I am also advised that the members for Mackay and Whitsunday were briefed over the course of yesterday and today and I know their thoughts are with the families involved as well.


The Minister for Transport is clear that his No. 1 priority for road and rail transport is safety and I know the road safety minister fully supports this as well. The crash is currently under investigation by the Queensland Police Service and I know TransLink are fully supportive of this investigation. The department of transport is conducting a bus safety forum on Monday which is a regular meeting of industry, government, employee and police representatives and academic experts on safety and transport. Accidents like this highlight the importance of safety and the Minister for Transport will be attending this forum to outline this government's commitment to safety.

Exports

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.03 pm): My government is committed to driving overseas trade and investment. My government's commitment is already paying dividends for the Queensland economy with exports increasing by \$5.6 billion in the last year. Overseas merchandise exports returned \$49.7 billion in 2015, driven by the new LNG industry and excellent results from Queensland's rural sector. This is the best result since 2011 and a 12.6 per cent increase on 2014. This is further evidence of my government's commitment to growing Queensland's economy. Since we were elected we have seen unemployment fall from 6.7 per cent under the previous government to 5.9 per cent today. We also have the highest levels of business confidence in the country, the highest growth in building approvals and the highest forecast economic growth of any state in this nation.

Deloitte Access Economics forecast Queensland to be the fastest growing state over the next five years with growth averaging 3.7 per cent. My government's pro-business economic approach is helping to create the right conditions for business and industry to prosper as this data shows. The new LNG industry, which started exporting this year, is an industry encouraged and established under the previous Labor government. It is now expected to become Queensland's second largest exporter. Despite tough drought conditions, with more than 80 per cent of the state currently drought declared, Queensland's beef producers have increased exports by an incredible 18.6 per cent. Beef exports exceeded \$5.5 billion in 2015. Crop exports also increased substantially despite the drought. Exports of crops, including sorghum, chickpeas and wheat, grew by \$961 million to \$1.7 billion. Despite the falling coal price and substantial pressures on our mining industry, coal exports increased by \$263 million in 2015 to be worth \$23.7 billion. My government will continue to promote Queensland's strengths overseas and capitalise on the lower Australian dollar and recent free trade agreements such as the Trans Pacific Partnership.

Australian Infrastructure Plan; Infrastructure Priority List

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.06 pm): Infrastructure Australia has today released the Australian Infrastructure Plan and the new Infrastructure Priority List. In Queensland we welcome the federal Liberal government's new interest in urban infrastructure and its desire to reform the planning and investment of infrastructure markets. They are building on the excellent work of Labor's outstanding infrastructure minister, Anthony Albanese. Many of the most significant ideas in the new Australian Infrastructure Plan can already be found in our draft State Infrastructure Plan, released late last year.

Over the last 12 months Queensland has begun a big agenda to reform the way we plan and invest in infrastructure. That is why we support Infrastructure Australia's call for state governments to deliver long-term land use plans for all Australian cities. We have been doing this since Labor introduced statutory regional plans more than a decade ago. It is why we support Infrastructure Australia's call for state governments to deliver long-term infrastructure plans. We are doing that now after more than three years without one under the former Newman-Seeney government. It is why we support Infrastructure Australia's call for higher quality design around urban infill. We are doing that now through our new board for urban design and the State Government Architect and it is why we support Infrastructure Australia's call for governments to consider value capture options, which we have already foreshadowed in the draft State Infrastructure Plan.

I am also pleased that the priority list confirms that projects like Cross River Rail, the M1-Gateway merge and the Ipswich Motorway are all nationally significant projects. Infrastructure Australia CEO Philip Davies recently attended the Building Queensland Board where he was briefed on the Cross River Rail project. Now we just need the Commonwealth to get on with the job and help fund these vital projects.

Ms Jones interjected.


Ms TRAD: That is my plea to the incoming member for Wide Bay.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from the member for Callide. If he ever did put in a submission for Cross River Rail, I would like to see it, as he was part of the government that abandoned Cross River Rail. Infrastructure Australia is now considering Cross River Rail as a priority initiative because of the Palaszczuk Labor government. We need the Turnbull government to support other regionally significant infrastructure projects as well, such as the Townsville stadium. Critically, the Prime Minister's own expert infrastructure body, Infrastructure Australia, recommends that the Commonwealth needs to invest more in infrastructure and that it needs to start funding public transport as well as roads. This year alone in Queensland we are spending more than \$10 billion on infrastructure, supporting 27,000 jobs. We are certainly doing our bit, but we need the Turnbull government to pitch in and spend more on infrastructure to help drive jobs and economic productivity.

Although many of the recommendations in today's report are welcomed by the Palaszczuk government, I note that recommendation 6.4 suggests that all governments should transfer their remaining publicly owned electricity generation networks and retail businesses to private ownership. At two elections in a row Queenslanders have spoken clearly on this issue of asset sales. I categorically state again that this government does not support the sale of Queensland's public assets. Whilst those opposite want a conversation about breaking their promise to Queensland, the Palaszczuk government is determined to keep faith with our pledge to stop asset sales.

Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (2.11 pm): During the end-of-year parliamentary recess, I released the Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review, which clearly shows that our economic plan is working. It is worth talking about today as this is the first sitting week since the release of the MYFER. We are creating jobs. In fact, in the past year in Queensland we have created more than 60,000 jobs. Despite tough global conditions, Queensland is forecast to record the strongest economic growth of any state—four per cent—in 2015-16 and reputable business surveys and hard data from the ABS show the trend in confidence has been strongly upwards under the Palaszczuk government.

In that context, I note that the Prime Minister has been in Brisbane today. We should be grateful for small mercies. At least for a few hours—just for a short time—in our state we had one LNP member who recognises that—

Business confidence is highest in Queensland, followed by Tasmania and New South Wales.

The Prime Minister's statement is in stark contrast to the deliberate campaign of denigration and destruction waged against confidence by those opposite. Those opposite are in their fourth year of talking down Queensland's economy. When we compare our Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review with the federal government's Mid Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook, we see that our figures stack up very well in comparison. We have a budget forecast of \$1.2 billion surplus this year, compared to the forecast operating deficit of over \$31 billion federally. World economic conditions have become tougher since the budget, which is why our December MYFER noted revenue writedowns of \$1.5 billion over the forward estimates, compared to revenue writedowns of over \$34 billion in the federal government's MYEFO. Under the Palaszczuk government's responsible economic management, we will continue to see strong surpluses totalling over \$1 billion each year. Our debt action plan will see \$10.6 billion sliced off general government debt by 2018-19. I remind members that we are reducing debt while retaining, for the benefit of taxpayers, the dividends of income-producing assets that the LNP wanted to sell off.

Our MYFER continues the significant progress we have made with our economic plan. I will outline a few of those things. Businesses have taken on nearly 2,200 apprentices and trainees so far, because they have received over \$4.4 million in payroll tax rebates. More than 200 grants have been made through the Home-based Business Grants program to help them grow from the garage to the

global stage. Over \$6 million worth of projects have come before the Business Development Fund's independent investment panel for potential matching support and our market led proposals initiative shows just how we are working with the private sector to speed up job creating investments that can be delivered without a hit to our budget. Under this program, the \$450 million Logan Motorway enhancement and the \$100 million Brisbane cruise ship terminal have moved to the detailed planning stage.

The latest MYFER and our record over the past year show that the LNP is in its fourth year of talking down Queensland. Only Labor is transforming our state to capitalise on the new demands, the new jobs, the new markets and the new opportunities that will confront us and future Queenslanders.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements



Hon. WS BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.14 pm): Twelve months ago, we came to government with a plan to protect jobs and to keep Queenslanders safe by delivering front-line services to build safe, caring and connected communities.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Order, members! We will listen to the minister in silence, unless he is being provocative.

Mr BYRNE: Merry Christmas to the opposition. We have started the way we ended last year. We are investing more than \$2 billion to keep Queenslanders safe. We are spending more than \$28 million to provide 266 additional police and we are well on track to meet our election commitment to increase police numbers by the end of June this year. We are giving police and QFES staff the resources they need to do the best job they can to keep Queenslanders safe. We have invested \$6 million in body worn video cameras for police officers on the front line. More than 300 body worn video camera devices have already been put out on the Gold Coast, with more to follow across the state. This is not just a matter of providing resources, but also of making sure that their use is efficient and effective.

That is why today I can advise the House that the Public Service Commission has completed an independent review of the Public Safety Business Agency. The review has recommendations that will revitalise and restore public safety support services and, importantly, put them back where they belong with their agencies, that is, the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. Many members of this House know full well my thoughts regarding the Keelty review and the formation of the PSBA. I have been consistent since day 1 of the last parliament. The former government's agenda was clearly to drive outsourcing and privatisation through the PSBA. Therefore, the Palaszczuk government committed to conducting this review to determine whether the PSBA was effectively supporting public safety service delivery for Queenslanders.

This government will restore efficient QPS and QFES service delivery of core functions. The core recommendations of the report will be in place by 1 July 2016, including the return of such functions as the operational functions, strategy, recruitment, education and training, local workforce health and safety, ethical standards, media services, right to information, ministerial services and cabinet legislative liaison. Some aspects of the process may require work beyond 1 July. However, we will be working hard to action all the recommendations as soon as practicable. It is important to note that the report also found some value in continuing to operate a shared portfolio model for corporate service to enable the QPS and the Fire and Emergency Services to focus on what they do best, which is delivering community safety services for Queensland. While the review's findings will lead to some changes of staff, these will be undertaken in line with the Palaszczuk government's commitment to public sector employment security, which is an amazing concept for those opposite.

I am confident that this report will be welcomed by police and firefighters right across the state. From the discussions and meetings I have had across Queensland—in fact, virtually every one that I have had—police officers and firefighters at all levels ask me the same question. As recently as this morning, the first question asked was, what are we doing about the PSBA? We are doing exactly what we said we would do. Today I am happy to announce the completion of this PSBA review. I am confident that changes identified in the review will achieve a more effective support service system for the men and women who work hard to keep Queenslanders safe. I table the report.

Tabled paper: Public Service Commission: Review of the Public Safety Business Agency, November 2015 [\[170\]](#).

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games) (2.17 pm): I advise the House that today marks 777 days until the Commonwealth Games open on Queensland's Gold Coast. This morning I was pleased to welcome the news that NEP Australia will be the broadcaster that beams the Commonwealth Games to the world. This Australian based company has secured the largest contract of the games, a contract to broadcast Queensland and the Gold Coast to an audience of 1.5 billion people worldwide. This decision will mean 1,200 jobs here in Queensland. This announcement is a major boost for Queensland's creative industries and will support talented broadcasters and technicians across the state. Most importantly, this announcement is accompanied by the commitment from NEP Australia that they will provide training for 200 local college and university students in the lead-up to the games and give them real life exposure to a major international event.

This investment in our state's students will be a tremendous legacy from the games and will help to build the next generation of broadcast talent in our state. As the father of a budding broadcasting student myself, I know the joy that this training commitment will deliver for students across Queensland. This is the best of the games spirit—connecting Queensland to the world and leaving lasting benefits for Queenslanders. This is exactly what these games will be about.

The Commonwealth Games is the largest sporting event to be staged in Australia this decade, injecting more than \$2 billion into Queensland's economy and supporting up to 30,000 jobs. NEP Australia will be responsible for filming and broadcasting high-definition television coverage to each of the individual rights holding broadcasts, which for Australia is Channel 7. They will be capturing all of the highs and the sporting memories across the 11 days of the Commonwealth Games.

I am advised that they will lay over 100 kilometres of cable and deploy some 350 cameras and produce over 1,100 hours of live television, radio and digital coverage transmitted via some 25 outside broadcast vehicles and control rooms. NEP Australia are in the process of establishing an office in Bundall on the Gold Coast and will also manage the design, installation and operation of the international broadcast centre. This is another great achievement in advance of the Commonwealth Games and as we get closer to it—there is little more than two years to go.

Today's announcement builds on the significant investments the government is making ahead of the games and there can be no greater sign of our commitment to the games and the coast than the delivery of stage 2 of light rail for the Gold Coast. As NEP Australia will be beaming Queensland to the world, Gold Coast light rail will be moving the world to the coast. It is a terrific achievement from the Palaszczuk government.

I am getting on with the job of delivering in this portfolio. This government is getting on with the job of delivering. I look forward to announcing even more jobs and opportunities as we look forward—770 days out from the Commonwealth Games in 2018.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister for Health, I acknowledge and welcome to the public gallery officers of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office: director-general Ken Lai, deputy director-general Francis Spong and director Brian Jing. Welcome to parliament.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Occupational Violence Taskforce; Paramedic Safety Taskforce



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.22 pm): I would like to update the House on the steps being taken to protect our healthcare workers from being assaulted while they are caring for their patients. Following an increase in the number of verbal and physical assaults against front-line health workers, including paramedics, I was determined to investigate options to help reduce the risk of assaults on Queensland's health workers. This led to the formation of the Occupational Violence Taskforce for our hospital and health service staff and the Paramedic Safety Taskforce.

The Paramedic Safety Taskforce delivered its interim report at the end of January and has recommended a number of measures to help improve the safety of paramedics. These interim recommendations include enhanced situational awareness and safety training for all paramedics and a public awareness campaign, both of which are being fast-tracked.

All front-line ambulance staff will be undertaking the enhanced training which aims to mitigate the risks of violence by helping paramedics to identify, de-escalate and withdraw safely from potentially dangerous or confronting situations. We are also implementing a \$1.35 million public awareness campaign 'Zero tolerance—no excuse for abuse', which is aimed at minimising violence against both

paramedics and front-line healthcare workers. This morning I attended a meeting of the Occupational Violence Taskforce. I am pleased to inform the House that the work of the task force is progressing well.

Our healthcare workers, including paramedics, are not punching bags. They deserve our respect and gratitude for the important work they do in our community. There is absolutely no excuse for anyone to abuse or physically assault a healthcare worker. I urge the Queensland community to join together and show zero tolerance for this type of antisocial behaviour.

Yellow Canopy Syndrome; Agriculture Industry



Hon. LE DONALDSON (Bundaberg—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries) (2.24 pm): Yesterday during question time I was asked by the member for Hinchinbrook to provide the House with an update on strategies to address the impacts of yellow canopy syndrome on the Queensland sugar industry. I took the question on notice. I would now like to provide the detail.

The cause of yellow canopy syndrome is unknown. Department of Agriculture and Fisheries staff are working with Sugar Research Australia on a number of research projects. In 2015-16 the Queensland government is providing over \$847,000 to Sugar Research Australia to fund four of the industry's research projects into yellow canopy syndrome. The solving yellow canopy syndrome project is undertaking a wide range of activities designed to identify the cause.

Another project funded by the department is investigating gene sequencing techniques to better understand the impact of the syndrome on sugarcane plants. I am advised that this research will be critical to identify management solutions for Queensland's sugar growers.

Mr Cramp interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven and member for Nanango, you are both now warned under standing order 253A for your unnecessary interjections. If you persist you will be asked to leave the chamber.

Ms DONALDSON: A separate project is underway to investigate leaf sucrose and the link to yellow canopy syndrome. A fourth project is investigating the link between yellow canopy syndrome and sugarcane root systems. I thank the member for Hinchinbrook for his question and for the opportunity to inform the House about the way the government is helping to solve this mysterious threat to the industry.

As members would know, sugar is vitally important to the Wide Bay region and to my electorate of Bundaberg. There are many eager and talented young people in the region who are actively looking for work. I am working hard and am very keen to see our youth have a future in regional Queensland.

At the last election Labor promised to work with industry to secure job pathways in rural Queensland. The Palaszczuk government is delivering on this promise. Last week I was very happy to launch the Queensland Agriculture Workforce Network at Perfection Fresh Australia in my electorate of Bundaberg. This is a \$3 million commitment to match rural workers with jobs.

This is a landmark statewide partnership between the Palaszczuk government and five agriculture industry groups to support rural job programs. They include: the Bundaberg Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Growcom, the Mareeba District Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, the Bowen Gumlu Growers Association and Canegrowers Mackay.


Growcom chief executive, Pat Hannon, says the partnership to coordinate skilled labour has the potential to enhance business profitability. Peter Hockings, the executive officer of the Bundaberg Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, says that this program will boost the capacity of agricultural businesses and grow the number of skilled agricultural workers.

Our partners in agriculture have agreed to place experienced, industry based officers in regional and rural Queensland to help tackle labour supply issues. They will consider the unique needs of individual regions and ways of attracting, keeping and training agricultural workers.

Last year my predecessor, the member for Rockhampton, established the Rural Jobs and Skills Alliance. That was also a landmark partnership between the Palaszczuk government and key agricultural producers. I am proud to be part of a government that is meeting its election commitments and securing jobs in regional Queensland.

The Queensland Agriculture Workforce Network will stay in place until the end of 2017. During this time it will be monitored and evaluated to see how it contributes to Queensland's agricultural production capacity which is helping the economy create jobs now and jobs for the future.

Education, Achievements

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (2.28 pm): Labor is the party for education. We are delivering more teachers and new, upgraded and improved schools right across Queensland. Over the school holidays tradies were hard at work at schools throughout the state delivering much needed upgrades and jobs. In total, \$26 million worth of works was undertaken on 500 projects during the holidays, meaning students and staff returned to new and improved facilities.


Works were delivered in state schools across Queensland, including refurbishments to the home economics block at Western Cape College in the electorate of Cook. To put another smile on the member for Callide's face, there was painting done at the Baralaba State School. That is more good news for the member for Callide. Drainage works were undertaken at Wellington Point State School in Cleveland.

Ms Trad: He's been so successful.

Ms JONES: I know. I am going to have an ally in Canberra, finally. In addition to these works, an extra 290 teachers above growth started in Queensland state schools. We went to the election committed to rewinding the cuts to teachers in our schools, and we are delivering on that. In addition to this, we promised to provide additional guidance officers in our schools. This year an extra 15 guidance officers have started in state high schools in Queensland. This will increase to 30 extra positions in 2017 and to 45 in 2018.

We are also implementing historic reforms to deliver the new assessment and tertiary entrance system for senior students. The implementation task force has already met this year and work is underway to ensure that Queensland is ready when the new system is introduced in 2018. In fact, during 2016 we will be having trials of external assessment for the first time in Queensland in a generation—all to ensure that by the time we get to 2018 we are well and truly ready. In fact, we have been overwhelmed with interest not only from state schools but also from independent schools and Catholic schools across Queensland. This is all part of our commitment to provide quality education for every child in Queensland's schools.

North Queensland, Small Business Ideas Forum

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.30 pm): The Palaszczuk government was elected on a promise of being a government for all of Queensland. This government's response to the retrenchment of workers from the Queensland Nickel smelter in Townsville is an example of a whole-of-government approach to standing by regional Queenslanders.


Last week I was delighted to announce that the Palaszczuk government will host a small business ideas forum in Townsville on Friday, 26 February. I want North Queensland to come forward with their bright ideas for starting a new business and find out about the support on offer from the state government. The ideas forum will include presentations from experienced small business experts and introductions to support programs and resources. Participants will also have access to one-on-one mentoring to test the strength of their business ideas. Many of the workers who have recently been made redundant are highly skilled and experienced and, provided with relevant information and mentoring, I have no doubt many of them would make excellent small business owners.

This government is focused on stimulating the North Queensland economy and this includes helping new small business get off the ground and helping existing businesses to grow. This is about helping former employees of Queensland Nickel and supporting anyone who has the next great idea for a new local business, whether that is designing a new app, working as a self-employed tradie or creating your own start-up. I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my parliamentary colleagues the member for Mundingburra, the member for Thuringowa and the member for Townsville in securing this important forum for the region.

Small businesses employ approximately 43 per cent of all private sector workers in Queensland and are a vital part of our state's economy. The Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland program also provides a range of funding opportunities for small businesses and start-ups.

I want to encourage anyone in the North Queensland community who is considering turning their great idea into a great business to attend the forum to hear about and discuss opportunities for starting a small business. The forum will be held at the Riverway Arts Centre between 12.15 pm and 3 pm on Friday, 26 February. Equally, I would encourage anyone who is considering starting a small business or start-up to visit the Queensland government Business and Industry Portal website and the Advance Queensland website for resources and funding opportunities.

Mining Industry

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.32 pm): Last night Anglo American announced to the London Stock Exchange that it would offer more of its Australian assets for sale. In Queensland, Moranbah North, Grosvenor and Moranbah South will be offered for sale. Anglo has assured government that any employees made redundant will receive their full entitlement. The company plans to operate Grasstree and the Capcoal open-cut mines in Middlesmoot.


Yesterday Royal Dutch Shell made an announcement about broad plans following the takeover of the BG Group. Shell has identified an intent to reduce staffing within its Australian operations. While precise numbers have not been identified, I expect they will not be insignificant. The global petroleum industry is undergoing a process of rationalisation. The local CSG-LNG industry has been transforming from its labour intensive construction phase to its operational phase. Finally, Rio Tinto announced the reduction of its workforce at the Queensland Alumina Limited refinery by 60 people.

International commodity markets are beyond the control of any individual government. However, there are things we can and are doing to assist the industry and the communities it supports. We are fulfilling our election commitment for a royalties freeze. We have the lowest payroll tax in the country and we are investing heavily in innovation.

Furthermore, we will support up to a 50 per cent reduction in the expenditure that an explorer is required to commit under their mineral exploration permit. For example, an explorer in the north-west mineral province with multiple exploration permits could be required to spend \$2 million over the next two years or risk forfeiting the permit. This expenditure relief will reduce their obligation to \$1 million, giving time for the market to recover. Importantly, this will keep explorers investing in Queensland which is vital for the long-term health of the mineral sector.

It is not all doom and gloom. Stanmore Coal has reopened Isaac Plains. QCoal has the first of seven mining lease applications for its Byerwen coal project. Korella phosphate mine is ready to move to production of up to 600,000 tonnes of phosphate per annum. QGC has its two-year \$1.7 billion Charlie 1 project to develop its natural gas tenements at Wandoan. Rio is investing \$2.6 billion to develop one of the world's largest bauxite deposits at Weipa. This is a pro-jobs government, a pro-investment government, and investment is continuing in this state's world-class resources.

Rockhampton Courthouse

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.35 pm): Late last year this government became aware of an upcoming appointment of a permanent Federal Circuit Court judge at Rockhampton, after the federal Attorney-General made a public announcement to that effect on the steps of the Rockhampton courthouse. Being aware of the difficulties and delays faced by Central Queensland families in having their family law matters dealt with, I welcomed this development.

I then wrote to Senator Brandis, requesting that if the federal government intended to accommodate the new appointment in the state courthouse for contact to be made with Justice Services to discuss what arrangements could be put in place. Senator Brandis did not respond and no arrangements were made with the state government, my department or, indeed, the Chief Justice, who the senator should realise has responsibility for the control and management of all Supreme Court buildings across the state.

Rockhampton courthouse provides a range of important services to the people of Rockhampton, which was made very clear in my letter to Senator Brandis. He chose to completely ignore my request, announcing on 2 February—via the member for Capricornia's Facebook page—that a permanent appointment had been made, with a welcome ceremony to take place on 7 March.

When I raised concern about the non-existent arrangements for the accommodation of the new appointment, Senator Brandis was reported as claiming that 'arrangements for the accommodation of the Federal Circuit Court judge are in place and have been the subject of discussion between those who administer the Federal Circuit Court and the state court authorities'. This is simply untrue. The federal government's arrogant approach actually risks compromising the delivery of existing state services at that courthouse. Is Senator Brandis suggesting that District Court sittings be reduced in Rockhampton? Is he suggesting that the people of Rockhampton should not have access to QCAT hearings?

I wrote to the senator again on 5 February. To date, I have had no response but he has had no problem responding to questions on this topic at Senate estimates on 9 February. He assured the committee that he was personally familiar with the courthouse and that there was a vacant courtroom

which would accommodate the new judge when she commences, to be based in Rockhampton. This is untrue. What the senator refers to as a 'vacant courtroom' is presently used by visiting judges of the District Court, the industrial tribunal and members of QCAT, as well as the visiting Federal Circuit Court judge. There is no vacant courtroom.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you are warned under standing order 253A for your interjections, which have not been taken.

Mrs D'ATH: The senator's comments were not only untrue but arrogantly dismissive of the diverse needs of the people of Central Queensland. They should be measured against his responsibility as a minister to answer truthfully to Senate estimates and his status as an officer of the Supreme Court of Queensland. He has treated the government, the Chief Justice and the people of Queensland with disdain. I call for Senator Brandis to respond to my correspondence and to answer questions about what Commonwealth funds will be committed to to make substantial modifications to the Rockhampton courthouse to deliver on his announcement.

MOTIONS

Suspension of Sessional Orders



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.37 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in the sessional orders, the cognate debate of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill and the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill shall take precedence over general business this Wednesday evening.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Order of Business



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.38 pm): I move—

That general business order of the day No. 1 be postponed until the House further resolves.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MENTAL HEALTH BILL

MENTAL HEALTH (RECOVERY MODEL) BILL

Cognate Debate; Order of Business



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.38 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—


1. That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Mental Health Bill and the Mental Health (Recovery Model) Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, as follows:
 - (a) second reading debate, with separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
 - (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
 - (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.
2. That standing order 136(6) be suspended for the Mental Health (Recovery Model) Bill, to allow the commencement of the second reading debate despite three calendar months not having elapsed since the tabling of the portfolio committee report.
3. That, notwithstanding anything contained in the standing and sessional orders:
 - (a) the time limits and order for moving the second readings shall be: the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services—60 minutes, followed by the member for Caloundra—60 minutes; and
 - (b) the time limits and order for reply to the second readings debate shall be: member for Caloundra—30 minutes, followed by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services—30 minutes.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE


Report

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (2.40 pm): As the chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, I lay upon the table of the House report No. 20 of the Finance and Administration Committee. This report covers the portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 15 September 2015 and 10 November 2015 considered by the committee. The committee did not identify any issues regarding consistency 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. 20, 55th Parliament—Portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 15 September 2015 and 10 November 2015 [[171](#)].

ETHICS COMMITTEE


Report

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (2.40 pm): As the acting chair of the Ethics Committee, I lay upon the table of the House the Ethics Committee report No. 162 titled *Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings*. For the information of the House, this is the second and final report in relation to the matters referred by the PCCC on 17 August 2015. I commend the report and the committee's recommendations to the House.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 162—Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings [[172](#)].

HEALTH AND AMBULANCE SERVICES COMMITTEE


Report

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (2.41 pm): As the chair of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee, I lay upon the table of the House report No. 12 of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee. This report covers the portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 16 September 2015 and 13 October 2015 considered by the committee. The committee did not identify any significant issues regarding consistency with fundamental legislative principles or the lawfulness of the subordinate legislation. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Health and Ambulance Services Committee: Report No. 12, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 16 September 2015 and 13 October 2015 [[173](#)].

NOTICE OF MOTION


Amendments to Standing Orders

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.42 pm): I give notice that I shall move—

- (1) That the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly be amended by inserting in standing order 213, after (2), the following sub-paragraph:
- (2A) A draft report of the Chairperson or another member to be tabled at a committee meeting in accordance with (1) or (2) above, must be provided to members of the Committee at least 2 clear days prior to any meeting at which the draft report is to be considered in accordance with (3) below. A draft report may be provided to a member personally, via their electorate office staff, by email, fax or express mail, except that in the case of mail, the draft report is not considered provided, until the time mail would expect to be delivered in the normal course of business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Australian Infrastructure Plan

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (2.43 pm): Mr Speaker, I want to touch on the subject of infrastructure in Queensland. As you know, it is a topic of mine that I have been following for the last 12 months or so, together with the—

Government members interjected.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the House!

Mr NICHOLLS: They all get excited, Mr Speaker. That is all right.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, I would ask you to come to order.

Mr NICHOLLS: They all get excited, Mr Speaker. That is all right. I can deal with them. I am going to come to the Leader of the House—

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, please. I might just warn the Leader of the House that if he persists he will follow the lead of some other members from the opposition. I would urge you to control yourself.

Mr NICHOLLS: That is a very wise statement too, Mr Speaker. I am going to come to the Leader of the House in due course. Today saw the release of the *Australian Infrastructure Plan* by Infrastructure Australia at a function that was hosted by Infrastructure Australia and Infrastructure Partnerships Australia. As we know, Queensland for the last 12 months has suffered an infrastructure freeze. There has been a dearth of new initiatives and new projects driven by this government. The only projects that are being delivered are projects that were initiated by the LNP. It does not matter—

Ms Trad interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Premier, you will have an opportunity to make a private members' statement if you want to respond to what the member for Clayfield is saying. I urge you to allow him to speak.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I forgot to welcome the members from the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office. I obviously congratulate their new president, President Tsai, and give my best wishes to President Ma, who is departing. While those members are here today, they may be disappointed to learn that in the last 12 months Queensland has become the place where the least amount of infrastructure is being undertaken and that the only infrastructure that is being undertaken is that started by the LNP.

In the last five weeks, the Leader of the House, the new Minister for Transport, has issued no fewer than five releases extolling the virtues of the new generation rolling stock, consisting of 75 new six-car sets delivered under the model that they hate over there—a public-private partnership. It will be funded for the next 30 years, with twice as many trains for the same price that those opposite were ever able to deliver. We look at the Minister for Education's releases in relation to all those new schools that she was going to at the beginning of the year. It does not matter whether it was at Pallara, Caboolture West, Ripley or Pine Rivers—they were all delivered under a 10 schools PPP organised by this government, another project that they hate.

I do not blame the Deputy Premier. She is doing her best. I think she genuinely does want to do her best. She is hamstrung by a Treasurer who has no economic narrative. We read the paper this morning. His own party room got up his ribs on Monday and said, 'What is the economic narrative? Where are we getting the money from? How are we going to pay for it? Where is it going?' There is no economic narrative. The Deputy Premier is hamstrung. There is no infrastructure.

Australian Infrastructure Plan

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.46 pm): I rise to respond to the former treasurer of Queensland, the member for Clayfield, who just extolled the virtues of the new *Australian Infrastructure Plan*. As members would recall, I got up and leant the Palaszczuk Labor government's support to that plan—right up until they said that we must privatise our electricity assets in order to pay for infrastructure, because of course that was the plan of those opposite.

The member for Clayfield likes to talk about the new generation rolling stock. As my colleague the transport minister would know, the new generation rolling stock that will come online in the very near future, starting from this year, was new generation rolling stock that was identified in the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan by the former Labor government. That is what happens when you plan for infrastructure, when you plan for growth.

Of course, we know those opposite did not like planning: they did not like planning for infrastructure and they did not like planning for growth. We know the member for Callide did not like putting out an infrastructure plan at all. When he was told that he should put out an infrastructure plan


he said, 'No, I don't want to put out an infrastructure plan until we have the money,' and of course they never had money until they put up a plan to privatise all of our assets. Then without any assessment, without any rigorous cost-benefit analysis, they went around the countryside supporting infrastructure projects that did not have a business case, just like 1 William Street. There was no business case, no funds committed unless we sold our assets. That is how those opposite do infrastructure in this state. They do not plan to procure; they do not do any business case development; they do not do any assessment of the cost-benefit analysis. That is why we have 1 William Street.

What did Australia's infrastructure plan reveal today? It revealed that what states and the Commonwealth need to do is to have more rigorous architecture around planning and procuring infrastructure. We do not have endless amounts of resources to fund and finance infrastructure. So we need to plan better. We need more rigorous analysis. What those opposite did was abandon any sort of planning, any sort of rigorous assessment around infrastructure. That was because they wanted to pork-barrel; they wanted to build a tower of vanity to the former premier of Queensland, the former member for Ashgrove, Campbell Newman. That is how the LNP roll out infrastructure and they stay silent on important new projects like Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2, which this government is delivering, and the new Roma Hospital. They stay silent on projects like this—

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I am pleased to inform members that we have students from the Aquinas College in the electorate of Southport in our gallery observing our proceedings.

State Budget

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.51 pm): Yesterday we had the remarkable situation where two of the Labor government's most senior ministers, the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer, were forced to come into the House and correct the record over their claims that Labor had delivered the first operating surplus in a decade. Of course, that claim was incorrect, as both the Treasurer and Deputy Premier have since admitted. I pointed out yesterday that the LNP delivered an operating surplus of \$619 million in 2013-14. In her correction, the Deputy Premier went so far as to suggest that the opposition leader should come into this House and correct the record for suggesting that Queensland had rising debt and deficit.

For the benefit of the House, I would like to refer to the publicly available figures in the 2015-16 Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review. These figures are available from table 3 on page 21. Debt in 2015-16 is listed as \$73.9 billion. In 2016-17 it is projected to increase to \$76.3 billion. In 2017-18 debt is projected to increase to just under \$78 billion and in 2018-19 debt is projected to increase to \$79.7 billion—


Mr Nicholls: \$80 billion!

Mr LANGBROEK:—nearly \$80 billion. Over the same period general government debt will increase from just under \$38 billion to just below \$41 billion. These projections from Queensland Treasury indicate that Queensland's debt is indeed increasing. Queensland will also remain in fiscal deficit—I repeat: fiscal deficit—over the forward estimates. Fiscal deficits over the next four years will total more than \$5 billion. In her correction, the Deputy Premier also made mention of forecast operating surpluses of more than \$1 billion over the forward forecast. The Treasurer mentioned them again today. I would again make the point that, since the budget, these operating surpluses have diminished by \$1.5 billion. It should also be noted that the LNP left office forecasting operating surpluses of more than \$3 billion every year from 2015-16 to 2017-18.

Here is the problem: the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer can fool some of the people some of the time and all of the people some of the time, but they cannot fool the backbench at all. They cannot convince the backbench at all about what they are saying. They do not believe them in caucus, so why would Labor MPs believe the Treasurer when he stands up in this place and says that everything is hunky-dory? It is writ large on the faces of the entire government. The Treasurer can attack me, berate me, cherry-pick the good statistics while completely ignoring the bad ones, but they do not believe him. It is not just me saying that this Treasurer is not up to the job of securing Queensland's economic future; independent commentators are saying it; the business community is saying it. Even his own colleagues are throwing him under the bus.

I say to the Treasurer: if you cannot sell it in here, you are never going to be able to sell it out there. That is plenty obvious when we look at independent report after independent report that shows the decline in confidence since the election.

Long-Wait Lists

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.54 pm): I was unsurprised yesterday to hear the Leader of the Opposition rewriting history when it came to the Health portfolio. We had the lowering of the elective surgery rates and the lowering of dental long-waits in Queensland, and no wonder because of a federal Labor government, through national partnership agreements—

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr DICK:—and he might laugh—that poured money into both of those things to reduce waiting lists around the nation. In Queensland we had the Queensland Implementation Plan: National Partnership Agreement on Treating More Public Dental Patients. I wonder what that was about. Perhaps it was about treating more public dental patients.

The Leader of the Opposition has to stop rewriting history and start telling the truth about why waiting lists came down under the previous government. It is no wonder the member for Callide does not want to hang around when he has a leader, like the member for Southern Downs. We all lived through 'Joh for PM'; now we have to live through 'Jeff for PM'. Who could not be excited about the member for Callide bringing his trademark people skills to Canberra? Who could not be excited about that? Not content with leading his party to one of the worst electoral defeats in history, he has to take his consultative and approachable style to Canberra. That is the future for him.


We know the Prime Minister is keen on innovation. What could be more innovative than a has-been deputy premier who cannot work with his own party at a state level going to Canberra? That is innovation. That is the innovation future for our nation. He believes so strongly in Lawrence Springborg that he wants to work for Malcolm Turnbull. Not only did he upgrade every airstrip in Callide; he wants to upgrade every airstrip in Wide Bay. There is the air marshal checking them all out. He has a plan for Wide Bay. You have to have a plan for the airstrip, but it is okay; I have rung the Australian National Audit Office. I have put them on alert. They will be ready.

This is an opposition without any idea. We had one idea from the Leader of the Opposition and that was to spend \$77 million on bureaucracy and advertising for a wait-time gimmick. He had one idea, and he could not even deliver that! It is an opposition without an idea, without a plan and now without people like the member for Callide—and can I suggest the member for Toowoomba South will soon be abandoning the ship to go to Canberra.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, you are now warned under standing order 253A for continual interjection. If you persist you will be asked to leave.

Queensland Economy

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.57 pm): One year ago this government started out with 14 ministers with training wheels on. Now we have 17 ministers with training wheels on. As we have seen with a particular issue in the last month, this is a government which becomes completely fixated on one issue and is unable to make decisions with regard to jobs and the economy in Queensland. The only thing this Treasurer is able to do is to galvanise his entire backbench against him. He has never been able to galvanise the people of Queensland into believing that he has a jobs plan, an economy plan, a plan to pay down debt, a plan to build infrastructure and a plan to deliver a budget surplus. What we have seen, as I said yesterday, is a set of circumstances in which the Premier has readjusted his own charter of goals to suit his increasing level of incompetence. That is something which is becoming more and more obvious to the people of Queensland.

When we look at the independent commentators on the real state of Queensland's financial performance—the Auditor-General, Moody's, Standard & Poor's—what are they saying about the real delivery around debt and deficit here in Queensland? Let's look at what Moody's said after the delivery of the last state budget. It said—

As a result, the achievement of a balanced budget (net lending/borrowing result, including capital outlays), which had been projected for FY2015/16, will not occur over the next four years.

Similarly, we have a situation in which Standard & Poor's themselves said that these measures are unlikely to have a substantial impact on the government's non-financial public sector debt, the sector on which Standard & Poor's bases its assessment of the state debt burden.

What did the Auditor-General say only a month or so ago in relation to this government's debt reduction strategy? He said, 'These actions are short-term strategies that cannot be relied upon indefinitely.' That means that we have a government that is shifting debt from one credit card to the

other. Every single householder in Queensland knows that that is something which is completely and absolutely unsustainable. The learned bodies that I indicated before point out that their debt strategy of shifting debt from the general government sector to the GOCs increases the burden on electricity companies around 75 to 80 per cent, which also puts them on the precipice of sustainability. That is what we see in Queensland: a government frozen at the wheel with no plan for jobs and no plan for infrastructure.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Queensland Economy



Mr SPRINGBORG (3.00 pm): My first question without notice is to the Treasurer, and I ask: as a result of ongoing discussions between Queensland Treasury and credit ratings agencies, can the Treasurer guarantee that Queensland's credit rating will not be further downgraded?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. The honourable member is asking me to divulge confidential conversations between Queensland Treasury and me as Treasurer with ratings agencies, which is something that I will not do. What I will say is that I have been proactively engaging with the representatives of ratings agencies not only here in Australia but around the globe. In fact, during the Queensland Treasury Corporation's post-budget trip last year I met with the global heads of Standard & Poor's and Moody's, and we explained our budget strategy from top to bottom.

What happens is that, when the commentary is provided by ratings agencies around a budget and around their updates, they very clearly provide commentary about where they see the budget position should be going according to their matrix. One thing that we always rely on very much in this state is a positive tick in terms of financial management, and we have received a positive tick in terms of financial management. Right now we have a situation where the conservatives in Western Australia have just experienced their third downgrade in very quick succession. We have not had that in Queensland. Why? Because we are standing up very well to very difficult and volatile global conditions, including the downturn in commodity prices.

The question that we have heard relates specifically to ratings agencies, but this is coming from the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Southern Downs, who is a global financial crisis denier. This is the man who said that there is no global financial crisis. He said that and it was played ad nauseam. He did not believe that the global financial crisis existed, so how can he come in here and talk about what credit agencies are saying about the state of the economy in Queensland?

Let me be clear for the member for Southern Downs. He made a brief speech during private members' statements prior to asking his first question and he talked about what is happening with the debt profile in Queensland. He should be looking to his left at the member for Clayfield, whose record while in government was to increase debt in this state by \$14 billion. Fourteen billion dollars is the record of the LNP. What have we done since we came into office? We have delivered a budget which shows that over the forward estimates we will be paying down \$10.6 billion of debt, so our record of paying down debt—

Mr SPRINGBORG: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My question to the Treasurer was: can the Treasurer guarantee that there will be no further downgrades to Queensland's current credit rating? I was not asking him to divulge any in-depth discussions with the ratings agencies. It is a simple yes or no: can the Treasurer guarantee?

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I call the minister.

Mr PITT: As the member for Southern Downs knows, there is no such thing as a yes or no answer when it comes to any question he asks. Let me say that we will not be seeing a downgrade in Queensland's credit rating on my watch if I have anything to do with it, because I will work day and night to continue the hard work that this side of the House has been putting in to see that our economy continues to grow at four per cent, which is forecast to be the highest of all states in Australia. We will continue to create jobs which, of course, will be one of the best things that we can do to avoid those sorts of downgrades.

Queensland Economy

Mr SPRINGBORG: My second question without notice is to the Premier, and I ask: given that the Premier has had two goes at writing the Treasurer's charter letter, can she explain why she again omitted 'restoring the state's AAA credit rating' as one of the Treasurer's goals?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition very much for the question. The Treasurer has made it very clear that we are firmly committed to growing the state's economy. It is this side of the House that in the last year has delivered 60,000 jobs and the lowest unemployment levels we have seen in two years. We have one focus, and that is jobs right across Queensland. I make no apology for that. Against advice which was contained in a Deloitte report, the former government axed Skilling Queenslanders for Work. It is this government that has brought that project back, employing people right across the state, and the Attorney-General and the Minister for Training and Skills are about to announce the next round very shortly. We are committed to growing the economy, and that is why my Advance Queensland plan is paramount to everything that we do. It is about growing the economy, diversifying the economy and making sure that we have jobs now and jobs for the future.

I make no excuse for tackling issues like Queensland Nickel in Townsville. I took my Working Queensland cabinet subcommittee out there to talk to the people of Townsville to make sure that we have employment opportunities for them, because their employer has let them down. We will also shortly be going to other parts of the state to make sure that we have a very firm focus on growing jobs in this state. After listening to the member for Mount Isa and the member for Dalrymple, the Working Queensland cabinet subcommittee will also travel to their regions because they are passionate about getting people there back into work.

We have a very clear plan, and that is focused on driving the economy, diversifying the economy, making sure that we attract more tourism to Queensland, capitalising on those new Asian markets and making sure that we deliver for this state. What did we see under the former LNP government? It was disgraceful. They cut front-line services and tens of thousands of jobs in their first year in government; that is their record. This government is firmly focused on growing front-line services and delivering for Queenslanders—not the slash-and-burn approach that we saw from those opposite who used to sit on the front bench. Every single one of those members opposite is responsible for the damage that they did to Queensland, and we will work night and day to repair that damage for the good of all Queenslanders right across this state.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Community Cabinet

Mr KING: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the House on any opportunities for people in my local area to raise ideas and issues with the Palaszczuk government?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Kallangur very much for his question. As we know, one of the best ways that local members can raise issues with members of my cabinet is through the community cabinet process. It is an enormous opportunity to take the cabinet to different parts of the state to listen firsthand to the issues that people have about their local community. In the past we have had community cabinets in Townsville, Rockhampton, Yeppoon, the southern suburbs of Brisbane, Bundaberg and also just recently this year in Gladstone. Our government has so far met with more than 630 Queenslanders during the community cabinet process right across Queensland. This is a government that listens.

I am very pleased to announce that the next community cabinet will be held in the electorates of Kallangur and Pine Rivers. These electorates have local members who will stand up for their communities. They have been speaking at length to me, the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer about the importance of having a community cabinet in their region in early March. We look forward to being there on 6 and 7 March.

The northern suburbs community cabinet will be held on 6 March at the Dakabin State High School—I invite people from the local community to register for a deputation—and the cabinet meeting will be held on 7 March in Strathpine. This is an enormous opportunity for locals to come together from right across that region to make sure we are driving employment opportunities, making sure we have the skills necessary, and looking at vital issues such as health and education in those regions. I know that the Minister for Employment will be looking at some job opportunities there. The new Minister for Housing will be out there looking at housing opportunities as well. I am quite sure that the minister for Advance Queensland and small business will be looking at small business opportunities.

We also know that it was this government that really pushed the Moreton Bay Rail Link—once again, delivering infrastructure for this state. Those opposite come in here and criticise this side of the House when it comes to infrastructure, yet they did hardly anything over three years. The only project they prioritised was 1 William Street. Frankly, it is simply not good enough.

My cabinet is looking forward to going to Kallangur and Pine Rivers in early March. We will be travelling across the state this year, honouring our commitment to listen to Queenslanders no matter where they live.

State Finances

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer explain how Labor intends to address Queensland's rising debt levels, considering the independent Auditor-General labelled the cash raids on government owned corporations, long service leave and superannuation as 'short-term strategies and a one-off solution'?

Mr PITT: I thank the member for Surfers Paradise for his question. He quotes the Auditor-General in relation to short-term responses. Let us think about another short-term response that those opposite thought would be the solution to all things: asset sales. They said that the short-term sugar hit was going to sort everything out. It goes to the previous question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I table a news article from 2014 titled 'Qld budget 2014: Asset sales won't be enough to restore AAA rating'.

Tabled paper: Article from ABC News online, dated 4 June 2014, titled 'Qld budget 2014: Asset sales won't be enough to restore AAA rating, Treasurer Tim Nicholls says' [\[174\]](#).

Their whole plan revolved around short-term sugar hits. We have looked at the balance sheet. We have looked at all of our assets, including our financial assets, and we are making them work hard for us. We have done balance sheet reform that will, over the forward estimates, save \$1.6 billion in interest repayments. That is a very good result. As I always say, even if you subscribe to the spin and innuendo coming from the member for Surfers Paradise, at the end of the day that is \$1.6 billion that we as a government can spend on providing the sorts of services those opposite neglected for the three years they were in government.

Those are the things that happened under their watch. What else happened under their watch? Let us think about the last time we saw a credit rating downgrade. The last time we saw a downgrade was under the LNP. After their budget they were downgraded. That is an indictment on their government. They tried to duck and cover at the time, but it was a sign of things to come, with almost no growth under that government.

When we talk about what is going to happen in the longer term, when we talk about our approach to continuing to pay down debt in this state, our election commitment was very clear. We retained public assets in public hands. Why? It is because they have an income stream which continues, year in and year out—not just for the next five years but for the next 100 years. It will continue to give back to the people of Queensland.

The energy mergers we have announced, between Ergon and Energex, will save \$670 million over the next five years. What will it do? It will continue to provide a revenue stream to government. We can have a better impact on controlling electricity prices because we own them. Also, we will continue to receive a dividend from those assets that we kept in public hands.

The Baird government has been criticised very strongly for selling off their electricity assets. What will happen? Their own New South Wales Treasury documents state that it will leave a structural hole in their budget. That is exactly what we have avoided in Queensland. Not for the next few years and not for the next 10 years but for the next 100 years and beyond, we will continue to have those revenue streams which are key to ensuring we can pay down debt in this state.

Infrastructure Projects, Federal Funding

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is for the Premier and Minister for the Arts. Will the Premier inform the House if the Prime Minister committed to any projects or initiatives during his visit to Queensland this week?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Barron River for that very important question. We know that earlier this week the Prime Minister started his visit up in Cairns. We were all in a state of anticipation, because we thought that would be a prime opportunity for him to announce the preferred tender for the patrol boats in that region. We know how important that tender process is for that region. I will mention a few aspects of the contract.

The Department of Defence has recognised Cairns as a hub for the minor war vessel, similar to the Pacific patrol boats. This would mean jobs for the Cairns region. The Cairns consortium encapsulates a team with impressive and extensive experience. The bid is backed by 40 years of local production and support and also by global leaders in shipping. This is a construction and maintenance program that I have spoken about in this House before. Wouldn't it have been good if Malcolm Turnbull, as Prime Minister of Australia, on his first trip to Cairns, had announced the awarding of this tender, which would have benefited the region and generated jobs?

What we are seeing very clearly is my government making firm commitments across the state to grow the economy and bring forward contracts to generate jobs right across the state. Unfortunately, we need the federal government to come to the party and help in relation to this. This would have been the No. 1 priority for the Cairns region. I thank the three local members who represent the region—the members for Cairns, Barron River and Mulgrave—for driving this project because it is a necessary project. It is a vital project. We will keep writing to Malcolm Turnbull about it because we believe that it will benefit the Far North.

I also understand that the Prime Minister went to Townsville and made some other stops along the way, at Mackay and Rockhampton. There are enormous opportunities right up and down the coast into which the Prime Minister could be putting vital infrastructure funds to help the state's economy grow. What we see from this side of the House is a massive injection of funds, with our Accelerated Works Program, to drive the economy and drive jobs.

Unfortunately, we are still yet to see the federal government match the \$100 million we have firmly placed on the table for the Townsville stadium. We need the Prime Minister to come to the party. In relation to other parts of the state, we know that if he unlocked the northern Australian infrastructure fund—the \$5 billion—it would open up even further opportunities, not just for the regional communities but also for out west. It is time for the federal government to step up to the plate and help Queensland.

Noon, Mr A

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is to the Treasurer. I refer to a well-known Labor mate and former chief of staff to Minister Lynham, Adrian Noon, and I ask: how was Mr Noon appointed to a \$200,000-plus per year job as an SES3 officer without going through the Premier's much vaunted merit based selection process?

Mr PITT: It appears that the member for Clayfield denigrates Queensland Treasury as much now, in opposition, as he did when he was actually the Treasurer. That is a real shame. That is what we have seen over the past few years. As I said, he and others are now in their fourth year of talking down the Queensland economy. When it comes to the specific question, I strongly deny the premise of the question.

Mr Nicholls: What's that? That he is a Labor mate?

Mr PITT: The Premier has made it very clear about merit based selection—

Mr Nicholls: That he was Lynham's chief of staff? What part do you deny?

Mr PITT: He asked the question. He does not want the answer.

Mr Nicholls: Flesh it out. Which part do you deny?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Clayfield—

An opposition member: Oh, come on!

Mr SPEAKER: No, you are pushing the boundaries. If you persist, you will be warned.

Mr PITT: The question that the member for Clayfield asks is a serious question. I would suggest that it is actually a serious allegation if he is suggesting that this has not gone through a merit based selection process. So let me be clear—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members!

Mr PITT: Mr Speaker, they are very uneasy today, aren't they?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister! Members! Minister, I would ask you just to answer the question please.

Mr PITT: Obviously they are all just thinking about the merit based process, or lack thereof, when it comes to LNP preselection! Let us look at this situation. This is a serious question asked by the member for Clayfield and I am going to give it a serious response. The Premier has been very clear about merit based selection in senior positions across government, and that is exactly what has happened on this occasion. I do not have a direct role in that. That is a role for the Under Treasurer and the Under Treasurer has, with others in Treasury and independent panellists, gone through a process and I have been advised of the outcome of that process.

I think it is quite grubby though for the member for Clayfield to come in here and talk about somebody who is a former Labor staffer, as he put it, which completely ignores the fact that the individual in question had a very long and distinguished career within the Queensland Treasury for many years. I think this is a low act. It is typical of those opposite. It is always about the politics.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. I do not really want you to be debating the issue. Do you have anything further you want to add?

Mr PITT: I reiterate my answer. My answer is that a merit based selection process was undertaken and in this case the applicant who was successful is someone who had all the credentials required as deemed by the independent panel that undertook the work. In future I hope that the member for Clayfield will think twice about coming in here and denigrating individuals in this House.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Health, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A.

Local Government Elections

Mr PEGG: My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. With local government elections on 19 March, will the Deputy Premier inform the House about any initiatives that will help support and mentor newly elected councillors?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Stretton for his question. I know that the looming quadrennial elections around the corner are something that his local community is fully engaged in in Stretton. Local government elections will be held right across the state on 19 March and there will certainly be councillors and mayors who are elected to office for the first time as there are a number of retiring mayors, and I want to put on the public record my appreciation for their many years of service. To support them in their new roles my department has been working to deliver a statewide induction program to help build the knowledge and skills of mayors and councillors, including good governance practices. I know, too, that sometimes former mayors will work with new mayors to mentor them in their job to ensure that they pass on their very valuable experience. But today I want to pay particular tribute to one former deputy mayor who in recent days has shown that he still has much more to give—and, of course, I am talking about the man from Monto, the member for Callide, Jeff Seeney. It seems he may soon be leaving us for Canberra, but I think I am very safe to say that it will take a lot for this chamber to forget his enormous contribution to this place. As he told the ABC today in a very candid interview, and I quote for the benefit of the House—

I'm in a position now where I don't think my talents or abilities are being used to their fullest extent ...

Government members: Oh!

Ms TRAD: I know that it is very sad; I will take that collective interjection, and on this side of the House we certainly agree. I mean, who could forget when the member for Callide directed the Moreton Bay Regional Council to take out sea level rise from its planning scheme because he does not believe in climate change—that is a great contribution; or the time that he came into this place and changed the laws in order to avert prosecution for an LNP donor mate from Karreman Quarries; or the time that Howard Hobbs called him the most hated man in the bush? There was that time soon after the 31 January 2015 state election when he came out and he said that asset sales were dead, buried and cremated. That only lasted a year, didn't it? That only lasted a year until the member for Southern Downs said, 'Let's have another conversation about it.' And who could have forgotten that wonderful contribution when he said that he would have kept better paperwork to justify pork-barrelling Royalties for the Regions if he had known the LNP would lose government? If he had known the LNP was going to lose government, he would have kept better records! And then there was that time of course when he said that in this business—in this game—it was very, very acceptable to tell tactical lies.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Premier.

Ms TRAD: Of course this—

Mr SPEAKER: You have had a pretty good go.

(Time expired)

Robina Hospital, Police Investigation

Ms BATES: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Can the minister explain why staff at the Robina Hospital have not been advised that a recent fire at the facility is now subject to a police investigation, or is this another cover-up?

Mr DICK: No, Mr Speaker; as far as I am aware it is not a cover-up. In relation to the fire in the mental health unit—and I know that the member for Mudgeeraba is very constant in her discussion about people who are mentally ill in the community being treated in that forensic unit—

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr DICK: No, I will answer the question, but the fire relates to someone, as the member knows well—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members! One moment. Pause the clock.

Mr DICK: I apologise to the member for Mudgeeraba—

Mr SPEAKER: We do not want a debate. Minister—

Mr DICK: As the member for Mudgeeraba knows well, the fire started in the mental health unit and I know from media clips from the member for Mudgeeraba that she is constantly talking about people who are mentally ill and the risk they pose to the community. I can say this to the member for Mudgeeraba: mental illness is part of our community and the more that we embrace mental illness and the more that we as leaders of our community embrace mental illness—

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DICK: Can I just—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, a point of order has been raised. What is your point of order, member for Mudgeeraba?

Ms BATES: My question was a very specific question to the minister: do the staff at Robina Hospital now know that the fire at the hospital is the subject of a police investigation? Yes or no?

Mr DICK: I will put the full facts, because sometimes the full facts are not in the public domain. A fire was started in a seclusion unit at the acute adult mental health unit at Robina Hospital by an inpatient on 15 January 2016. The Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service had reviewed the incident as part of its normal processes and the alleged arson is now subject to a Queensland Police Service investigation—no secret, no conspiracy, nothing being hidden.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr DICK: In response to some of the media commentary—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, one moment. Member for Mudgeeraba, you have had a pretty good go. I would ask you to desist from your interjections. The minister is answering the question. It is relevant. I call the minister.

Mr DICK: In contrast to the media commentary—and I know the member for Mudgeeraba has been quoted in the media on this—the fire occurred during routine annual fire testing which followed documented procedures. Three Protective Services officers responded to the emergency codes in the mental health unit. There has been a significant increase in the Protective Services staff number at Robina since January 2015 during the period of this government. The patient at the centre of this incident had not been on day leave. The patient, whilst agitated, had not physically assaulted a staff member. The five staff who needed medical attention were medically cleared within one hour of presentation to the emergency department. So the whole question was predicated on a conspiracy and a cover-up. Nothing could be further from the truth. I just say to the member for Mudgeeraba: let us just try to put mental health in a space where we can act in a bipartisan way in our state. We all have that responsibility—

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I do not want you to debate it with the member for Mudgeeraba.

Mr DICK:—and that is a responsibility not just of every member of parliament but our community.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I now call the member for Ferny Grove.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, if you persist you will now be warned.

Business Confidence

Mr FURNER: My question is directed to the Treasurer. I refer the Treasurer to figures on business confidence in the recently published National Bank of Australia survey, and I ask: will the Treasurer detail the significance of the figures? Is the Treasurer aware of recent commentary on them?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for Ferny Grove for his question. Recent surveys and hard data show that the recent results from our election commitments that are being implemented through our economic plan are working. We know that the state accounts talk about a 2.6 per cent rise in GSP between the September quarter 2014 and the September quarter 2015. Unemployment is the

lowest in two years and we have created 60,000 jobs since the election. Residential housing approvals are 27 per cent higher in 2015 than they were in 2014 and merchandise exports are the best since 2011 despite drought and lower coal prices.

This very important question relates to the business confidence survey. We have heard the Premier talk about that a couple of times today. Yesterday the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, talked about the fact that business confidence is the highest in Queensland. That is a direct quote from federal *Hansard*. His statement of fact directly contradicts the ongoing campaign by the LNP to talk down our state. Its campaign is built on half-truths, it is built on deliberate distortions and now it is in its fourth year. The Prime Minister has read the NAB survey and he has told the truth about business confidence in Queensland. The LNP is in its fourth year of talking down our economy.

Almost every day of the last three years under that previous government those on this side of the House who were here and those who were watching heard quotes such as, 'We're on a power-dive into the abyss.' 'Queensland is the Spain of the Australian states.' Their campaign of negativity started even before the 2012 election when they came to office. At that time, when we had unemployment in the mid five per cent range and growth of four per cent, the then shadow treasurer, the member for Clayfield, called the economy a basket case. He said that it was a basket case even though the results were better than anything that the LNP ever achieved when it was in office.

Also, the shadow Treasurer kept on about Queensland being \$80 billion in debt. At one point that figure even went to \$100 billion of debt. Of course, the budget papers now show that his budget papers would have shown debt of \$80 billion. Where is that figure now? It is not at that level. They have told lies and mistruths.

When talking about the position of the Prime Minister, that does raise a question. The member for Callide is thinking about a switch to federal politics. What would he have done if Malcolm Turnbull had stood in that House and said that Queensland is leading all states in terms of business of confidence? Would he have jumped up and said, 'No, Prime Minister, you can't tell the truth?'

Mr Seeney: I would say we have a Treasurer who is a goose.

Mr PITT: 'My state LNP colleagues have been on a campaign of misery for the last four years and they wouldn't have said it. You'll ruin it. All they've got is negativity.' Today is question time for the member for Callide—

Mr Seeney: An absolute goose.

Mr PITT: He should come clean and say would he support—

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Treasurer. Pause the clock. Member for Callide, will you withdraw that comment; it is unparliamentary. I ask you to withdraw the comment; it is unparliamentary.

Mr SEENEY: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I call the Treasurer if he has anything further to add.

Mr PITT: He abandoned the BaT tunnel. One that basis, maybe he should run for the federal seat of Batman instead of Wide Bay. We will see how he does.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Treasurer. That is more than enough.

Queensland Nickel

Mr COSTIGAN: My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland. I ask: can the minister advise on what day last year did she first become aware of potential job losses at the Queensland Nickel refinery? What actions did the minister personally initiate?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for the question.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, thank you. I call the minister. Do you want the question repeated?

Mrs O'ROURKE: No. If I can firstly just clarify that job losses with QNI were announced this year— 237 job losses on 15 January this year.

Mr COSTIGAN: I am happy to rephrase the question if the minister is struggling—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat. The minister has heard your question. Minister, do you have anything further that you want to add in answer to the question?

Mrs O'ROURKE: Yes. Two hundred and thirty-seven job losses in QNI have been confirmed. Currently, we have the rapid response team—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Health.

Mrs O'ROURKE: This government's main priority is the workers. From the moment the job losses were announced, we had a rapid response team on the ground engaging with the workers, making sure that we provided them with all the support and the services that they were requiring. The rapid response team has engaged very actively with the administrators to make sure that they have what they need.

Mr STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was very specific in terms of when the minister found out about the matter and what were the actions she initiated. She has answered neither of those questions.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Mrs O'ROURKE: As I said, the job losses were announced on 15 January—237 job losses to be precise. This government is committed to working directly with those employees who have lost their jobs—

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, you are warned under standing order 253A for your persistent interjections all morning.

Mrs O'ROURKE: On top of the rapid response team, which is working directly with the workers, the Premier brought the Working Queensland cabinet committee directly to Townsville, engaged with the local mayor and the local members to find out exactly what opportunities could be put on the table and also announced the accelerated works program, which is delivering jobs not just in Townsville but across all of North Queensland to address the jobs that have been lost by workers within our state.

South-East Queensland, North-South Rail Corridor

Ms LINARD: My question is to the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister update the House on initiatives to build capacity in the north-south rail corridor in South-East Queensland?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I would like to thank the member for Nudgee for her question. With 12 railway stations in her electorate, I know that rail is of great importance to her community. She is a strong advocate for her community in ensuring a high-quality public rail transport service.

Today's release of Infrastructure Australia's infrastructure priority list shows that the Cross River Rail is still the No. 1 project for Queensland. Cross River Rail is about alleviating congestion on our rail network before it grinds to a halt. It means getting in front of future growth and expanding suburbs in their demand for movement from both north and south of the Brisbane River.

When Labor left office in 2012, we had developed a Cross River Rail plan that was shovel ready. Those opposite know that, when they were in government, that Cross River Rail project was a priority. It was listed as the most important infrastructure project in Australia. But after three years of LNP inaction without an infrastructure plan, three years of Campbell Newman's BaT fantasy, there is nothing to show for it. The LNP's decision to walk away from federal funding and scrap the plans for Cross River Rail cost Queensland time and money.

I remember that the former Newman government was not big on business cases. The business case for the Cross River Rail was abandoned. It forgot its homework on the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2. It did not even bother starting one for 1 William Street. What a waste of time and what a waste of money.

I am determined to get this project on track. The Palaszczuk government has already proven its commitment to getting public transport infrastructure delivered after seeing it stall under the LNP. It took a change in Prime Minister and furious and effective lobbying from our Premier to get the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2 delivered for Queensland. If it is going to take a change in a federal minister, or even if it takes a change in Prime Minister again, this government will do everything it can to see Cross River Rail delivered in Queensland. There has been enough politics; it is time for action. That is why we have to get on and get it done.

Last night I referred to the Leader of the Opposition as the Eeyore of Queensland politics. We have seen here today who Tigger is. We have seen the member for Clayfield jumping up and down all excited with other people clearing the way. That has made it clear where we are. There they are, down in the Hundred Acre Wood—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, is there some personal reflection that you are raising an issue on?

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you took offence at what the member for Callide said and you are now asking the member for Callide to supposedly take offence at what the Leader of the House does.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, will you resume your seat. I was not having a conversation with you. I understand the member for Callide was taking issue. I saw him speaking. I did not hear what he said. I did not hear the exact words that the Leader of the House said and I was simply inviting you, member for Callide, did you find something offensive? If you did not, that is fine. I will move on. If you want to have a conversation later about it I am happy to talk with you in my office. Did you find something offensive, member for Callide, that you were referring to that you were trying to attract my attention about? Yes or no?

Mr SEENEY: Yes or no?

Mr SPEAKER: Did you or did you not?

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, what you are referring to was my attempt to point out to the House the inconsistency in your ruling when you asked me to withdraw a comment—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, resume your seat.

Mr SEENEY: So you have asked me a question but you will not let me answer.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat. If you want to persist with this I invite you and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to take it up with me in my office after question time.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. I was listening to the conversation that was going backwards and forwards and I think the point is this: in a previous interjection the member for Callide was referring to the Treasurer using a word which you considered unparliamentary. In the recent response by the Leader of the House he has referred to someone else, the Leader of the Opposition, using the same sort of unparliamentary language. Referring to someone as a donkey is unparliamentary if referring to someone as a goose is unparliamentary.

Mr SPEAKER: I am not going to persist with this matter at the moment. If members want to discuss it further I am happy to talk about it in my office later.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, if I may, I am entitled to complete making my point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: What further do you have to add?

Mr NICHOLLS: My point of order is that the use of the term 'donkey' in reference to any member is unparliamentary as is the use of the term 'goose' unparliamentary, as you have ruled only a couple of moments ago.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. Before I call the Leader of the House, I did not hear the word 'donkey'. I heard the other word that I found offensive.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, what do you want to add to this conversation?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I just wish to clarify that the term I used was 'Eeyore'.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, resume your seat. Members, if we cannot come to order I will suspend the sittings for some time until we want to have a proper discussion. Leader of the House, those comments are not appropriate. Withdraw them, please.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. Resume your seat.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that there is a world of difference between the word that was used by the—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I have made a ruling. Leader of the House, that is enough. Members, there are 20 minutes of question time left. I am about to call the member for Kawana for his question. I would ask that he be heard in silence.

Borallon Correctional Centre

Mr BLEIJIE: My question is to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services. Does the minister agree with the findings of the Auditor-General yesterday that the private provision of prison services is realising significant savings whilst providing a commensurate level of service? If so, can the minister explain why Borallon prison has sat dormant for seven months?

Mr BYRNE: A polite question, I suppose, requiring a polite answer. It is a bit extraordinary given yesterday the member had the opportunity to ask that very question. I fully expected it yesterday.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BYRNE: There are two matters. I fully expected it yesterday. I was fully expecting the member would actually ask questions about it. It has taken a day. Yesterday the member for Kawana decided that he wanted to continue the vitriol and sink the boot into the previous minister, but today he finally gets around to asking a question.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I would ask you to answer the question, please.

Mr BYRNE: There are two parts to this question. The first question is about the audit report. I have read it. I am glad to see that the member has as well. The inference he makes is completely and utterly erroneous. The fact is that the comparison between public and private in Queensland is a perfect example of efficiency in prison management in Queensland.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. For clarification and potential misleading of the House, I quoted a conclusion that the Auditor-General found in his report and the minister has now said that it is erroneous.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. That is not a point of order. This is not an opportunity for debate. I call the minister. Do you have anything further you wish to add in your answer?

Mr BYRNE: I do have a fair bit to offer. If the member wants to get down to facts on this we will talk about the audit report. The Productivity Commission's recent report into government services shows that Queensland had the lowest cost per day in 2014-15 of \$177.86 compared to the national average of \$224.17. There is the first comparison. The Productivity Commission's report makes it clear that Queensland operates the most efficient corrective services. The audit report that is referred to by the member for Kawana compares Queensland's two privately operated prisons, further confirming that Queensland operates a highly efficient and effective correctional system. That is what it actually says. The report shows that there is little difference in performance between Queensland's privately and publicly operated correctional centres in terms of safety, security, prisoner rehabilitation, quality of life and health services. They are the facts of the report.

It further identifies some differences in the estimated government cost of operation at the time of tendering and the private sector tender price. That is what the report is fundamentally about, but I reiterate that Queensland Corrective Services delivers the most cost efficient prison system in Australia. That is what the reality of the audit report was about. It does not compare these matters.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Recognising that there are 27 seconds left, I asked about Borallon and its sitting dormant for seven months. If the minister could answer that part of the question in his remaining time, please.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Mr BYRNE: If the member for Kawana wants compartmentalised answers then we will try to do that. Why does he not ask one question about one issue? If he wants an answer to 25 questions—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, this is not an opportunity for debate.

Mr BYRNE: Borallon is progressing exactly as scheduled, exactly as we expected and I can give the member a lengthy briefing on that at the next session.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, it is not an opportunity to debate the question.

Referendum, Fix Four-Year Terms

Mr KNUTH: My question is to the Premier. Many Queenslanders are unaware of the proposed changes to the Constitution through the referendum on 19 March. How is the government informing the public of this important issue that impacts on all Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Dalrymple for that important question about the referendum. We know that the referendum will be held at the same time as the council elections and there will be a yes case and a no case presented very clearly for the people of Queensland to make

their minds up about whether or not they want to see four-year terms for the Legislative Assembly. As we know, there has been a committee that has been formed in relation to the formulation of the yes case involving representatives from the business community, the union movement, the LNP and the ALP. There will also be a no case that will be put forward that I understand the Katter's Australian Party will be involved in.

It is very important that all of this information is clearly presented to the people of Queensland in a logical format for them to make up their minds about whether or not they want to see four-year terms. I am very clearly on the record of supporting four-year terms. Every other state in Australia actually has fixed four-year terms except for Tasmania. We know that council elections are held every four years. It will give certainty for the business community and also certainty for the legislative program of the elected parliament.

This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity. I welcome bipartisan support on this issue. At times in this parliament we can agree on things that bring about outcomes, as we have seen with the referendum and also with domestic violence.

Townsville, Jobs

Mr HARPER: My question is to the Minister for State Development. I ask: what is the government doing to explore future economic development and job opportunities for the people in Townsville?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Thuringowa for his question. I take this brief opportunity to thank the member for Thuringowa, the member for Townsville and my ministerial colleague Minister O'Rourke for being an absolute credit to their region in the way that they have dealt with the Queensland Nickel refinery and the 231 workers who have been retrenched. They are an absolute credit to their communities. Those members also know the importance of future industries and economic development for their electorates. Townsville is just one community in Queensland that will be positively impacted by our government's vision and determination to grow economic development and new industries, such as advanced manufacturing. Unlike the previous government, we are not just working in isolation. We are not just focusing on four pillars, because Queensland is far more than four pillars. Agriculture and resources are the mainstay of our prosperity, but we cannot rely solely on those sectors.

Our Labor government sees a whole different focus for growth in Queensland. There is a world of other industry out there, ready and primed to make a greater contribution to our economic development. We are looking to the future. Today I am here to tell the House that my department is focused on the Queensland industries of the future: advanced manufacturing, biofutures, biomedical and life sciences, mining equipment, technology and services, and defence and aerospace. My Department of State Development will work with those sectors to develop a road map for each of them by the third quarter of the year. Those road maps will guide how industry and government works together, not just for the term of this government but for the next 10 years. By working closely with industry, we can create new jobs, grow our economy and advance Queensland.

Last week, I chaired the second meeting of the Industry and Manufacturing Advisory Group and an innovative Queensland company, Heat Treatment Australia. Not only was this meeting a great opportunity for us to visit a truly innovative business but also it provided a great forum for dialogue between government, the manufacturing industry and unions on the opportunities and challenges facing the sector. At that meeting we saw what a road map would look like and, importantly, what a road map would achieve. The very next day I was in Sarina, touring the Wilmar BioEthanol plant with other members of the government's Biofutures Cabinet Committee. As the Premier has already told the parliament, biofutures represents a real opportunity for a new regional industry in this state that supports our well-established and internationally competitive sugar industry and other agricultural industries.

This work is about diversifying into the knowledge based and technology based industries to futureproof our economy, generate jobs now and jobs for the future, and boost our regional economies in centres just like Townsville.

Advance Queensland

Mr BROWN: My question is to the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy. Will the minister outline how the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland initiative is supporting jobs?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question and for his ongoing commitment to supporting innovation in his electorate. It gives me great pleasure to update the House on the government's Advance Queensland initiative and how it is directly supporting jobs. The Palaszczuk government is

committed to delivering Advance Queensland to create jobs now, create the knowledge based jobs of the future, unleash innovation and give Queensland the edge in global markets. Over the past 12 months, we have been putting in place a platform from which we will foster, attract and retain world-leading scientific and entrepreneurial talent in Queensland. Already, our Advance Queensland initiatives have delivered 143 jobs in the research and innovation space and the program is uniquely designed to create thousands of jobs into the future. Not only is Advance Queensland delivering new research opportunities but also it is giving businesses the chance to innovate and grow, while also giving start-ups the opportunity to develop and find new ways to improve existing industries.

Since July 2015, the Advance Queensland initiative has opened 10 grant programs and approved 143 grants, totalling funding of \$12.2 million. This funding is delivering real change. It is supporting efforts to tackle major social and environmental challenges, both here in Queensland and globally. Through the Knowledge Transfer Partnerships program, Advance Queensland is strengthening our state's knowledge economy by fostering collaboration between our fantastic research base and Queensland businesses. It is providing 22 Queensland companies with access to university graduates to develop innovative ideas to grow their business, overcome challenges and create jobs. Those projects will have an impact across a range of industries, including agriculture, health, mining, energy and construction.

Our other funding programs have had a huge uptake. The first round of the Advance Queensland research fellowships received 138 applications, which is the largest number of applicants for a funding program of its type in Queensland. Along with scholarship and fellowship programs, we are improving the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and women in our tertiary institutions, ensuring the inclusion of Queensland's entire community as we move towards the industries of the future. A \$2 million Young Starters Fund is providing opportunities for our young emerging entrepreneurs to receive guidance and advice as they seek to make their mark on the global scene.

Advance Queensland is equipping people with the skills to thrive in an increasingly digital world, unlocking the untapped creative and entrepreneurial potential of Queenslanders. The economy is resetting itself and investment in innovation is the key to delivering globally competitive industries, now and into the future.

Smyth, Mr S

Mr CRIPPS: My question without notice is to the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. I refer to the finding of the Fair Work Commission that senior officers of the Queensland branch of the CFMEU, including President Stephen Smyth, had committed serious breaches of the Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act and the internal rules of the union, and I ask: can the minister advise if he still considers Mr Smyth to be a fit and proper person to be a member of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and, if he does not, what action will he take?

Dr LYNHAM: I have had considerable dealings with the mining division of the CFMEU and those dealings have always been very positive. I can relate to the House that, if it were not for the mining division of the CFMEU, the serious issue of pneumoconiosis would not have had the attention that it deserves. This is a union that is looking after its members in the serious issue of safety and health. In my dealings with Mr Smyth, he has been a man of integrity and he has been a man who has represented his workers to the fullest.

I understand the member for Hinchinbrook's question. I understand there are serious implications involved, but I will leave those matters to the courts or any avenue that may be investigated into the future.

Maryborough TAFE

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Training and Skills. Will the minister update the House about new and improved TAFE services being provided in Maryborough?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for his question. It is a pleasure to answer the question of the member for Maryborough because I know how passionate he is about training, skills and investment in his local community. I thank him for being such a champion for jobs, for small business and for training and skills opportunities. It was an absolute pleasure to be in Maryborough last Thursday with the member to open up the fantastic new Maryborough campus, located in the middle of the CBD. It is an amazing new facility. I visited the site last year at the request of the member for Maryborough. He had said, 'We have real problems with our TAFE facilities locally', and what I saw was a very drab, run-down

facility. Quite honestly, anyone passing it would have thought that it was on the brink of being shut down. It was atrocious. However, through the hard work of the local member, a commitment from TAFE and Rescuing TAFE funding, we were able to come together and give this new building a complete facelift. It looks incredible, as I am sure the member agrees. All of us there, including students, staff, industry representatives and the local mayor, were blown away by how great this new facility is.

The new TAFE Queensland East Coast facility, which had almost half a million dollars invested in it, is a first for TAFE Queensland. It might seem like a small campus but when one goes into it one realises that they are not just delivering for the students who have enrolled at that campus but through the use of technology—and the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy will appreciate this—they are incorporating virtual learning. Someone who is enrolled at another campus can come in and interact with their lecturer or lecturers can be delivering learning to people in the regions. It is fantastic.

Not only was I so proud to hear that they love their new facilities but also, I was advised by the staff, this year there was a 20 per cent increase in enrolments through the Rescuing TAFE funding. That is a 20 per cent increase in this first term because of the Rescuing TAFE funding.

I am very proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government as it supports TAFE and investment in TAFE. My message to the federal government is, 'Hands off, you are not getting our TAFEs.' We know what it takes to look after TAFEs. We want to invest and grow our public provider in this state. That is what we are doing through Rescuing TAFE. That is what we will continue to do. We are proud of it. Queenslanders can be proud of their wonderful TAFE Queensland facilities around the state.

TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 12 November 2015 (see p. 2891) and the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill resumed from 6 May 2015 (see p. 426).

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.01 pm): I move—

That the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 be now read a second time.

I proudly rise to speak to the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and to call upon all members to support this bill. I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill. I note the committee tabled its report on 8 February 2016. I now table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 20, 55th Parliament—Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, government response [\[175\]](#).

I would like to thank all of those who made written submissions to the committee and those who made themselves available to present to the committee's briefings and hearings. I would also like to thank my colleague the member for Stafford, a minister of the Palaszczuk Labor government, and, importantly, a doctor, Dr Anthony Lynham, who today sees his lifelong work and dedication come to fruition.

I stand here today to honour those who have lost their lives, those who have endured serious injury through alcohol fuelled violence, their families, their friends and their work colleagues who will never be the same because of these violent incidents related to alcohol. I stand here in honour today of the police, the ambulance officers, the doctors and nurses who deal with this violence on the front line on an all too regular basis.

Prior to the election the Palaszczuk government made a commitment to the Queensland people to tackle alcohol fuelled violence. We said, all of us, here last year 'Enough is Enough'. We said it to domestic violence. We said there should be zero tolerance to violence in our communities, whether it is in our homes or in our broader communities.

What I did not realise at the time is that zero tolerance came with an escape clause that in fact some tolerance is okay if it means not infringing on someone's right to drink after 3 am. If the choice is zero tolerance to violence or condoning this behaviour so that people can drink in the early hours of the morning, I think we have an obligation to stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves.

As parliamentarians we have an obligation to act to reduce the number of assaults, sexual assaults and deaths that result from alcohol. To lose this opportunity presented here before us today, all of us, to create lasting change would be regrettable to say the least. I do not want to lay another bunch of flowers at a makeshift memorial for a young life lost too soon. My heart goes out to those families who have lost family members as a result of alcohol related violence.

The fact is that there is one thing this parliament has not been able to address and that is the service of alcohol trading hours. We are not asking members to simply take our word for it, extensive, independent, peer reviewed research could not be clearer. For every hour of reduced liquor trading there is a corresponding reduction in alcohol related harm of up to 22 per cent.

During this debate I will explain what this bill does, why we are doing it, how we came to this decision and why Queensland should not be shy in leading the way and in the process dispel the myths that there is no reason or need to do this based on current assault rates, that changes to liquor hours will cost jobs, businesses and affect tourism and that there is no evidence to show that changing liquor hours reduces assaults.

The bill before the House consists of effective yet modest measures. The government measures to address the hours in which alcohol can be served can be summarised in the following four key measures: 2 am statewide last drinks, patrons will be able to purchase their last drink at 2 am and then have a 20-minute grace period within which to consume that last drink; safe night out precinct boards can choose to apply to have last drinks called at 3 am with a 1 am lockout; no new approvals for takeaway liquor licences beyond 10 pm; and high-alcohol-content drinks designed to be consumed rapidly, such as shots, will be banned from midnight.

We are aware members of the Katter's Australian Party will be moving amendments that will see a phase-in in the lockout for precincts to come in from 1 July but that the 3 am last drinks will apply to precincts from 1 July. There will be an amendment to mandate a review of the legislation after two years. The government will be supporting these amendments.

I can also advise, through discussions with members of the Katter's Australian Party, that we will also be consulting with key stakeholders about widening the banning orders by courts to include those charged and found guilty of drug offences to rid our precincts of drugs. We know it is an issue. We know the community wants us to address it. We are happy to sit down and look at legislative changes to expand those banning orders. We will also look at the guidelines for grants for the safe night out boards to ensure that that grant funding can be accessed for assistance to transition to the new liquor laws, including for security.

The government's strategy has been shaped by significant consultation over the last 12 months with stakeholders including liquor industry groups, business groups, community service providers, health organisations, legal associations and academics. Further consultation will be undertaken to finalise certain measures in the bill such as the type of rapid consumption drinks that will be banned for sale or supply after midnight. Too many Queenslanders are being impacted by harm caused by alcohol abuse, misuse and the associated violence. Action is needed. An evidence based approach proven to achieve rapid decreases in assaults will save lives and lessen the impact of this scourge.

So why are we doing this? There has been a lot of misinformation thrust into the public debate by those who have vested interests and who do not have the safety of Queenslanders at heart. I have travelled North Queensland and the Wide Bay region. I have held round tables in Brisbane and Cairns. I have listened to the public firsthand and I have spoken to the doctors and nurses, the paramedics, the police officers who are so sick of being verbally abused, spat on, bitten, assaulted and seriously assaulted. The simple truth of the matter is that we have a problem when it comes to alcohol fuelled violence in Queensland. The independent evidence proves this. When I talk about independent evidence, I mean peer reviewed, published research and statistics.

To quote Professor Najman, Chair of the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol, at the Brisbane committee hearing—

The evidence base is for hours. That is, the evidence indicates that for every extra hour you continue to make alcohol available ... you increase the level of harm.

Let us start with the Queensland Police Service statistics as to why we are doing this. The total number of offences against the person in Queensland in 2015 where alcohol was an indicator was 6,049. This represents a total of 21.1 per cent of all offences against the person—that is, more than one in five offences against the person are alcohol related across the state. That is an extraordinary figure. The total number of assaults on police in the Brisbane CBD and safe night precincts in the past 12 months was 324, up by 11 from the previous year. Across the state there were 5,229 alcohol related assaults in 2015. There were 427 alcohol related sexual offences across the state. There were three alcohol related homicides across the state.

Much has been made of Cairns and Townsville. So let us look at the statistics from those cities. In Cairns, in 2014, there were 266 alcohol related assaults and 21 alcohol related sexual offences—rape, attempted rape, sexual assault. In 2015, there were 257 alcohol related assaults and 16 alcohol related sexual offences—a drop of nine and five respectively. We will hear that, because there are signs of a marginal decline in these figures, somehow we no longer need to do anything further, that everything is working—there is no need to take further action. Instead of talking about the nine who were not assaulted in Cairns over the last 12 months, how about we talk about the 257 who were. How about we talk about the 16 alcohol related sexual offences. Who is going to speak up for these victims? It is our responsibility to do so, to give them a voice.

These decreases have come at a cost to Queensland taxpayers as well. The reduction of nine alcohol related assaults comes at the cost of the police rostering on an extra 12 to 18 police officers in the Cairns safe night out precinct every Friday and Saturday night. At the police briefing to the committee held in Cairns, Acting Chief Superintendent Rhys Newton said, in response to the following question from the chair, 'Dealing with people under the influence of alcohol is your core business; is that what you are suggesting?'—

We certainly see those challenges on those nights where there is late night trading in liquor and there is that extra demand on our resources and there will be calls for service, yes.

Let us now turn to Townsville. In 2015, there were 497 alcohol related assaults—up on the previous year by an additional 48. Once again, who is speaking up for those 497 victims? Who is their voice? In reference to Townsville, the Queensland Police Union of Employees, represented by Ian Leavers, said at the Gold Coast community hearing—

Cairns is one area. I know that in Townsville you take from Stuart, Deeragun and the shopfront there which polices The Strand in Townsville. We are having to suck police out of there to go and perform duty on The Strand. The problem is that we cannot just flood it with police because we cannot have police just working during the night-time hours, between 10 pm and 6 am. It is not feasible. Police have to work at other times. Part of our core duties is protecting life and property but also investigating other things, such as sudden deaths and domestics, which take a lot of our time at this point. It is pulling us away from our core duties.

To suggest that alcohol fuelled violence is only a Brisbane problem is a myth. This is a statewide problem that needs a statewide solution. The government does not claim that the bill is a silver bullet, as I have heard some on the other side say in their media interviews. Just as the introduction of seatbelts were not a silver bullet to stop every motor vehicle death or assaults, neither are these laws. But what they do is reduce harm, and that reduction is significant and can lead to saving lives.

Last year we stood together as a parliament, united as one, against domestic violence. I ask members to do the same today. If this House votes against this bill, it sends a message to our constituents that alcohol related violence is somehow okay and that it is okay to turn a blind eye to it. This would be morally wrong. Queenslanders expect us to take a zero tolerance approach to violence. There should not be an out clause. I echo the Premier's remarks about taking the politics out of this. Let us do our jobs as parliamentarians—examine the independent evidence and take the necessary action to provide an evidence based solution. Let us make Queensland safer for our kids going out to have a good night on the town.

How do we know it works? The evidence is in and it is clear. If you do a Google search of 'alcohol and damage' you will get 1.3 million articles come up. I will not try to table all of them. We know that the Premier put up a very large pile of articles and research papers the other day in relation to alcohol and violence. I want to make it easier for those who want to do a bit of research before the end of this debate, so I table the 15 research papers that Professor Jake Najman referred to in the parliamentary committee's report—15 research papers that have been put together from around the world that have tested the propositions looking at this particular issue in relation to legislation.

Tabled paper: Research reports and journal articles, various dates, regarding reducing alcohol fuelled violence from the National Drug Law Enforcement Research Fund, the Society for the Study of Addiction, International Journal of Drug Policy, British Journal of Addictions and others [\[176\]](#).

Similar liquor laws have been implemented in Newcastle, Kings Cross and the Sydney CBD. In the first 18 months of the implementation of liquor reforms, research indicates there was a 37 per cent decrease in alcohol related assaults in the Newcastle CBD and a reduction of almost 340 emergency department presentations per year. Professor Gordian Fulde, who was recently named Senior Australian of the Year, has urged people to remember what the Sydney CBD and Kings Cross were like two years ago before the new laws were implemented. He said—

... as time passes it's harder for people to remember just what those days were like—but those of us who work on the frontline, we remember. Quite simply, it was a war zone.

The data in the peer reviewed Newcastle studies specifically relates to the area in which the measures were implemented. As at March 2015, alcohol related assaults in the Newcastle CBD were measured as having dropped by 52 per cent overall. Speaking about the Newcastle experience to the committee hearing held in Brisbane, Mr Tony Brown, an alcohol reform campaigner, said—

In real practical terms we have seen more than a doubling in the number of licensed premises in Newcastle, which refutes the hysteria and scaremongering from the industry that it would be devastated. What this has practically translated into in Newcastle is more jobs and more opportunities for our young people. With respect, I do not think any responsible government or opposition should deny their communities that.

Kings Cross and the Sydney CBD have a 1 am lockdown and last drinks at 3.30 am. In April 2015, the impacts of the January 2014 liquor reforms were assessed by Professor Kypros Kypri and the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, BOCSAR. The findings were—

Significant and substantial reductions in assault occurred in both Kings Cross (down 32%) and Sydney CBD entertainment precinct (down 26%) (including a 40% cent decline in the sub-section George Street South.)

The City of Sydney's *Late night management areas research: phase 4 report*, September 2015, indicated the number of premises licensed to trade liquor was up by 13 per cent in the Sydney CBD since 2012. It is hard to see where the devastation in Sydney is with such an increase. Despite the comments we have heard that the reductions are as a consequence of the reduction in foot traffic and patrons, we fail to see how Newcastle can have over a 100 per cent increase in licensed venues and Sydney can have a 13 per cent increase in licensed venues if in fact no-one is going there.

More recent BOCSAR data from 16 months of the reforms shows an overall reduction in assaults of 45 per cent in Kings Cross and approximately 20 per cent in Sydney's CBD. Furthermore, data gathered at St Vincent's Hospital in the Sydney CBD has shown a 25 per cent decrease in alcohol related serious injury presentations during the first 12 months of the liquor reforms. The results we saw in Newcastle, Kings Cross and the Sydney CBD involve rapid drops, with an accelerated decline beyond the generally decreasing assault rates. Put quite simply, rapid declines in assault rates such as those in Newcastle, Kings Cross and the Sydney CBD mean that people are saved from injury and death. Waiting for a gradual decline is not an option this government is prepared to accept.

In relation to lockouts, we have seen lockouts utilised successfully in Newcastle, Kings Cross and the Sydney CBD as part of a package of reforms that, in combination, has achieved the successful reductions in assaults I have just described. Byron Bay venues have implemented a voluntary lockout at 1.30 am. There is also peer reviewed evidence demonstrating that lockouts reduce preloading and are effective at reducing violence inside premises. A 3 am lockout is already in place in Queensland and licensees have been operating effectively with this lockout since 2006. The Sunshine Coast, a popular tourist destination, has implemented a voluntary lockout at 1.30 am. Lockouts also support the Queensland Police Service as a crowd control measure. Lockouts assist in managing patron migration and maintaining order during the high-risk late-night trading period.

Prior to discussing some of the myths that have been peddled by opponents of the bill, I must say how disappointing it has been to not see any data being put up by those who are opposing this legislation. I have heard many claims about significant job losses and the cost to the economy. I have been advised through media interviews that this modelling has been done by the entertainment industry, but no-one has yet produced that modelling. I have offered, I have met with stakeholders, I have said, 'Put up your evidence. I will consider that evidence. I will take it on face value. Show me what you've got to show that it affects jobs and the industry,' and no evidence has been put up.

I will deal with the casinos. The hysteria around the issue of casinos is quite appalling. Let us be real about this. For those opposite who are carrying on and saying, 'This is hypocritical. Casinos are going to be exempt,' I remind them that the LNP was in government for three years and for that entire time the 3 am lockout operated across the state for every licensed venue and every single casino was exempt.

Mr Rickuss: You were in government 20 years before that. Why didn't you do something about it then?

Mrs D'ATH: I am doing something about it now. I am responding to those who have come out in the media carrying on about casinos and that this legislation is being hypocritical in allowing those exemptions. The fact is that the LNP themselves acknowledged that those exemptions have existed for many years and for particular reasons and that they chose to leave them in place, despite bringing in their safe night out initiatives. They left the lockout in, they left the exemptions in, but now they are crying out that it is not appropriate and it should not be happening. They carry on about Queen's Wharf, which was their project that they started, but I can guarantee that if they were still in government that project would go ahead and they would be exempt like every other casino and that their safe night out policies would still be in place with a 3 am lockout. So they should stop carrying on and misleading the public about this debate about casinos.

Mr Walker interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: I am happy to hear the shadow minister when he gets to debate his arguments. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition come up with the myth that this legislation is inconsistent—that a pub will have to close but the strip joint next door will not and that this is what these laws will allow. There is nothing whatsoever in this bill that actually has that provision. Every single venue will stop serving drinks at 2 am, and for licensed venues in precincts it will be 3 am. Whether it is a strip club, whether it is a pub, whether it is a hotel or whether it is a club, it is 2 am and 3 am. So to say that a club or a pub will be forced to shut but the strip joint next door will not is just a ridiculous argument, and they should read the bill before they go and make those public statements. I want to quote Ian Leavers from the Queensland Police Union to the parliamentary committee hearing in relation to casinos. He said—

When it comes to intoxicated people and people behaving badly, their security are a hell of a lot more strict and they have a lot more systems in place than a lot of the other licensed premises.

They are highly regulated—much more than any licensed venue—and I would call on any licensed venue that is willing to put their hand up and say, 'I'm happy to be as regulated as a casino if it means changes in this area,' because I can guarantee that none of them will.

I go to the issue of tourism and jobs. There are many international tourist destinations and we are expected to believe that this is going to destroy tourism in this state. Honestly, in California, in Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco, they shut at 2 am. In Boston, Ottawa, Toronto and Ireland, it is 2 am. Is someone telling me that in Ireland they do not like a drink, they do not enjoy live music and they do not have good tourism? In Dublin, last drinks are at 2.30 am. Let us be honest with the people of Queensland when we run this rhetoric out there about the impact of these laws. Stopping the service of alcohol at 2 am in these cities does not impact on their desirability as a tourist destination—as it will not in Queensland, because we are not just about our night-life. That represents one facet of our overall tourism offering—it is an important part, but it is one element.

Similarly, many of the areas have vibrant music scenes which are not inhibited by their liquor licensing laws. I have already talked about the New South Wales figures about licensed venues. Let me talk about closer to home, though, because I have been told that we are not California, we are not Newcastle and we are not Sydney. What about the Sunshine Coast precinct? Are we honestly expected to believe that the Sunshine Coast precinct—one of the fastest growing tourism regions—would voluntarily impose a 1 am lockout on themselves if it was going to affect tourism, if it was going to close businesses, if it was going to result in job losses? No. If it was not going to have any impact on reducing violence, would they do it? No. Have they at any stage since introducing it said, 'This is hurting business. It is affecting tourism. We're going to lift the voluntary 1.30 am lockout'? No. It is still operating. The Sunshine Coast knows it works. The Sunshine Coast knows that it improves tourism, and that is why they are now getting cruise ships and they are one of the fastest growing areas for tourism. So the evidence is there. Members only need to open their eyes and look at it.

There is the myth that there is no evidence to say that the measures will work. I have referred to many, many research papers. Members only need read the parliamentary committee report. If they do nothing else, they should just read the parliamentary committee report. It is there. I have to say that in my almost nine years in federal and state parliament I have never seen so much independent evidence to back up a bill. I have never seen so much evidence to support a piece of legislation coming before the parliament. I have already said that studies reveal that in Newcastle, Sydney and Kings Cross assaults are down 37 per cent, 26 per cent and 32 per cent respectively. We want to see these sorts of decreases here.

There is the argument about punishing the many and not the few. Let me talk about that, because there are penalties in place for the offenders. Let us not pretend that innocent people going out for a night on the town are not being punished now. I have already talked about the level of assaults. I have already talked about the 324 assaults on police officers in precincts in the Brisbane CBD in the last year. So the innocent are being punished. They are being punished by alcohol fuelled violence and we have a responsibility to act.

There is the argument that this is just one issue, that they think it is a silver bullet and that there are all of these other initiatives. The other initiatives are there. They are still there.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: The education, the penalties, the safe night out precincts—they are there. The only thing we did not bring in are the mandatory ID scanners and I really want to address the mandatory ID scanners.

Mr Watts interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): The member for Toowoomba North has been interjecting on quite a regular basis. You will have your turn and I ask you to keep your thoughts until it is your turn to speak.

Mr WATTS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am just trying to make sure that the member—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Please resume your seat.

Mrs D'ATH: I want to talk about the mandatory ID scanners because I have seen some of the comments from those opposite and from former members of this House about mandatory ID scanners and the carry-on that somehow if I had brought the mandatory ID scanners in we would not need to do this. First of all, again, if they read the evidence in the parliamentary committee report, they would find that Geelong introduced all of those initiatives but did not reduce the trading hours and have a lockout, but Newcastle did, and there was clear evidence that it worked in Newcastle and resulted in a rapid reduction in assaults and it did not work in Geelong. Why? Because they are important initiatives but without this key element they do not work.

Mandatory ID scanners were supposed to come in in March last year—absolutely. We got elected, we came in and I was sworn in as the new minister in February—which was wonderful—but what did I find? They were not ready. They did not have them. The equipment was not there to install. The previous government was going to make it a requirement under law for venues to install equipment that was not even ready. So we pushed it out to July, but it was still not ready. The industry was told that there would be at least two providers operating the mandatory ID scanners so there would be competition out there. No, there was only one. I was being told that it was going to take 20 seconds to scan each person. Think about that—20 seconds for each person. Think about the unintended consequences of people lining up outside a club because every person takes 20 seconds, when the standalone ID scanners take about three to five seconds now. If I do this, I am going to do it in a responsible way. I will work with the stakeholders. I will make sure that the technology is there and it works properly. That is why we have said we will continue to consult on this.

We should not be afraid to do this. Queensland should lead the way, as we did back in 2004. People may remember that this same debate about the sky falling in, mass job losses and the end of the industry was argued when Peter Beattie sought to bring in smoking bans in pubs and clubs. It was going to destroy everything. I refer to an article in 2004 from the Centre for Policy Development. It states—

But pubs and club bars were said to be different.

There had already been bans in restaurants across various states, but pubs and clubs were said to be different. It went on—

Romanticised as the last bastions of smoking, their representatives stood their ground, brandishing a heady mix of economic snake oil and talk about returned soldiers who'd fought for the right to smoke, drink and eat a pie. Studies of the greatly elevated blood nicotine levels of bar staff came and went, as did stratospheric measures of toxic tobacco smoke particles in pub air. All namby-pamby nonsense to pub industry officials. Reports of the improved respiratory health of Californian bar staff after that state banned smoking in bars in 1998 changed nothing. When non-smoking Port Kembla bar worker Marlene Sharp was awarded—

almost \$500,000—

in damages for her throat cancer in 2001, predictions of rising workers' compensation insurance premiums failed to materialize.

...

The club and hotel industries fed governments and an often unblinking media a diet of empty bars and cataclysmic job losses if smoking were to go.

...

The pubs and clubs sought to position those pushing for the ban as dreary fun phobics who never went out after dark and couldn't stand the thought of anyone enjoying themselves with a beer and cigarette. They knew nothing of real life. They saw this as a resilient caricature that, when combined with 'pick a number and double it' talk of pub collapses and mass sackings, would create a powerful and enduring spectre that would daunt any pragmatic cabinet minister.

Despite advertisements and massive campaigns from health professionals and key stakeholders about this, the AHA continued their line saying this would destroy businesses. So what happened? In 2004 amendments to the act introduced the most comprehensive smoke-free laws in Australia at the time with effect from 1 January 2005. Smoking was banned anywhere within four meters of an entrance to a non-residential building and, importantly, smoking bans in enclosed liquor licence premises in poker machine gaming areas were phased in from 2005 to 2006 with smoking being permitted in one-third of these areas up until 30 September 2005 and completely phased out from 1 July 2006. Queensland led the way and we can do it again.

Mr Ryan: We should.

Mrs D'ATH: We should be doing it again. I wish to very quickly talk to other amendments in relation to the private member's bill. We examined the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015 in a bipartisan fashion just as we ask those on the other side to do right now in relation to our bill. We do not play politics when it comes to liquor reforms and ensuring that licensed premises are not managed by inappropriate persons, consistent with harm minimisation that will assist small businesses and enforcement activity by liquor and gaming inspectors and the police. We have adopted 14 of the amendments from the private member's bill out of a total of 18. We have incorporated them into our bill. Why? They are sensible, practical changes that we are happy to adopt in our legislation. I want to run through briefly what they are.

Granting formal investigator powers to police officers: this amendment would assist police by lifting an unnecessary administrative and evidentiary burden and simplify their work in relation to the Liquor Act. Removing duplication in recording incidents in registers: this amendment will reduce unnecessary duplication for licensees while still ensuring that there would be no decrease in record keeping or accountability for licensees in relation to incidents. Prohibiting persons from taking liquor into or away from certain events: this amendment will assist in reducing alcohol related harm as it will address uncontrolled and unregulated drinking by patrons at large events. Clarifying acceptable evidence-of-age documentation: this amendment will strengthen the requirements around evidence-of-age documents and ensure that any additional entities approved to issue proof-of-age documents have been through a rigorous assessment of their processes and controls. Amending car park event approval processes: this amendment will ensure that the car park approval process is uniform for all licensees and will help to address issues that have arisen during car park events regarding the health and safety of members of the public and the amenity of the community and locality. Providing notices to licensees of approved manager suspension or cancellation: this amendment will assist licensees and permittees to comply with their obligation under the Liquor Act to ensure that a person employed by them as an approved manager holds a valid approval. It is also considered that it would help to ensure that licensed premises are not managed by inappropriate persons.

Clarifying the meaning of liquor: this amendment will clarify what constitutes liquor while still providing safeguards to address problem behaviour. Allowing investigators to issue notices to produce documents: this amendment will increase the capabilities of liquor investigators to conduct investigations and address noncompliance and will also allow investigations to be finalised in a more efficient and effective manner. Reinstating the ability to specify requirements for a risk-assessed management plan: this amendment will rectify a deficiency in relation to risk-assessed management plans, which are intended to curb alcohol fuelled violence and ensure appropriate management practices are in place to mitigate risk. Allowing sale of craft beer at promotional events: the provision will assist the growth of the craft beer industry by expanding the way that this product can be promoted and supplied in the community, bringing it into line with the wine industry. Allowing sale of takeaway

liquor to community club guests and visitors: this amendment will allow takeaway liquor sales to signed-in guests and visitors of community clubs and will increase the range of hospitality services that community clubs can provide and support the funding of community activities of clubs.

Increasing maximum allowed guests for bed-and-breakfast liquor licence exemptions: the provision of liquor at bed-and-breakfast accommodation is considered to be a low-risk activity and the amendment will support bed-and-breakfast operators and the tourism industry. Extending risk-assessed management plan exemptions to certain low-risk licence types: it is proposed that the management plan exemption be supported for florist and gift basket licence types only as there is very little nexus between the business and alcohol related violence. We oppose the exemptions for all other licence types as we are of the view the exemption should only occur in circumstances where there is very little possible nexus with service environments where alcohol related violence is a risk or because of the vulnerability of those around whom alcohol is served.

Directors' liability amendments: we will support the repeal of section 96 of the Fair Trading Act. Doing so will bring the Fair Trading Act into line with reforms implemented by the Directors' Liability Reform Amendment Act 2013. The amendment will also ensure consistency across Queensland statutes dealing with directors' liabilities.

I now turn to the committee's recommendations. The committee recommended that appropriate data on alcohol related incidents be collected and available from agencies which the bill affects. The government concurs. The government supports this recommendation. While there is significant independent, thorough, peer reviewed evidence supporting the reforms set out in the government's bill, the government agrees the collection and analysis of statistics and data going forward is an important part of public policy delivery. This is why the government has committed to establishing an independent crime statistical body to publish reliable statistical information for all criminal offending across Queensland. This independent body will be vital in providing robust data to inform the development and implementation of crime prevention strategies.

Recommendation 2 is noted. However, the government is of the view that a two-year period is the appropriate time frame for a proper independent assessment to occur. The government recognises the importance of evidence based policy and is committed to ensuring a robust evaluation of the impact of the government's policy is conducted. The government is committed to a thorough and independent evaluation of the changes in the community as a result of the bill's implementation. Because of the staged approach to the introduction of the changes, the review will commence from 12 July 2018, which is 17 months after the commencement of the full suite of measures under the bill.

The committee also recommended that the government address a small number of identified drafting issues regarding clauses 18 and 55. I have foreshadowed moving an amendment during consideration in detail to correct these cross-referencing and numbering issues. However, regarding the recommended amendment to clause 49, I can state that section 155K(1)(e) was deliberately not referenced in section 155AL(3)(d)(i) and it is not a drafting error. Undertaking this recommended amendment would allow the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming to impose a requirement on a licensee to ensure that the type and quality of the liquor they sell and the way in which it is served continues to differ from other premises in the locality. As the licensee would not have the power to influence how other businesses operate in a locality, the obligation being imposed would be impossible for a licensee to comply with. Accordingly, I am not proposing to move an amendment to this clause.

I turn to the government members' recommendations. The government members of the committee recommended that the current approved late-night extended trading hours of takeaway outlets be wound back to 10 pm. While the recommendation is noted and has merit, any such proposal would require broad consultation and that has not occurred in relation to this issue. The government will not be winding back extended trading hours for takeaway liquor to 10 pm for all premises at this stage.

The measure to prohibit the approval of new extended trading hours for takeaway liquor after 10 pm is a complementary measure to the restrictions to on-premise liquor service hours that will be introduced from 1 July 2016. It is intended to curb the further proliferation of takeaway liquor sales between 10 pm and midnight and to address the issue of preloading. The winding back of takeaway liquor hours to 10 pm for all venues is not considered to be warranted at this time. Our first priority is to address the on-premises consumption of liquor associated with violence and deliver on the commitment that we made in relation to no further applications being granted in relation to the extension of liquor hours beyond 10 pm. However, I can state that it is intended that an examination of the issue of late-night extended trading hours for takeaway liquor will form part of the evaluation of the government's overall policy.

In relation to the government committee members also recommending that the definition of 'lockout' be changed to 'one-way door', I certainly have some sympathy for this proposal and acknowledge that 'one-way door' terminology is much more accurate. I have heard some of the comments about people being locked out—or should I say 'locked in'. I have heard claims that with a lockout suddenly at one o'clock everyone is pushed out into the street at once, which is completely inaccurate. The reality is that the term 'lockout' is used throughout areas of New South Wales, and a 3 am lockout has already been in existence across Queensland since 2006. Patrons across Australia are well aware of the mechanisms of the lockout function in legislation, and the government believes that it is appropriate to leave the term 'lockout' in place at this stage.

In relation to the statement of reservations by the opposition members, they talked about a multifaceted approach being required. I do not think that we could spell out any more that that is already occurring. Those initiatives which have been implemented by previous governments over the years, both Labor and LNP, will continue to be in place and implemented. This is in addition to those initiatives, not in place of them, and they should be honest and start saying that as opposed to, 'This is not a silver bullet. You need all of these other initiatives.' Those other initiatives are happening, and they know they are happening and they should be honest about that.

I understand that there were also arguments from the opposition members in their statement of reservations in relation to data issues. We have already said that to have proper analyses going forward we need to work on improving that data where we can. It is very important and that is why we are creating the independent crime statistical body, but that should not be used as a basis to say that data does not exist now. That argument has no validity whatsoever. The evidence is clear; it is there for everyone to see. To say that this recommendation is somehow evidence that the data is not there is false.

Mr Walker: Have a look at what some of those who gave evidence said.

Mr Rickuss: Read the report.

Mrs D'ATH: I take the objections of those on the opposite side, because of course there is so much evidence out there. I have read the parliamentary committee's report but I do not know if everyone else has. I have read the committee's report, and the fact is that there is a mountain of international evidence which supports this. I fail to see how anyone could come up with the argument that there is not evidence out there to support these measures and that they work. I know that those on the other side sought to cite David Rosengren, chair of the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, who gave evidence before the committee. Dr Rosengren expressed concern that there is a lack of clear and definitive data around many of the arguments put forward for and against the legislation. Yes, he was quoted as saying that but—

Mr Rickuss: He said it!

Mrs D'ATH: Yes. But what the opposition failed to put in their statement of reservations is the rest of the quote, so let us hear the rest of the quote. Dr Rosengren goes on to state—

This is clearly a significantly important strategic step to tackle a complex problem. A failure to take this forward and to really work on this would be fairly similar, in my mind, to a decision by the government to walk away from drink-driving legislation or seatbelt legislation or bike helmet legislation.

He goes on to say—

With a complex problem we have to start somewhere. This seems to be a great step.

That is what he said, so do not pick out little bits and try to verbal the doctor. If you are going to quote a professional who is giving evidence to a parliamentary committee, then quote him accurately and fully.

In relation to the statement of reservations, the opposition contends that the Safe Night Out Strategy should be given a chance to work before further amendments are introduced. The opposition also made reference to assault rates in Queensland being lower than those in New South Wales. I have no doubt that we will hear some figures in this debate, and I hope there are professionals who were at the forum this morning listening to this debate. I noticed that none of the opposition members went to the forum this morning to listen to the academics who have put this data together. The chart of assaults shows that there has been a gradual decline in assaults over the years. There has been a gradual decline, but we are talking about significant declines that can be achieved with these reforms and not cherry-picking figures and comparing something that happened at this time in one month in one year to this month in this year. Look at whole year data and look at the figures that we are putting up.

Even if you accept that there has been a gradual decline in assaults that is not a reason why we should not act. It is okay to have over 5,000 alcohol related assaults, is it? Are we supposed to stand back as Queenslanders and say, 'Oh, our alcohol related assaults aren't as bad as the other states, so it's okay; we don't need to do anything'? The latest polling shows that 29 per cent of Queenslanders have been affected by alcohol related violence. One in six has been a victim. Coward punches have taken too many lives across Queensland. People are still offending despite the penalties put in place by the previous government. It has been reported that police are spending 60 per cent of their time dealing with alcohol related issues. A recent Australian College of Emergency Medicine survey found that 92 per cent of emergency department staff in Australia and New Zealand have reported experiencing physical aggression from a drunk patient in the past six months. Ambulance paramedics, hospital staff and police dealing with emergency situations in Queensland are still being attacked by intoxicated people, often by the person they are trying to help.

For these reasons, the Palaszczuk government believes that alcohol fuelled violence remains at an unacceptable level in Queensland. This government is prepared to take action by implementing evidence based measures in order to lessen the human cost of alcohol fuelled violence. While we certainly appreciate the merits of the safe night out measures, our view has always been that the strategy did not go far enough. The evidence before us today certainly supports that view; therefore, our tackling alcohol fuelled violence policy builds on the existing legislation to ensure that the best possible mix of measures is in place to prevent alcohol fuelled violence across all of Queensland.

The opposition raised issues regarding the casino, and I do not intend to go back over that. They did not see that as an issue when they were in government and they introduced the safe night out policies. Those exemptions exist around those particular premises because they are regulated differently and they are highly regulated. Casinos are in a different business. They are not there to sell alcohol. To say that we are being hypocritical in any way by allowing that exemption to continue—when they were happy to do so for the three years that they were in government while there was a 3 am lockout—is just appalling and not being honest.

The opposition raised the issue of recreational, illicit and synthetic drug fuelled violence. We have already said that we have given an undertaking to the member for Dalrymple and the member for Mount Isa in relation to looking at widening court ordered banning orders to drug offences as well. We have also put \$20 million into the 2015-16 budget to specifically tackle the drug ice, organised crime and alcohol fuelled violence over the next four years. Work is being done in this area, but you cannot use that as an excuse not to address this measure. We know this is important.

I turn to the private member's bill. I have already said that we will be adopting 14 of those initiatives and incorporating them into our bill. There are four elements that we do not support. I stand to be corrected, but I understand one particular one that goes to church and community organisations is not being progressed at the moment.

An opposition member: No, but it will be.

Mrs D'ATH: Okay. We are opposing the private member's bill as a whole on the basis that the four elements we have not picked up we do not believe should be supported. The first relates to reducing the requirements for approved manager availability for venues that do not trade after midnight. Approved managers are directly accountable for responsible service of alcohol measures, which are critical in minimising the risk of alcohol related violence and harm. This amendment would have the effect of increasing the potential for harm. It would potentially put a young person who is working there, in a busy pub or nightclub late at night, in the difficult position of having to make serious decisions about the responsible service of alcohol to intoxicated patrons alone. The government simply cannot support this irresponsible proposal.

The second relates to allowing after-hours consumption in hotel and resort foyer bars. The amendment is opposed on the basis that it could result in high-risk venues such as backpacker hostels converting existing private bars into quasi-nightclubs in the early hours of the morning to get around other liquor laws. We do not believe it is appropriate and it puts people at risk.

The third relates to the introduction of community liquor permit exemptions for campdrafting events. Campdrafting events are family orientated occasions attended by children and teenagers. This amendment would give rise to the possibility of unregulated liquor consumption over 14 hours per day for the duration of the events, some of which last multiple days. The government's bill proposes to bring about cultural change in our drinking culture. Exposing children to unregulated liquor consumption over 14 hours per day over multiple days at these events is just not good policy and we would oppose it.

I mention the church and community organisations amendments. It is our intention not to support this at the moment, while the royal commission into institutional child abuse is continuing. We hold that position.

Once again, I thank the committee for its consideration of this important bill. The bill has the support of the Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol, the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, the AMA Queensland, the Queensland Police Union, the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education, Clubs Queensland, Healthy Options Australia, National Alliance for Action on Alcohol, the Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory, the national Trauma Committee of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, Lives Lived Well, the Public Health Association of Australia, the Queensland Nurses' Union, the Queensland Network of Alcohol and other Drug Agencies and the Australian Christian Lobby—just to name a few.

I want to point to someone else who supported these sorts of initiatives in 2010—actually, even before that. The Leader of the Opposition is a man who truly stood for what he believed in at one point, from the moment he was elected. Back in 1992 the Leader of the Opposition said on a debate on liquor laws in this chamber—

I turn now to the issue of extending the hours of a hotel from 10 a.m. to 12 midnight. This may be of great benefit to many tourism areas throughout Queensland, but I do not think that it will provide a great benefit to some of the State's smaller hotels. The Minister would be well aware that last year I led a deputation to him. That deputation was concerned with the issue of youth drunkenness and some violence in the township of Goondiwindi.

He went on to talk about the impact of extended hours in those areas, youth drunkenness and a certain amount of violence in the town which was causing a general nuisance. He said—

What may be an advantage on the Gold Coast or in Cairns may not necessarily be an advantage in towns such as Goondiwindi or Stanthorpe where hotels are universally open from 10 a.m. to 12 midnight.

He went on to say—

For the major part of the year, we are not talking about dealing with tourists or people who are passing through, but about people who reside in the town, who are employed in the town ...

He went on to say in relation to extra facilities of alcohol—

That may not necessarily lead to a better work life, a better home life or a better social structure in the town. It may still contribute to the problems that I suggested before, such as drunkenness that occurs late at night ...

But in 2005 the Leader of the Opposition said—

In many ways, today this parliament is reaping what it has sown. I came into this place in 1989. At that time, there were far more strict regimes in place for the service of alcohol and the closing time for licensed establishments around Queensland. Maybe we could argue that the 7 o'clock closing of establishments on Sunday and the 10 o'clock closing of establishments during the week was not right. But how long do we need in order to go and drink?

He went on to say—

... it is interesting to note that maybe in that respect we have gone a little bit too far. We let the genie out of the bottle and now we are trying to catch it and put it back in the bottle.

Importantly, in 2010 the Leader of the Opposition went on to say, in talking to a parliamentary committee report that actually suggested similar changes—

People might have the view that some of them were over the top or some of them were a little bit misguided—

talking about the recommendations of the committee—

but it was charged with the responsibility by the Premier to look at this issue, to do its research, to talk to those people who use these precincts, to talk to the licensees of the establishments and to talk to police officers and those involved in the various support services.

He went on to say—

It was supposed to be such a big issue—it was an earthshattering issue reported on by this bipartisan committee—yet the report was not even debated in parliament.

He went on to be critical of the government of the day saying—

'No, we're not going to do that. We're going to give them a few extra police officers and a bottle of water and a bit of token response along the way.' That is hardly a comprehensive response to this issue.

He went on to say—

I believe that we should be seriously looking at trading hours so that we can clean up some of those areas before we have people walking down the street when the sun rises.

I ask people to read that speech from 2010, because it talks about Cairns and Townsville and the absolute disgust of the Leader of the Opposition going out for a morning walk and seeing people stumbling out of clubs early in the morning. That is reflected in his comments over a decade. Where has that conviction gone?

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: Two decades, yet the Leader of the Opposition has spent the past couple of weeks running around in the media saying that there is no evidence to support this, that there is no evidence to say that this is needed. Where did his beliefs go? The Leader of the Opposition knew that this needed to happen. He has been saying it for years. He should back these laws.

I know that there are members across the chamber who support the government's proposals. I urge them to hear what their own leader has said over previous years about trading hours. I urge them to listen to Queenslanders and what they have asked for. I urge them to look at the evidence that is before us. It is overwhelming.

A week ago when I was at home I flicked on the new show about the St Vincent's Hospital emergency department. I saw Senior Australian of the Year Dr Gordian Fulde and other doctors and nurses at work in the early hours of the morning. I watched as people were brought in—bloody, injured, violent. My daughter, who shortly turns 16, stopped and took notice of what was on the TV and said to me in quite a surprised, if not shocked, voice, 'What are you watching?' I said to her at the time, 'This is why I am pursuing these liquor law changes.' Her response to me was, 'I think what you're doing is a good thing.' I leave this thought with members across the parliament: sometimes you just have to do what is right, put aside what it means for your longevity in this job—the votes—just stand here in this esteemed institution and make a difference. I am proud that I am. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (4.58 pm): I move—

That the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

The Attorney-General has rightly raised a number of significant issues in the second reading speech on her bill. She picks up on a mood in the community that obviously requires this House to look at the issues that relate to alcohol and the issues that relate to violence. I separate those two at the wise suggestion of Lance Mergard, the chaplain from ChaplainWatch in the Valley, who I think rightly points out that we do not have one problem of alcohol fuelled violence in this community; we have two problems. One is the way people treat alcohol and the other is the way in which people are accepting of violent behaviour.

It is right that the House looks at this issue. It is an issue that affects many of us—many families. I expect that the families who are most in our thoughts today as we debate this are the families of Cole Miller, whose death occurred during the discussion of this legislation, and others such as Lindsay Ede at Ipswich and Trevor Duroux at Coolangatta—all of whom have been the subject of unacceptable violent behaviour in our community. So we do need to look at this issue and I am, like the Attorney, a parent. My children are a little older, but I also remember—as I am sure many parents in this House and in the community remember—those nights when you lie in bed half awake with one ear listening for the reassuring sound of the taxi turning up, the lights being turned on, the door being closed and your children being safely home. It is an emotional issue that goes to the very heart of us as individuals and as a community—and our emotion rightly drives us on to address the issue, but as legislators emotion is not enough. While emotion has to motivate us and direct us in our thoughts, it is the head which has to rule when we look at legislation. Once we have identified the problem society has the issue of whether the government's particular measure is going to make the difference that the Attorney has claimed it will, and that of course is where the opposition parts company with the government.

The Attorney has rightly pointed out that when we were in government we took this issue very seriously and we had a multifaceted approach—our Safe Night Out Strategy. So we are not looking at a doing something or a doing nothing option here; we are looking at a comparison of what the government proposes to do and a comparison of what we propose to do and some areas in which the government has not, despite what the Attorney has said, taken on significant parts of our Safe Night Out Strategy. That strategy included compulsory drug and alcohol education in Queensland schools from years 7 to 12 and establishing 15 safe night precincts right across Queensland to ensure that our popular nightspots have coordinated prevention and support initiatives in place to keep patrons safe. It included a new offence of unlawful striking causing death which carried a maximum penalty of life imprisonment and a requirement that anyone convicted served 80 per cent of their time in prison, and it is of course the legislation that has been used with respect to those alleged offenders who were

involved with those people whose names I mentioned earlier. The policy included increased penalties for other violent and antisocial offences such as serious assault of public officers, public nuisance, refusing to leave a licensed premises, obstructing police, failing to obey a move-on order and urinating in public. It empowered police to issue banning orders and it ensured that police have the resources to have a presence and an ability to respond quickly to alcohol and drug related violence. It provided for stronger and better coordinated action to ensure licensees provide a safe environment and comply with liquor licensing rules, including mystery shopper style tests, and it included an awareness campaign, including advertising, to promote clear standards of responsible behaviour for patrons, licensees and police. More than 13,000 Queenslanders had their say as part of developing that strategy and it was widely consulted on before being put into effect.

One of the provisions, which I will come back to later, was the requirement that after midnight compulsory ID scanning take place of those patrons entering those premises. That was a scanning and banning regime that meant that if you played up in one venue and you were turfed out you could not simply go down the road and enter another venue and create havoc there. It was an important part of our range of proposals—in fact, a central part. The Attorney spoke today—and I have heard her speak before—as though there were some sorts of technical arrangements in putting it into effect but that we will overcome those. That is not what she said in the House on 10 November. She said then about the deferring of this important part of the Safe Night Out Strategy—

Any decisions about the implementation of mandatory ID scanners will be deferred until September 2016 subject to further consultation and agreement with stakeholders.

So it is not a matter of, 'I have to work the technology out.' She has said that these will not be implemented until there is further consultation and, what is more, agreement with stakeholders. I hope that the government moves ahead with that proposal, but it was and is a key part of the Safe Night Out Strategy and to put forward the proposal that our strategy is in place and this proposed measure simply adds to it is not the case at all. Our strategy has not been put into place. It has not been given a chance to take effect, and for that reason we say that it has not yet been properly tested. We took significant public input into that policy and it has not been tested in practice and cannot be until that essential element of scanners is put in place. It is not a popular element with those in the industry. It requires expenditure and it requires the linking up of technologies. While it is not popular with those in the industry in some cases, our position is that it should be implemented, and the member for Brisbane Central would know that it is not popular—she would have heard—but it is an essential part of our strategy and it is one that Labor has gone to water on.

The Attorney spoke as though the obvious worth and merit of the government's proposal was such that it was amazing after hearing the evidence that no-one could simply accept that this was going to work. It is not amazing. In fact, the efficacy or otherwise of these measures is still very much a live debate around the world and of course here in Australia, and we have seen that only in the last couple of weeks. The Attorney's colleague the Premier of Victoria, where lockdown laws were tried and abandoned because they were not felt to be successful, tweeted this week a nice three-word tweet—'Lockout laws? Nope!' He then attached an article from the *Age* titled 'Victorian government says lockdown laws would destroy Melbourne'. So it is not a black-and-white matter and the Victorian government of the same colour and persuasion as this government has made a very clear decision that it has looked at it and that it is not working, and I will table that tweet. I do not know if I am the first person ever to table a tweet, but there it is.

Tabled paper: Document, dated 15 February 2016, screenshot of Mr Daniel Andrews MP's Twitter profile, in relation to lockdown laws [\[177\]](#).

On the other hand we know that in New South Wales a lockdown has been tried and adopted as government policy. When that state's Premier went out lauding that only in the last week or 10 days, an extraordinary public backlash saying, 'I think you've got it wrong, mate,' has led him to appoint former High Court judge Ian Callinan to review that measure. So it is not a matter of settled practice and procedure obviously accepted by any reasonable person in our community that these things work—it is simply not the case—and, of course, it happened right here.

We in this parliament delegated looking at this legislation to six of our members—three from the government side, three from the opposition side—and that committee heard all of the evidence. It read all of the submissions and heard all of the verbal evidence. They are the only six people in this state who did that—who saw it all and heard it—and they could not come to the conclusion to recommend to this House that the measure pass. What is more, their first recommendation is that more data is needed.

How can a responsible legislature move ahead in those circumstances? You do not legislate first and then go out and get the data; you get the data before making the decision, and that is the position that the opposition takes in relation to this matter.

In this debate the LNP is very much focused on ensuring the right outcome that provides laws that improve our community safety in complicated circumstances that differ not only from state to state but from city to city and from community to community. As I said before, when we were in government we took our time in consulting widely on this issue in formulating the Safe Night Out Strategy, which commenced following the evaluation of Labor's drink safe precinct trial in the Fortitude Valley area, Surfers Paradise and Townsville, which commenced in December 2010.

We have significant concerns about not only the lack of evidence for this measure but also the gaps and inconsistencies within this legislation. The government seems to be saying that alcohol is the root cause of all evil, yet gambling and other forms of entertainment have been carved out of this legislation with their own set of rules and regulations. We know that the prevalence of gambling and its link with domestic violence bring a whole set of other concerns that need to be considered as part of this debate. For example, the explanatory notes state that the bill is—

To promote the development of a diverse night time economy that includes but does not revolve solely around the service of alcohol, the Bill provides clarity that licensees are able to stay open beyond the hours of liquor service to provide other services such as food, non-alcoholic beverages and entertainment.

The Liquor Act stipulates that the hours in which gaming and adult entertainment may take place on a premises are linked to the venue's approved liquor trading hours or consumption hours. Consequently, the Bill includes amendments to enable licensees with gaming or adult entertainment hours approved immediately prior to 1 July 2016 to continue to provide these activities for the duration of their current approval, despite the wind back of their liquor trading hours on 1 July 2016.

So on the one hand the government is winding back liquor trading hours, yet on the other hand it is continuing to promote gambling and adult entertainment to diversify the night-time economy. This is despite the overwhelming evidence that links domestic violence not only with alcohol issues but also, of course, with problem gambling, particularly in Indigenous communities.

But the *Not now, not ever* report refers to the federal government's 2010 report into violence in Indigenous communities and that report divided the causes of Indigenous violence into three categories: precipitating factors, situational factors and underlying factors. The *Not now, not ever* report goes on to state—

Contributing situational factors commonly seen in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander lives include low levels of employment, overcrowded housing, drug and alcohol use, gambling, passive welfare dependency, disengagement from education, poor physical and mental health, low levels of human rights awareness, a lack of access to services, financial pressures, boredom, and the normalisation of violence in communities. These interlinked elements of disadvantage create a febrile environment in which a variety of individual circumstances precipitate violent incidents.

The report itself has some other disturbing elements to it, including the link between sexual assaults and sexual abuse and gambling debts. In some Indigenous communities, rapes have been carried out on drunken women by groups of young boys aged as young as 10 and typically between 10 and 15 years of age. Even more alarming is that young boys have been reported as trading their younger sisters to older boys to pay gambling debts or to purchase alcohol. The point is that there is an inconsistency in this legislation in the treatment of alcohol and gambling and adult entertainment.

In September last year, the Attorney-General was asked in the parliament about these links between domestic violence and problem gambling. She responded as follows—

Can I say that this is in relation to where we have the biggest problem in gambling in this state and that is in our regions, in our local clubs. It is not in our casinos where we have the biggest problem; it is, in fact, in our local communities. It is our pensioners who are going down to our local clubs, our most vulnerable who are spending money that they do not have. That is where we know the bigger problem lies with these machines.

Just a couple of months later the Attorney introduces this measure that we are debating here today that decouples—her term—the liquor licensing and gaming regimes in Queensland. That is an unprecedented move. That means that, under the liquor licensing changes, community clubs can continue to offer gaming for two hours after they stop serving alcohol. It is no wonder that the Attorney proudly read out the comments of the representatives of Clubs Queensland as supporting this measure, because they can continue gambling notwithstanding whilst serving cups of tea or lemon lime and bitters to their patrons. Gambling can keep charging on.

I will go back to the data and the evidence issue. This issue was mentioned in the Attorney's speech and was somewhat dismissed, I thought, particularly in talking about the specific evidence given to the committee. As I said before, the simple point was that six people were charged by this House to

look at that issue. If the evidence was so overwhelming, they would not have come back with recommendation No. 1, which was, 'We need to get more data.' They could not have done. The parliamentary committee was not able to be convinced that sufficient evidence existed on which to base findings. After it looked at all the evidence that was presented to it, its first recommendation was that more data was needed. That recommendation reinforces our concerns about the matter. We believe that the government should obtain data before legislating, not the other way around.

Mr FURNER: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, the report actually says—

Miss Barton: That's not a point of order.

Mr FURNER: Excuse me, I am taking a point of order. It states that the committee recommends appropriate data—not more data—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! I will hear this in silence.

Mr FURNER: The member for Mansfield is misleading the chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what point?

Mr FURNER: The recommendation of the report is to seek appropriate data, not more data.

Mr MINNIKIN: I rise to a point of order. I seek a ruling. Is that a point of order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you will let me finish, member for Chatsworth. You are not in your proper place. It is not a point of order.

Mr WALKER: Irrespective of the lack of point of order behind it, if there is not appropriate data to support the proposition, there is not appropriate data. It is pretty simple. That is obvious when you look at the report and look at the evidence that was given. Dr David Rosengren's evidence to the committee was referred to. I concede, as the Attorney said, that in the end Dr Rosengren says that he still supports the legislation. That is not the point that we are making. The point is whether the data is there to enable him to get to that conclusion. He says that. He stated—

... I think the data that we have at all levels is grossly flawed and that there is a possibility that simple improvements in measuring might be one contributing factor.

He goes on to say—

The first one that I think is very important is that there is an absolute lack of clear and definite data around many of the arguments that have been put forward for and against the legislation. It is close to impossible for us to truly quantify the impact of alcohol on the community simply because we do not have any mechanisms, certainly in the health system in Queensland, to actually record it or document it with any certainty. Therefore, to rely on arguments of absolute evidence for and against is significantly challenging, as is often the case with many of our public community health and safety initiatives that we have tackled as complex problems in the past. So I would raise that as an issue that I think needs to be addressed in the longer term but also one which the College for Emergency Medicine certainly acknowledges is clouding our ability to make clear arguments on this.

That is pretty clear from Dr Rosengren. He then goes on to say, 'Despite all of that, I have a hunch that this is the right thing to do.' That is fine for him to come to that conclusion, but we take seriously the reservations that he has made so obviously and so accurately in the committee's report.

John Lynch, the President of the Cairns City Liquor Safety Accord, said—

The data was provided by Bob Norman, the former Cairns and hinterland hospital and healthcare chair; Dr Richard Stone, the hinterland hospital and health service ED director; and Associate Professor Alan Clough from JCU, who was researching alcohol fuelled violence. The data is from financial years 2013, 2014 and 2015—our most recent data. There are over 160 presentations per day to the hospital on average. From these 160-plus presentations, two to four on average are alcohol related. That is less than two per cent of total admissions. Of these, only 20 per cent are related to licensed premises so that would make it 0.3 of one per cent of total admissions relate to licensed premises. This is the data that has been given to us.

The situation was a little bit different in relation to lockouts. In relation to lockouts the committee's resolution is quite clear. The committee report confirms that the data and evidence shows that lockouts were overwhelmingly opposed by those who addressed the committee. So there is no issue of uncertainty by those giving evidence on the lockout issue. The committee's report says—

... there was little support from any quarter for the 1am lockout proposal.

That is the committee's conclusion in respect of the matter that this government asked us to move forward on, allegedly citing an evidence base. The committee that looked at this said there was little support from any quarter for the 1 am lockout proposal. I will read some quotes from the committee report of the public hearings in this regard. Professor Wayne Hall from the Centre for Youth Substance Abuse Research at the University of Queensland stated—

There seems to be a lot of confusion with lockouts, which I think are a dumb policy because they just lock the drunks up inside to be all thrown out at the same time. It is reducing trading hours we want to do, not lockups.

Professor Kypros Kypri, from the School of Medicine and Public Health at the University of Newcastle, said—

The evidence on lockouts is not strong. There are about six studies and I would say it is equivocal at best. The effective strategy is reducing alcohol consumption and that means either last drinks or closing premises.

So on the lockout issue specifically there is an absolute lack of comfort for this government in proceeding with its measures based on the evidence given to the committee. This evidence has reinforced our concerns that the data and evidence presented to the parliamentary committee was often not recent and often not derived from Queensland and does not quantify the relationship between emergency department hospitalisations and alcohol related violence.

The committee also received evidence about what has occurred in other jurisdictions in Australia and around the world. The Newcastle solution is often held as the model for solving the issue, yet the committee heard that assault rates in the Brisbane area are already 63 per cent lower than Newcastle. As I mentioned before, the New South Wales Premier Mike Baird dipped his toe into this debate last week and he found a pretty significant public response. He has appointed former High Court judge Ian Callinan to review the policy that they have set in place. I also pointed out Daniel Andrews' views similarly that he will not be entering into this regime. The Premier and the Attorney have to deal with the views of Labor Lord Mayor candidate Rod Harding who, in November 2015, said—

I fear locking the doors on our pubs and clubs will be a handbrake on Brisbane realising its potential to become one of the world's most modern, vibrant and sophisticated cities.

Even Minister Mark Bailey has a view on this issue which he expressed in 2005 when he was a councillor for the Moorooka Ward in the Brisbane City Council. He fired off a letter to then minister Paul Lucas saying this—

It is with dismay that I have learned of the proposed 3am curfew for licensed venues in the Valley. This is an extraordinarily misconceived proposal, existing problems notwithstanding.

It will exacerbate street problems and violence as patrons spill onto the streets in one almighty crush. This is obvious. With 5am, many 'stayers' drift over that 2 hour period to go home. A 3am close will see a huge number of patrons hit the streets at once with the resulting long taxi lines being breeding sites of disagreement for irritated, drunken and 'wired' people and an increased number of impatient patrons choosing to drink or drug drive. This is simply inevitable.

It is also amazing to see this proposed in one of Australia's most thriving music precincts—

I interpose that the live music industry has been very strongly in my ear on the effect of this on their sector—

the likes of which walk over Melbourne and Sydney for having so much diversity and quality in one area. This is a unique area, recognised nationwide over the past 5 years and this proposal is a step back for the city creatively, economically and culturally. The ridicule of a 'Return to Hicksville' from the rest of the country will be potent and justifiable. A sad state of affairs it would be under a Labor Government.

By all means, work with the Valley venues and police to manage proactively the problems but forget the kneejerk reaction. You've scared the bejesus out of venues, so now is the time to drop the 3am proposal and work collectively on solutions.

That is not the opposition's point of view; that is the point of view of a minister in the government promoting this legislation. Let us not forget, of course, the member for Cairns and his issues with this bill and the conundrum he is yet again facing on whether he stands up for Cairns as his mantra says or tows the party line and gets bullied by the Labor faction leaders. His comments on this particular issue can only be described at best as walking both sides of the street. When he ran for Cairns at the election last year his website described him in these terms—

Rob is born and bred in Cairns, and passionate about making sure that Cairns gets its fair share. As a local Councillor, Rob Pyne has always put Cairns first.

...

Rob Pyne will stand up for jobs here in Cairns. After being let down by the LNP, we need someone who'll fight for local families and ensure that Cairns gets a fair go.

Late last month it was revealed in the *Courier-Mail* that he would even consider quitting the Labor Party if he did not get more influence, declaring that he was not going to be taken for granted. He stated—

'If I can't have some significant influence in delivering for the people of Cairns, in particular, I certainly would consider it,' he said.

...

'The result of my decision is that I might not be around much longer, but I'll be doing what I can to make sure that the voice of the Parliament is heard and the executive doesn't dominate,' Mr Pyne said.

Last week Mr Pyne was quoted in the *Cairns Post* as saying—

It will be Monday that push comes to shove in the party room and I'm not the only member of the Labor caucus concerned about these laws.

The article then went on to say that he would continue to argue for that city's exemption. We look forward to the contribution to this debate from the member for Cairns to see whether he stands up for his principles and he continues to push the argument that he strongly stated and the very critical point to which he would take his opposition. That will be interesting to see.

We owe it to the victims of the one-punch attacks, who I mentioned earlier, to bring in laws with tougher penalties for offenders and that is why we acted and introduced the new offence of unlawful striking causing death as one initiative that was part of our Safe Night Out Strategy. We had that comprehensive package of reforms. When the safe night out legislation was introduced in June 2014 the former premier said—

Unfortunately, alcohol and drug fuelled violence is not a new phenomenon in Queensland or throughout the country. The Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 forms part of the government's Safe Night Out Strategy, a comprehensive action plan to tackle alcohol and drug fuelled violence in Queensland. The government has consulted the community extensively in developing the initiatives that form this bill. The message was clear: The community wanted something done about the violence and the culture that creates it.

The final strategy will deliver positive changes for the people of Queensland. It is not a bandaid solution; it is a comprehensive and holistic approach aimed at changing the culture that leads to antisocial and violent behaviour. Along with such initiatives as enhancing liquor licensing compliance, it contains enhanced education and social marketing campaigns to create long-term cultural change in the community. We believe that only with long-term cultural change that real, sustainable impacts will be delivered to the Queensland community. The government is now moving swiftly to implement the strategy. While some of the initiatives are administrative in nature and can be implemented straightaway, others require legislative change—

They were the changes contained in this bill. The community, rightly so, believes that something needs to be done about addressing this issue and we agree with those sentiments entirely. That is why something was done in 2014. We believe that the Safe Night Out Strategy should be given a chance to work given all the time and consultation that was involved in putting it together. It is comprehensive. It takes an holistic approach to addressing the issue of alcohol and drug related violence. This is not about keeping something that was implemented by the LNP because it was one of our initiatives. What we need is long-term cultural change. It does not happen overnight. There are no magic silver bullet solutions to address the issue. If that were the case governments would have implemented them long, long ago.

There have been some people who have likened this debate to the attitudes of people towards drink driving or wearing a seatbelt. Twenty and 30 years ago people's attitudes were vastly different. We heard before that we were once debating whether hours went from 10 pm until midnight. It shows how much things have changed in that time. Over time, through education and awareness, cultural attitudes have changed and that is something that is needed with this issue.

The early results of our Safe Night Out Strategy were very encouraging. Initial police data indicated that overall assaults had decreased by nine per cent across Queensland, sexual offences by 18 per cent, property damage by 10 per cent and drug offences detected by the police had increased by 26 per cent across the 15 safe night out precincts in the 2014-15 financial year. Again, that is backed up by Chaplain Lance Mergard's comments on Steve Austin's talk-back show. Lance Mergard has worked in the Valley for a long time and he points out that the decline in violence has occurred over a significant period. While that is contrary to intuition, it is the stated fact of those who maintain the records in this matter. It clearly indicates that targeted intervention and a high visibility policing strategy is improving the general safety of patrons who visit Queensland's most popular nightspots. I should point out that we have had a significant amount of trouble obtaining the data beyond June 2015, which can have happened for only two reasons: the government has deliberately stopped collecting it or it has collected it, but will not provide it. In September 2015, we asked specific questions on notice to obtain a range of police data in the 15 safe night out precincts. In each case, we received responses to those questions on notice, which stated—

The Queensland Police Service (QPS) generally provides statistics based on Police Districts and Regions rather than Safe Night Precincts.

Therefore, the particular data, which we know was collected per precinct up until June 2015 because the Public Safety Business Agency actually provided it to organisations interested in the issue, is again another gap in the information that is needed to assess whether the Safe Night Out Strategy is working and whether we need this measure.

As I have said, the early results of the strategy were very encouraging, despite the fact that many elements in the strategy have been either stalled or not yet commenced. Those include, importantly, the introduction of ID scanners, community awareness and education programs and the development and resourcing of local safe night out management boards. The boards are important, because, as has been pointed out in the debate, not only in the House but also in the public domain, various areas of the state and various precincts have different needs and different requirements. That is quite right.

The safe night out management boards enable us to deal with each of the precincts separately. For example, there are practical issues such as lighting that can make a heck of a difference. Lance Mergard says that in the Valley changing the bulbs from one colour to another is a simple strategy that can make a difference. It is only the safe night out boards, working on the ground, that know which individual strategy, be it lighting or something else, is right for their own areas. They need to be properly resourced and they can make decisions about things such as lighting, safe havens for people and the management of taxi ranks. All of those are important practical things that can be done on the ground, rather than master solutions.

It was of some concern to us to read in the *Courier-Mail* comments made earlier this week by the Premier, who said—

The facts are that if you actually reduce the level of trading hours you reduce the level of violence which actually means less resources needed.

The article added that the Premier was not backing the laws with an increased police presence, saying that she was confident fewer police on the beat would be needed. This flies in the face of the government's earlier comments around additional resourcing for police, which was also mentioned in the budget last year. I think those comments need to be clarified by the Premier or the police minister—that is, is it the case that it is planned to reduce the level of policing in these precincts? Will we see fewer police on the beat, keeping people safe?

As I said earlier, there are many inconsistencies in the legislation that certainly create confusion. The Attorney-General dismissed the fact that under this legislation casinos remain able to trade for 24 hours a day. What the history has been prior to this is a different matter. The government's argument is that fewer hours means less violence. In her speech, the Attorney-General said she has a zero tolerance policy on the matter of violence. If that were the case, the only consequential result of her argument is that you trade for zero hours. Nobody is suggesting that. It is always a matter of getting the balance right.

However, the casino remains a 24-hour venue. In places such as Cairns that will be an issue as people stop drinking at an earlier time and simply go to the casino. If the Valley adopts a 1 am lockdown and 3 am close, for example, you can turn up in the Valley at 1.05 and be told that you cannot get in anywhere in our most thriving entertainment precinct, but you can hop in a cab and go out to a tavern in the suburbs and drink there for another hour.

The inconsistencies within this legislation are of great concern and they result from Labor's transition through this debate. Labor members would like us to think that they have a solid position that they have hung onto forever, but that has not been the case. In January 2014 when they launched their election policy in relation to this matter, they proposed a 1 am lockdown and 3 am last drinks. We all know that that changed suddenly when the legislation was about to be introduced. For some reason that was totally unexplained to the Queensland community and totally unsupported by any evidence of any kind, but presumably done after they had talked to people and done backroom deals outside the glare of the public examination of these matters, suddenly the policy changed. That was the position that advocated for 2 am last drinks call and the 1 am/3 am position. The Attorney-General then said—

In my mind, a compromise is a weakening of a position and we have not done that.

She then said—

It is a better outcome.

The people of Queensland still do not know why that shift was made or what undertakings or deals were done to do it. There was no explanation or evidence given for that.

We know that in January of this year Mr Pyne raised concerns about the matter. What arrangements or undertakings have been given to him to come on board is also a matter not known to the community. As of yesterday, Katter's Australian Party said that the laws were no good and they were not convinced, yet overnight, again in a deal done away from the public glare, the laws are going to be changed because suddenly the Katter boys are on board. This has been an unhappy way to

formulate policy on the run to get into the position that we are in today. For a government that speaks about it all being evidence based, there have been twists and turns along the way that have not been explained at all to the public at large.

The convoluted regime that we have ended up with will only add to the confusion and potentially cause more issues with people trying to venue-hop or venue-shop as they try to get around the different closing times. Another issue raised by submitters to the committee review process was the issue of displacement and the increase in suburban house parties or warehouse parties, as they are called, which has been one of the experiences in New South Wales. The difficulty is that you can certainly legislate to close the clubs, but you cannot legislate to make people go home to bed. They may well go to another venue, as I said before, in the suburbs or come to the house next to you.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! The member for Mansfield is not taking interjections.

Mr WALKER: If people are locked out of the Valley or clubs have to close earlier, why wouldn't they go home—which might well be the house next door to any one of us—get on their Facebook page to say, 'This is where the party is now on,' and keep going? The inconsistency of closing times, the continued 24-hour trading of casinos and the difference between the entertainment precincts, which is where—

Mrs D'ATH: I rise to a point of order. The member continues to talk about a reduction in closing times. It is inaccurate. I want you to bring him back to the fact that it is reducing liquor trading hours; not closing times of venues. Closing times are not changing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not see that as a point of order.

Mr WALKER: In relation to casinos being safe places and so on, an article in the *Guardian* dated June 2015 headed 'Spike in assaults recorded at Sydney's casino following city's lockout laws' contains some startling statistics. It states—

The NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics figures show an increase in alcohol-related assaults in Pymont, with the trend driven by a rise in incidents at The Star.

That is, The Star casino.

An analysis of police figures by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSAR) shows alcohol-related, non-domestic assaults in Pymont have jumped by more than 88.3% year-on-year, for the 12 months from April 2014 to March 2015.

According to BOCSAR, this increase is largely the result of a jump in the number of assaults at the Star Casino.

...

The Star has a 24-hour licence and falls outside the designated lockout area.

There were other recent national media reports around violent assaults at the same casino. While we are on the subject of New South Wales and what has been done there to address this issue, it is worth noting that the measures put in place in areas such as Kings Cross and Newcastle are not statewide regulations. In fact, they are specific to those locations and the Sydney CBD. There is a different set of rules and regulations in Kings Cross and Newcastle from those in Wollongong and Parramatta.

The research bureau BOCSAR, which I referred to before, tells us that in the four-year period from March 2008 to March 2012 the relative performance of Newcastle failed to keep pace with successful accord and industry interventions in all and other parts of New South Wales which did not involve a lockout. New South Wales licensed premises and assault rate changes from March 2008 to March 2012 were as follows: Newcastle LGA minus 25.3 per cent; Campbelltown LGA minus 42.7 per cent; Gosford LGA minus 37.7 per cent; Wollongong—

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr WALKER: The member might listen instead of being single-minded about his position on this matter. A little bit of open-minded debate might help instead of a blinkered view on the matter. Wollongong LGA was minus 34.6 per cent and all of New South Wales was minus 30 per cent.

So the clear conclusion from those official statistics is that, despite introducing severe restrictions such as lockouts and early closing times from March 2008, Newcastle continues to lag behind the rest of New South Wales in terms of the progressive reduction in criminal assaults in and around licensed

premises compared to other parts of New South Wales. This, together with other experiences in Melbourne, Queensland and Ballarat, demonstrates that the jury remains well and truly out in relation to the effectiveness of lockouts as a deterrent to antisocial and criminal activity in public places.

The consultation on this legislation has been nothing short of a debacle. The so-called 10-point plan that we saw Labor take to the election is in tatters. The controlled nature of the consultation has been plain for people to see. If we look back at Labor's election promise and compare it with this bill, there are many changes which all seem to have taken place behind closed doors, in a controlled and filtered environment of 'consultation'. Many of the attendees of the government's so-called consultation process were certainly left with the impression that the government was not listening, and, in fact, it was a process for the government to tell everyone what they were implementing.

What we have in this bill is an unsatisfactory solution. It is a proper policy solution to an important and complex issue that governments from right across the country have been dealing with for decades. We need a comprehensive approach to this issue not the magic silver bullet solution.

The issue of drug related violence is as big an issue, if not a bigger issue, than alcohol related violence and yet, until today, nothing in this bill dealt with that. In fact, the only provision relating to drugs was the watering down of the bail conditions for drug and alcohol rehabilitation that were put in place by the LNP. That has changed today with a knee-jerk reaction to a proposal from the Katter party in relation to measures dealing with drugs. Those measures are about to pass into legislation, if we believe what parties have said as to whether they support the measure or not, without having been tested in any evidentiary way and without having been put before a committee of this parliament. It was a deal done in the last 24 hours. Suddenly an important provision, which we would encourage being in there—we would have criticised the bill for its failure to deal with drugs—

Mrs D'Ath: It is not in the bill. It is not being put in the bill.

Mr WALKER: The press statement talks about drug measure being dealt with.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Member for Mansfield, direct your comments through the chair please.

Mr WALKER: There should be provisions regarding drugs in the bill if they are not going to be there. If they are going to be there they should be properly debated and tested before they are put into effect.

An editorial in the *Courier-Mail* a couple of days ago summed up the broad position well. At that time the numbers were unclear in terms of support for the bill. The editorial stated—

With the numbers still looking finely balanced it is hard to understand why this crash or crash-through approach has been adopted, rather than a more nuanced strategy which may achieve the same laudable outcomes when it comes to reducing alcohol-related violence. In essence, the Government's legislative prescription is a combination of crowd control and liquor licensing measures that aims to reduce the flow of alcohol and get people off the streets. What this fairly blunt instrument is missing, though, is a degree of finesse, a comprehensive analysis of socio-economic cost versus benefit, or indeed a strategy to actually change antisocial behaviour rather than simply contain or divert it.

I think that puts the argument well and in a sophisticated way against what is a blunt and ineffective message from the government.

For all the reasons that I have outlined, the LNP in good conscience cannot support this legislation. We believe the evidence is not sufficient that changing the laws in the way put forward by the government will do what is required. It is a complicated issue. It requires a comprehensive response. That comprehensive response is not contained in the measures put forward by the government.

It seems from comments made outside this place that that measure will be supported by a majority of parliamentary members. If so, then the onus will fall on the government to show that these measures which they have said will achieve so much indeed do so. We will be watching closely to make sure that they are kept to account on that measure.

There are elements of the government's bill which have largely replicated some areas of the bill that I introduced last year—the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015. These include provisions on: the removal of duplication for Brisbane licensees across the incident register and crowd control register; the issuing of notices or requisitions by investigators; risk assessed management plan exemptions; the increase in maximum guests for bed and breakfast exemptions to the Liquor Act; the sale of takeaway liquor to signed in guests and visitors; the deeming of all police officers as investigators under the Liquor Act; the sale of craft beer to be allowed at promotional events; the update of proof of age requirements; the clarification of the meaning of liquor and excluding certain substances from the operation of the Liquor Act, including Chinese cooking wine and soy sauce; and other miscellaneous provisions which would improve the effectiveness of the act

and clarify the position of the regulator on a number of matters. To that extent, we obviously support those elements in the government's bill, given that they are the same or very similar to those that we had introduced earlier last year.


I am disappointed that the government did not extend their bill to other provisions of the LNP bill, including the exemption of campdraft events from the requirement for a community liquor permit and the repeal of 14 obsolete church and community organisation acts following a Queensland Law Reform Commission report. I will dwell on that for a moment because the Attorney did make the point that they will not be supporting that provision. They are for some reason linking it to the royal commission. I have no idea why it has any link to the royal commission.

We had the Queensland Law Reform Commission look at these matters. There was wide consultation with the churches. These matters will have absolutely no effect on the financial viability of the churches, if that is what the issue is, or the ability to obtain recourse, if that is what the issue is. They are simply obsolete measures. The Law Reform Commission has been through them. It is a simple way to tidy up the statute book. I am disappointed that the government is taking a point on that issue.

The bill of mine was reintroduced following the work of the former LNP government in reducing red tape and building our economy, primarily in the area of tourism in this context. As I said in my introductory speech to that legislation, every legislative reform that helps business means that there is another job available in our community or the business costs go down. That reduction in cost can be passed on to give us cheaper products or cheaper services. Although we will not be supporting the government's bill, I hope that the government supports the LNP bill to the extent to which the elements of our bill are very similar to some of the provisions in the government's bill.

I refer back to the government's bill and say once again that the simple position for the LNP is that we do not believe, just as other members of this House and the parliamentary committee do not believe, that there was evidence upon which to recommend—and the committee did not recommend—the passing of this measure. It sought the relevant information that it needed to get the data that is applicable to these measures. In our view that is what should come first. What should happen is that the comprehensive policy which we had in place should be given time to work. The scanners, which this government has run away from, should be a central part of that policy. The full regime that we brought into effect when we were in government should be given a chance to work first. It is not an unreasonable request when the early figures show that it was working. That would be a sensible and measured position to take. That is what we believe the House should do. We would urge all of those voting not to support the government's bill but to support the red-tape reduction bill introduced by me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! Before calling the next member, Mr Speaker has advised that there will be a photographer from the *Courier-Mail* around the chamber over the next little while taking some photographs.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (5.50 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. This bill presents this parliament and its members with a clear choice: we take action and do something to tackle alcohol fuelled violence or we sit on our hands and do absolutely nothing. To me and my government, there is no choice. We will act and we will do something.

If you have spoken to the families of victims of alcohol fuelled violence, there is no choice. If you have spoken to the paramedics and police who deal with the victims as well as the perpetrators, we must do something. If you have spoken to the doctors and nurses in the emergency wards, we must do something. If you have spoken to the facial surgeons and neurosurgeons and psychiatrists tasked with putting the victims' lives back together, we must do something. The culture of booze fuelled bashings in the early hours of the morning must end, and this bill will help achieve that.

It is not just my government saying that. It is not just the Attorney-General or Dr Lynham saying that. It is our police and our ambulance services. It is almost every single medical doctor and nurse you are likely to come across. It is the Salvation Army and other community groups. It is the Queensland Tourism Council, Clubs Queensland and many others. These are community laws, with a community focus, aimed at tackling a community problem.

It is important we have a brief look at the history when it comes to this bill. The previous Bligh government commenced the difficult job of tackling alcohol fuelled violence with the establishment of drink safe precincts and the moratorium on very late-night trading licences. The previous government made some significant changes to those laws, removing that moratorium and allowing a spate of new premises to serve alcohol until 5 am.

We support the changes that work, and many of the previous government's reforms have been maintained. But we could not support that legislation. The one glaring omission in the strategy of the previous government was the question of reduced hours for the very late service of alcohol. What all the experts said, what all the evidence pointed to, was that winding back the hours for service of alcohol would dramatically reduce the incidence of violence on our streets. That is why we developed our tackling alcohol fuelled violence study.

It has come about with consultation with the community. They want action. In fact, a recent Galaxy poll commissioned by the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education found that the majority of Queenslanders—80 per cent—believe that more needs to be done to reduce the harm caused by alcohol related violence. Almost three quarters support the proposed late-night trading hours. The community is telling us it is time to act.

I recently went to Longreach and, with a member of the LNP, I visited a family about an hour's drive outside the town. I sat across the table from a mother who told me how concerned she is when her sons go out in Brisbane. She lives hundreds of kilometres away. She encouraged me to see these laws through. I do not want to let her down. I do not want to let down the countless other Queensland parents who know these laws will reduce violence in our communities.

I would like to thank the member for Mount Isa and the member for Dalrymple for their contribution to the discussion on this issue. The series of measures we have agreed upon will improve employment, health and safety. There will be no change to the last drinks times set out in the legislation, but we have agreed to phase in the 1 am lockout for those precincts that adopt it until 1 February 2017—that is, there will be a 2 am last drinks statewide and a 3 am last drinks in safe night precincts.

As the experts say, reducing trading hours leads to reduced violence, and that is what this bill achieves. We can tackle alcohol fuelled violence by building a safer community whilst at the same time fostering a vibrant night-life in our communities. We recognise the many positive social, economic and cultural benefits that Queensland's night-time economy brings to our state. The evidence shows that in Newcastle between 2008 and 2015 the number of licensed venues increased by 110 per cent, proving that a safe precinct is a more vibrant and prosperous precinct. Safety is the key, not just for the pub and club patrons. Alcohol fuelled violence takes its toll on our police and our emergency services resources. It puts our police and paramedics in real danger. Let me quote—

We should not under estimate the risk we are putting our police at, not to speak about law abiding citizens ...

These are not my words; these are the words of the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, when calling on the New South Wales government to take action in Kings Cross, which is in his electorate.

Even the Prime Minister can acknowledge that this is an issue that should be beyond question, because the research is beyond question. We have all seen the results from Newcastle. Those statistics are irrefutable: a 37 per cent reduction in assaults in the first 18 months, a 67 per cent reduction in assaults between 3 am and 5 am, and a reduction of more than 340 emergency department attendances per year. We have seen similar results in the Sydney CBD and Kings Cross. Just last week the Premier of New South Wales, Mike Baird, took to Facebook to tell us how effective his reforms have been in New South Wales. He said—

Let's start with a statistic about Sydney's nightlife that matters: alcohol related assaults have decreased by 42.2 per cent in the CBD since we introduced the "lock-out laws".

And they're down by over 60 per cent in Kings Cross.

There is the evidence. Kings Cross police data also tells us that there has been a 20.8 per cent decrease in sexual assaults, a 43 per cent decrease in assaults causing grievous bodily harm and a 50.3 per cent decrease in assaults causing actual bodily harm in the first 12 months of the reforms.

People have said, 'That's Sydney or Newcastle. That's not Queensland. You can't quote those figures because it's different here.' Last week I visited the Sunshine Coast. The Sunshine Coast have a vibrant tourist industry and a vibrant night-time economy. But what they also have is a self-imposed reduced trading hours policy. Clubs and pubs have of their own accord eliminated very late trading with a 1.30 am one-way door and 3 am close of trading. Would Sunshine Coast businesses have done that if they thought it was likely to harm their businesses? Would they have done it if they thought it would affect tourism? Having taken that step, would they continue with it if they found that it did actually harm their businesses or their economy or their region? I am fairly certain that they would not.

What I do know and what my government knows is that Queensland cannot afford the human and economic costs of the abuse and misuse of alcohol. My government made a commitment at the last election to the people of Queensland to keep their loved ones safe when they went out at night,

and this comprehensive package is designed to do just that. After extensive consultation with industry and community stakeholders, we have developed a multiagency policy framework that will encourage cultural change around drinking behaviour, promote responsible service of alcohol practices and create a safer environment. This is the evidence based approach our state needs. It is informed by the advice of experts in the field and the clear evidence of other jurisdictions that are successfully tackling this issue, both here and around the world.

I want to make it clear that I take on board the concerns of industry, but I also need to reiterate that we are not closing businesses down at 2 am or 3 am. Venues with an existing 5 am closing licence will still be able to continue trading in entertainment, food and non-alcoholic beverages.

In conclusion, I want to make a few comments. I went to the election promising Queenslanders I would take action against alcohol fuelled violence, and in government I have delivered. Despite the tough nature of this debate, never once has my government wavered in its commitment to introducing these laws. I would like to pay tribute to our Attorney-General, Yvette D'Ath. The Attorney has been a tireless advocate for these laws and has helped foster the huge amount of stakeholder support. I acknowledge the member for Rockhampton, who drove the policy development process during our time in opposition. I would also like to pay tribute to state development minister Dr Anthony Lynham. Everyone knows his story. He left a very successful career as a surgeon to run for the Australian Labor Party in the seat of Stafford. He did so after lobbying the Newman government to do something to tackle alcohol fuelled violence. They would not listen and the LNP still is not listening today. Dr Lynham has campaigned for over a decade to see this state introduce these laws.

I would like to thank my cabinet and my caucus. We can hold our heads high and say that we had the courage to act, we had the courage to take a stand, we had the courage to say to the community, 'We will do something for you.' What I am concerned about is that this could have been a bipartisan approach. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity where we all could have acted in the best interests of the community. Everybody sitting here in this chamber could have held their heads high in the full knowledge that they had done something that is crucial and is critical to saving lives in this state. There is nothing more important.

I have spoken to countless people. I have spoken to parents. I have spoken to the mums and dads across this state. I could not sit by one more day and not act. This is more than a moral issue. This is an issue that has the ability to change people's lives. We stand by our convictions. We can go to sleep safe at night knowing that we have done something to change the community for the good, and that is what being part of the Labor Party is all about—standing by our values, standing by our morals, standing up for Queensland and saving lives for the betterment of the people in this state.

Debate, on motion of Ms Palaszczuk, adjourned.

MOTION

Amendments to Standing Orders



Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (5.59 pm): I move—

- (1) That the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly be amended by inserting in standing order 213, after (2), the following sub-paragraph:
 - (2A) A draft report of the Chairperson or another member to be tabled at a committee meeting in accordance with (1) or (2) above, must be provided to members of the Committee at least 2 clear days prior to any meeting at which the draft report is to be considered in accordance with (3) below. A draft report may be provided to a member personally, via their electorate office staff, by email, fax or express mail, except that in the case of mail, the draft report is not considered provided, until the time mail would expect to be delivered in the normal course of business.

As members on both sides of this House know, the committee system is one of the most important institutions of this parliament. It is fundamentally a system of review, enhancing the ability of this parliament and its members to hold the government of the day to account and to provide vital input on bills and legislation before it. I have served on a number of committees since being elected to represent Mudgeeraba, and in fact I was part of the parliamentary team which visited New Zealand in the 53rd Parliament when we were considering adopting the new committee processes.

Throughout my time in the parliament, I have been grateful to have been ably assisted by a number of committee secretariats who did provide essential administrative and research assistance and assisted the committees in their day-to-day operations. Unfortunately, there have been many instances where the ability of committee members to assess and provide recommendations on

legislation has been hindered by unrealistic deadlines and time frames and disorganisation—including draft committee transcripts which had not been approved for publication but were suddenly found to be on the committee website for public consumption, without giving us the benefit of seeing our own words. That is not good enough. We have also had instances of draft reports, dozens of pages long, being distributed the day of the meeting at which they are to be adopted, and there has been a lack of communication from members of past secretariats. These are undeniably instances where administrative blunders have hindered our capacity to perform our committee work.


Circumventing or truncating the committee process does not provide for effective or efficient analysis of committee reports and in fact puts at risk an essential institution of our democracy. I place on record my thanks to the recently appointed secretariat of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee for their hard work and for doing their best to wade their way through what was left to them by a former dysfunctional secretariat.

As a result of past administrative disorganisation, I am moving this motion today to define specific organisational requirements for committees to ensure that we as members of this place can effectively do our jobs in reviewing legislation, consulting widely and providing recommendations in a timely manner to the House for consideration. Specifically, this motion seeks to ensure that committee members are given at least two days to consider a draft report to ensure that any recommendations or amendments can be adequately prepared, consulted on and considered. Importantly, it allows for draft reports to be distributed to members in a variety of ways, including through a member's electorate office staff, taking into account that members may not always be instantly contactable due to competing electorate and parliamentary commitments.

As a draft report which is posted can take a number of days to arrive, particularly in regional areas, this motion takes into consideration the number of days it can reasonably be considered to take for a draft report to reach a member by post. In the past, as I have mentioned, it has not been uncommon for committee members to receive reports within hours of a meeting where it is scheduled to be discussed. I will provide just one example for the benefit of the House. The Health and Ambulance Services Committee recently considered a bill and was due to provide a report to the House. Less than 24 hours was provided to consider the draft report. This report was 180 pages long and the time allocated to adopt what was a draft report was a one-hour teleconference. In turn, committee members were provided with 10 seconds per page to read, consider and formulate a series of informed opinions on what was a lengthy committee report on a very significant bill.

The practice of sending draft reports to be adopted *cart blanche* with no scrutiny and no time to change recommendations is beginning to become a joke. Quite rightly, I and my colleagues on this side of the House could not in good conscience pass a report to be tabled in the House with no scrutiny. With time frames like this, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the committee to consider reports, and as a result it may be that no committee report will be passed for particular bills if this remains common practice.

I have moved this motion after consulting widely with my fellow members about how the committee system can be improved and how we can end ongoing frustration in the way the processes are handled. Queenslanders deserve a parliament which operates efficiently, with legislation reviewed appropriately and mechanisms designed to increase scrutiny and transparency operating as intended. It is for these reasons that I move this motion tonight and I urge my fellow members on both sides of the House to provide their support for the benefit of this place and our democratic institutions. It is not good enough to get a draft report 24 hours before it is supposed to be tabled and expect members of the committee from both sides of the House to sign off on it. It is just not on.

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (6.04 pm): I rise to speak against the motion moved by the member for Mudgeeraba. Disappointingly, this is the second time I have risen in this House to speak on a motion of a procedural rather than substantive nature. This parliament has a strong and active committee system that is enhancing the accountability of parliament, at least under this government. We are once again taking the parliament to the people, listening to them and giving them an opportunity to have a say on the operations of this House. This parliament has clear guidelines in regard to the conduct of committee business—when committees meet, how they are instructed, how and when they report. In appreciation of the dynamic nature of this place, our roles and demands within it, committees are also provided the necessary flexibility to manage their business—standing order 198 relates.

As the chair of a committee, I take seriously the conduct and operation of that committee, I take seriously the duties and role of that committee, and I take seriously the bipartisan operation of that committee. The member for Mudgeeraba would know this as she is a member of my committee. Members being provided with adequate time to read, consider and debate reports is a matter of

significant importance, but it is also a matter of a procedural nature that could be dealt with by discussion within respective committees, by discussion with the Clerk, as it relates to secretariat resourcing, and by discussion or reference to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly. In fact, I understand the CLA is currently reviewing the operation of committees in this House.

We discuss many things within our committee—without offending standing order 211, of course—including the schedules to inquiries, closing dates for submissions, hearing dates and reporting dates. We decide on those as a committee. Every member has an equal say on the time lines determined and we can alter them, and we must respond with flexibility to issues that arise. My colleague mentioned the mental health report. That is one of those examples where all six of us had to respond to a short time frame.

What I want to know is why we are having this discussion here tonight. Why are we standing here talking about matters that are procedural in nature when we could be debating issues of importance to Queenslanders? Last week in my electorate I talked to a woman who is fearful for her life due to domestic and family violence. She has lost her home, her friends, her sense of belonging and her safety in her community. She wants legislative change. She is not sitting at home hoping that we will talk about when draft reports are provided to members.

I had a long conversation with a gentleman on Friday about the challenge of homelessness and meeting the need of social housing in our community. He is concerned about a family with six children who are struggling to keep a roof over their heads and about how they will feed their children. He is not sitting at home hoping that I am standing here debating whether I have 48 hours within the normal course of business to read a report.

Weekly I have people come into my office wanting assistance to access job support and access jobs programs because their careers—the careers they loved—were callously cut short under the former government. They are also not sitting in their lounge room hoping that their elected representative is using their time in this House to debate and argue over matters of such a procedural nature. Why are we not talking about jobs? Why are we not talking about the economy? Why are we not talking about front-line services—the doctors, the nurses or the teachers who are, once again, providing integral services to our electorates, our communities and our state because of the actions that we have taken? Why are we not talking about working together to change the culture of domestic and family violence in our community? The member opposite could have chosen any of these issues, any topic to debate tonight in the interests of the people of Queensland and she chose reports. To say I am disappointed is an understatement.

Queenslanders deserve better. They deserve a parliament that debates the issues of importance to them: jobs, the economy, essential services, housing. Let's talk about and debate those issues. That is what this side of the House is doing each and every day. I oppose the motion.



Mrs SMITH (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (6.10 pm): I think this is a very fair and reasonable motion and so I rise to support my colleague. The committee system is such a vital part of parliamentary process. The ability of committee members to gather and examine the evidence—the views of all Queenslanders—is key to informed decision-making. The member for Nudgee asked why we are not talking about a range of things. That is exactly what we do in committee. This motion is about being able to properly consider the information.

People who go to the trouble of submitting or putting in a written submission or even attending the hearings must have the confidence that their input is carefully considered. I think that is just so important when people go onto the website, decide that there is a topic that we are discussing in the committee and they go to the trouble of putting in their submission. We would like to think that if they have gone to that trouble that we will give them due consideration. A lot of information obviously goes into the reports, and that is a very relevant point. I think that answers the queries of the member for Nudgee.

When unrealistic time frames are being applied, that jeopardises the whole credibility of this process.


Government members interjected.

Mrs SMITH: It is a very fair and reasonable suggestion. I do not know why everybody on the other side is getting upset when they do look at being fair and reasonable all the time—so they say. I make this point very clearly. This is certainly no reflection on the secretariat. They have been doing a marvellous job—and I can only speak of the secretariat of my committee; they have done a very good job. I am going to give a couple of examples which anybody who is fair and reasonable would agree with and if we do want to have well considered reports, this certainly goes to that.

We have had a number of inquiries such as the lemon laws. The date for adopting the report was a Friday and we received it on the Thursday afternoon. In relation to the improved representation bill, again, we received the report on Thursday afternoon to adopt it on the Friday at a teleconference. Transcripts from hearings such as in Townsville and on the Gold Coast were not received. They were then on the public website but we were waiting for them to peruse as part of our informed decision-making. Of course, there was the very important alcohol fuelled violence. That report was over a hundred pages and I received it at 5.48 on the Thursday night and had to be able to have a full, informed discussion about it at 11 o'clock on the Friday. As I said, when they are such important reports, when there are reams and reams of information—we received over 760 submissions. I think it is only a fair request to be able to listen to that information, dissect that information and to come in here and be well informed.

I again, therefore, say that it is extremely fair to ask for two days to digest and consider reports, look at the decisions we could be making and what we want to discuss and agree to. Anybody who is saying that giving full consideration is not fair or reasonable is being flippant about the whole process. As I said, when documentation is missing, not only does that put pressure on our committee secretariat—and different secretariats obviously have different workloads, but they are very professional—it then puts them in a certain position. This would also go a long way to supporting our secretariat.

Again, this is a very fair and reasonable request. My colleague has put forward a very good motion that I certainly will be supporting. I would encourage anybody else who is fair-minded, who wants well considered, constructive reports to support this motion.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (6.15 pm): I rise to speak against the motion moved by the member for Mudgeeraba. The motion takes the extraordinary step to move to change the standing orders of this House and to change the process by which committees work. I wonder if there is a better process with due deliberation which could discuss the issue and is there perhaps a current committee that is discussing these exact issues? For the benefit of the member for Mudgeeraba, I will let her know about a little-known resource that the parliament provides us that may aid her in her quest. There is an obscure website with the address parliament.qld.gov.au, and it has a clear link 'Work of Committees'. There is a committee right at the top of the page—the member does not have to scan down too far—called the Committee of the Legislative Assembly. Its work is described as—

The committee has the following areas of responsibility—

...

- (c) standing rules and orders about the conduct of business by, and the practices and the procedures of, the Assembly and its committees ...

I wonder who the members of this committee are. I myself am often a proxy member, but the rest like myself are probably obscure backbenchers whom perhaps the member does not even know. Again, the website can help us out with the link entitled 'Members'. It states Hon. Peter Wellington, Speaker of the House; Mick de Brenni, member for Springwood; Stirling Hinchliffe, Leader of the House—hold on, there are a few more—John-Paul Langbroek. Has anyone heard of him? He is apparently the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. There is also Lawrence Springborg. He has the title Leader of the Opposition.

It is possible that this committee is reluctant to involve itself in looking at the role of committees or perhaps it is too busy with other matters to look at committees. That is possible. Again, however, a click on the website shows that the CLA is currently in the midst of a review of the role of committees. That was referred to the CLA by this House on 3 December. The terms of reference state—

That, in undertaking this inquiry, the committee consider how the current parliamentary committee system could be strengthened to increase accountability by:


- examining the role of parliamentary committees in other jurisdictions with unicameral parliaments, including the functions and powers of those committees and how they are exercised, to see if the functions and powers of Queensland Parliamentary committees can be further strengthened; and
- reviewing the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 ... to ensure these functions, powers and procedures are operating as effectively as possible as an accountability mechanism.

It seems as if the terms of reference that were given to the CLA were almost exactly what the member for Mudgeeraba asks for. It is almost as if this inquiry were designed to soberly and reasonably address the problem that the member for Mudgeeraba thinks she sees with the committee system.

Perhaps she could have made a submission to the CLA on this matter. Let's see if she has. Again, it is only a click away. Let's see if anyone made submissions. It is all on the public record. Perhaps no-one did, and this is the first piece of information the CLA might consider.

Let's check: SG Brown; the Integrity Commissioner; D Wills; the Queensland Ombudsman; the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties; the Queensland Audit Office; the Queensland Greens—the Queensland Greens could make a submission but apparently the member for Mudgeeraba cannot—the Queensland Resource Council; the Local Government Association of Queensland; the Anti-Discrimination Commissioner; the Queensland Law Society; the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland; the Clerk of the Queensland parliament; Shane Knuth, the member for Dalrymple; the Queensland Council of Unions; and the Liberal National Party of Australia managed to make a submission. I have a copy here. I did a quick scan. I could not see in the submissions any of the vitally important issues which were raised. Let me see if I can see 'R Bates' on the list. No, there is no-one of that name here. No, the 'member for Mudgeeraba' is not there either, but not to bother. It seems that the only person in this House who has not had a say is the member for Mudgeeraba. The member for Mudgeeraba could have realised at any time that these issues were of great importance to her.

I represent the great city of Logan which shares one thing in common with the Gold Coast, and that is the M1 motorway which the member for Springwood is fighting so hard for. We could have taken the time today to put forward a joint motion to condemn the federal government for their inaction and failure to pay 80 per cent of the M1 project. Instead we are wasting our time on a motion when we should be debating the bill before the House. That is a shame, and I condemn the motion.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (6.19 pm): Is that not just typical of the Australian Labor Party! I stand here to support the member for Mudgeeraba and the motion that she has put forward, which is plain, simple and very reasonable. I doubt whether any member in their right mind over there would not think that this is a reasonable motion. Most of the members are on committees, they will have seen this process over the year that they have been here, and they would know that you just cannot react to a 100- or 200-page report in a matter of hours. This motion sets a time frame in place and we can work backwards from there. If we have two days to react to what is, after all, the chair's draft report of the committee reference, that would give us time to digest it, to look through it and to make sure that it is reflective of what happened during the committee process. It would allow us to provide input as to where changes may be made, maybe talk to the other committee members to see whether we all agree, and maybe just put out a really good committee report.

I must say that over the four years I have been here I think that the committee system is working exceptionally well. During the term of the last government I was on the same committee that I am on now, the infrastructure committee. We made a number of recommendations to our ministers. I think that in one of our reports we made something like 20-odd recommendations to the member for Callide, who was the deputy premier at the time. He accepted every one of them because we thought it through in a bipartisan fashion. We put out a really good report and we made some great recommendations. The minister accepted all of them and we came out of it with better legislation.


I would ask the members here whether that is what the committee system is meant to do. It is meant to put out better legislation. The minister has prepared this legislation and put it out there. In many instances this is the first time there has been consultation. We go out there as a committee and we talk to the public. We travel around the state and we talk to people and we make the legislation better. You have to remember that a lot of these people put in submissions. They are taking the time; they think that they can make a difference. We invite them in and they come before the committee, we ask them pertinent questions and we get a response back. Every now and then one of them comes up with a really good idea that would be great to include in the committee's report. I must say that our particular committee is working very well in that area. As the member for Mount Ommaney said, all of the secretariats are doing a great job but they are under a certain amount of pressure.

I would say to you that if we could have two days so that we can sit down and read the report, then we would know that we have to finish everything in two days. What we have heard here tonight from the member for Nudgee and the member for Logan is really just a lot of drivel. We were talking about the M1. The committees talk about all sorts of legislation, and all of it is important. We are debating a very important one tonight.

Mr Power: The M1 is drivel; that is what you said.

Mr HART: Mr Speaker, I take the member's interjection and I will be raising that at a later date. We have a government who says that they are open and transparent. If you are open and transparent, what is your issue with giving the members of parliament two days to read a chair's draft report? That

is the problem here. If you want to be open and transparent, then is it not fair to give the members of parliament a couple of days to read something, a couple of days to make improvements on the committee's report and to get it right so that this parliament does its job in the right fashion? I urge all members to support this motion.

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games) (6.24 pm): Mr Speaker, last evening I said that the opposition's brain trust had been hard at work over the summer holidays to come up with a swag of motions and ideas for the six o'clock scream. Yesterday they used this daily opportunity to discuss the important issues facing the state by moving a procedural motion to revisit an idea from last year. Well, today they have truly hit the bottom of the barrel. If this is day 2, I cannot wait to see tomorrow night's effort.

Here is the LNP's plan for Queensland. Take out your papers and pencils, members opposite, and jot it down, because it has taken the Leader of the Opposition and his team all summer to come up with this. Here is the big pitch to Queenslanders: under a future LNP government, draft parliamentary chair committee reports will be provided to committee members two days prior to any meeting to discuss said report. It is a slogan you can bang on a bumper sticker. I can see it on a corflute. It is going to go really well for them. The slogan can go right over a big picture of the Leader of the Opposition doing his best 'Sam the Eagle' impersonation with a recently unfurled flag caught in the breeze. What a sight! I can just see it; it is fantastic.

We have heard some valid concerns and issues raised by the proposers of this motion tonight. The reason the government opposes this motion is because there are valid processes for them to pursue these valid concerns. Those valid processes, as set out by the member for Nudgee and the member for Logan, are through the Committee of the Legislative Assembly. If the member for Mudgeeraba has these concerns, she has the capacity to raise them with the Committee of the Legislative Assembly. It is created as the standing orders committee to consider these sorts of matters. Not for the House as a whole to deal with them, but for those matters to be considered by a committee—the very matter that she is trying to defend and support—so that we can deal with potential unintended consequences of such a change. These are things that need to be looked at and considered at length and in detail, not in a screaming match on a Wednesday night for half an hour. We have not seen these issues raised at the CLA. I welcome them being raised at the CLA. I am happy to look at that and consider that. There is a process to allow for that to happen. We heard from the member for Logan that it has not occurred under the system so far.

It is clear that the opposition have dropped the bundle on private members' motions this week. They did not spend the time at their love-in retreat drafting these motions. They spent their time trying to be inspired by the leadership, but it is not working. Instead, we have the Leader of the Opposition come into this place with his hangdog-looking face, trying to sit through his colleagues' failing efforts.

I know that there is a lot of focus today on the member for Callide. I wish him well. I wish him the best of luck for his future. Our loss will surely be the gain of a future federal Turnbull-Joyce-Seeney opposition. The dedication he showed to good policy and integrity in his time as deputy premier will be really welcome in Canberra!

My heart has to go out to the Leader of the Opposition today. He hears all this excitement about where the members for Toowoomba South and Callide are going, and he sits in his office surrounded by dead moths and visions of Maranoa, AA Milne characters dancing before his eyes. He laments what could have been. Meanwhile, the member for Clayfield has a spring in his step because he knows that he is a contender now.

Mr HART: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Tonight we are here debating the very serious issue of giving members of parliament time to do their job, and the member for Sandgate is completely off track. I would ask you to bring him back to the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the member for Sandgate to ensure his contribution is relevant to the topic of debate.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your guidance. In the moments remaining to me, I will reiterate that we as a House should oppose this motion because the proper course of action to consider, understand and deal with this issue is through the Committee of the Legislative Assembly. I oppose the motion.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 41:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Simpson, Pyne.

Resolved in the negative.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Member for Warrego, Unauthorised Disclosure of Committee Proceedings



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.38 pm): I give notice that tomorrow I will move—

That—

1. the House notes Ethics Committee report No. 162 titled *Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings*, tabled in the House on 17 February 2016, and, in accordance with standing order 265, adopts that report;
2. this House finds that:
 - (a) the member for Warrego made an unauthorised disclosure of proceedings of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee by including the Premier's generic and electorate office email addresses in her email to the members of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee and the secretariat of 12 July 2015;
 - (b) the member for Warrego made an unauthorised disclosure of proceedings of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee by involving Mr Jake Smith, chief of staff to the Leader of the Opposition, in the preparation of the email to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee of 12 July 2015;
 - (c) the member for Warrego deliberately misled the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee in her response to the Acting Chair of that committee of 12 August 2015 by not disclosing the assistance provided by Mr Jake Smith, chief of staff to the Leader of the Opposition, in the preparation of the email sent to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee members, secretariat and the Premier's generic email addresses on 12 July 2015; and
 - (d) the member for Warrego deliberately misled the Ethics Committee in her responses to questions at a private hearing of the committee on 30 October 2015 by omitting the involvement of Mr Jake Smith in the preparation of her email of 12 July 2015.
3. the House orders that the member for Warrego be discharged from the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee;
4. the House orders that the member from Warrego be suspended from service on all committees of this House for a period of six (6) months from today's date;
5. this House requests Mr Speaker to admonish the member for Warrego for her lack of regard for the rules of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee and lack of respect for the Ethics Committee and this House and orders that the member for Warrego listen to that admonishment standing in her place; and
6. the House notes the Ethics Committee conclusion that the member for Warrego not be appointed to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee for the remainder of the 55th Parliament.

MOTION

Order of Business



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.40 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in the sessional orders, for tomorrow's order of business:

- (a) the notice of motion given by the Leader of the House containing charges of contempt against the member for Warrego be debated immediately following question time tomorrow;
- (b) introduction of private members' bills be postponed to 3 pm; and
- (c) debate of committee reports be postponed to the next sitting week.

Motion agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.41 pm to 7.40 pm.


DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**Photographs in Chamber**

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Mr Speaker has advised that there is a photographer from the *Courier-Mail* who will be around the chamber this evening taking photographs.

TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION)
AMENDMENT BILL****Second Reading (Cognate Debate)**

Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from p. 176, on motion of Mrs D'Ath, and Liquor and Fair Trading (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 176, on motion of Mr Walker—

That the bills be now read a second time.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7.40 pm): I rise to speak to the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. As someone who represents a part of Queensland that includes some of the largest entertainment precincts, being Surfers Paradise and Broadbeach, I am well aware of the issues that have been part of this debate for over a decade. In fact, in my practice as a dental surgeon I have also had to deal with a number of patients over the years often as a result of the injuries that they suffered during schoolies weeks that were part of a regime when, under then Premier Beattie, there was almost no responsibility taken by the government about what was happening in the precinct of Surfers Paradise.

As I have said publicly, I have concerns that there are those on the government side of the debate who have tried to make out that they are the only ones who have concerns about the safety of children in this state. As the parent of three children who are 18, 23 and 25, I reject that notion out of hand and think that it is a particularly unseemly aspect of this debate that has been raised, as those on the government side tried to put more and more pressure on members on this side to try to come round to their way of thinking. That is something that I definitely want to put on the record. Dr Lynham was in dental school a year before me—he was in the year ahead of me—but he does not have any more carriage of this in terms of the self-righteous way that he has carried on tonight on the news and in the last couple of weeks about this particular debate. All of us who have children and all of us who go out in the precincts ourselves and travel around the state also have concerns about our safety as well as our children, and that is something that Labor has tried to commandeer in this debate and it is a completely unseemly aspect. I commend the shadow Attorney for his comprehensive presentation that has brought up many of these aspects in debate on this bill.

Alcohol and drug related violence is a complicated problem that requires a comprehensive and well considered approach. What seems to have been forgotten in this debate is that the bill before us today is a broken election commitment and since the election the government has fumbled and bumbled its way to where we are today in one of the strangest policy development processes that I have seen in my time in the parliament. It started off in the election campaign with a so-called 10-point plan, so let us see how that has unravelled in the last 12 months. Point 1: introduce a 1 am lockdown and stop the service of alcohol at 3 am. That changed to the mess we have now where we see a 2 am cessation of alcohol across the state, unless you are in a precinct and the precinct can apply for a 3 am close and 1 am lockdown. The first time that Queenslanders heard about the 2 am close was on the Sunday two days before the bill was introduced. Point 2: continue the operation of drink safe precincts, DSPs, in Fortitude Valley, Surfers Paradise and Townsville. That did continue to an extent, but those opposite forgot to mention the other 12 declared precincts across the state. Labor also stopped the grant funding process for nine months and some of the local safe night boards have either disbanded or never formed in the first place. It is a complete disaster and flies in the face of the Attorney-General trying to suggest that there has been anything other than a repudiation of the LNP policy and those opposite almost deliberately tried to frustrate it rather than trying to see if it was going to work at all.

Point 3: maintain the moratorium on very late night/early morning licensed trading. The moratorium on extended trading applications expired in August 2014 and nothing has been put in place in the first 12 months of this government. Point 4: impose mandatory ban orders on troublemakers. Nothing of this kind is mentioned in the bill and seems to have been abandoned. These are all policies taken by the Labor Party to the election. Point 5: undertake intelligence led policing in DSPs and increase inspection by Liquor Licencing officers, particularly on Friday and Saturday nights. There has been no mention of this at all. In fact, all we have seen from the Premier is a suggestion that we may well see lowered police resources throughout the state—something that, for a government that claims it does not get involved in those sorts of operational arrangements, seems like a perplexing and very concerning thing for the Premier to say. Point 6: empower police to breathalyse intoxicated or disorderly patrons. Who could ever forget this picture of ‘D’Ath Vader’—also known as the Attorney-General, and I will table it—on the front page of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* in June 2015, and I presume the Attorney has a copy in her office.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, dated 19 June 2015, titled ‘D’Ath Vader—Exclusive: Attorney-General using the force to keep the peace ... and keep you sober’ by Jack Houghton and Ryan Keen [178].

The article states—

Forget light sabres—State Attorney-General Yvette D’Ath wants breathalyser-wielding police leaning over the shoulders of Gold Coast drinkers to see if they are drunk.

‘Allowing police to breathalyse patrons will help them to build cases for prosecution for court,’ Ms D’Ath said.

For example, police consider a (blood-alcohol) reading of 0.15 to be highly intoxicated.

Perhaps after receiving a phone call from level 15 of the Executive Building, a statement was issued from the Attorney herself later that day saying—

This government took a comprehensive plan to tackle alcohol-fuelled violence to the election. We are determined to ensure venues are safe places for everyone to enjoy.

...

There is no plan to random breath-test drinkers and there never has been.

Flip-flop backward and forward in one day, gone the next. Those opposite have been making it up as they go along on this issue since the election last year, and here it is again for all to see. No wonder no-one has any confidence in what the government is doing. It does not know itself! Point 7: ban the sale of high-alcohol-content drinks, including shots, after midnight. That is included in this bill, but it still cannot decide and no-one has any idea of what is defined as a high-alcohol-content drink and rapid consumption drinks.

Mr Bailey: You’re out of touch.

Mr LANGBROEK: That is interesting coming from that particular minister—a minister who railed against the very legislation from the shadow Attorney. It is all in *Hansard*.

Mr Bailey: That was 12 years ago.

Mr LANGBROEK: It was 12 years ago, so a strongly held position that he had then he now no longer has. That shows the flip-flop nature of whatever it is that suits at the time. It is probably because he has gotten so old that he is too old to go out into the precincts! Point 8: conduct a multimedia education and awareness campaign. That never took place. In fact, it pulled \$1 million that we had in the budget for awareness campaigns. Point 9: support federal opposition leader Bill Shorten’s call for funding for boxer Danny Green’s national Coward’s Punch Campaign. Bill seems to have moved on, stalking the aisles of Woolworths around the country asking people about their favourite kind of lettuce. Point 10: investigate strategies to ensure safe travel to and from work for industry staff in early hours—another pie in the sky commitment that no-one has heard of since.

So to recap: the so-called 10-point plan is nothing more than broken promises, hot air, thought bubbles that floated away and harebrained proposals that were exposed in the media for exactly what they are. Contrast that to the approach taken by the former LNP government, of which I had a part of overseeing in terms of the education aspects. In 2014 we introduced a comprehensive approach to the issue of alcohol and drug related violence, and we did so after a period of analysis and significant consultation with Queenslanders—over 12,000 as I recall. The Safe Night Out Strategy was developed on the back of research and results of Labor’s own drink safe precinct trial that commenced in December 2010 and was extended by the LNP government to ensure a proper evaluation could take place. The Safe Night Out Strategy was underpinned by three central elements: one, changing the

culture through education and awareness so that everyone is responsible; two, bad behaviour will not be tolerated by those affected by alcohol or drugs; and, three, safe and supportive environments will be created by the establishment of 15 safe night precincts for the safe and effective local management of key entertainment precincts across the state.


That brings me to one of the key points in this debate: the impact of drug related violence. Along with issues such as the price of alcohol and the increase in preloading, the impact of drugs on our entertainment precincts should not be overlooked. But there is very little about those issues in this bill—apart from the recent addition that was negotiated today with the Katter party—other than watering down the mandatory drug and alcohol bail conditions that we put in place as part of our Safe Night Out Strategy.

As we have been saying all along and as the shadow Attorney-General said, show us the evidence, show us the data. That is what the committee had to say. I know that the deputy chair of that committee, the member for Mount Ommaney, is here and she will speak later. The very first recommendation of the committee report states—

The committee recommends appropriate data on alcohol related incidents be collected and available from agencies which this Bill affects, for example Queensland Police, Queensland Health and Queensland Ambulance Service.

Labor is putting the cart before the horse. It should bring in legislation based on data and evidence, not the other way around. Labor likes to talk about the Newcastle solution, but it does not like to talk about the extent of the issues in Queensland. We have seen all the data from New South Wales. There are severe restrictions and lockouts in Newcastle, but in other parts of New South Wales there has been a progressive reduction in criminal assaults around licensed premises compared to other parts of New South Wales. Of course, Mike Baird has now asked Ian Callinan to review his own laws.

The government continues with its plan. As I said, it does not have a monopoly on caring for young people. The evidence is not clear that this bill will make an impact and reduce the incidence of alcohol and drug related violence across the state.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (7.50 pm): The evidence is clear. There are journal articles, peer reviewed data and statistics from across the world that demonstrate that this policy will work.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: I rise to speak in favour of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. The committee actually said in its recommendation—and if the member read the recommendation he would see it—that it will collect adequate information and data after the introduction of the bill. It is recommendation 1 in the report and I refer to that. I think that perhaps the member needs to read the report again.

In his contribution to the debate the member for Mansfield encouraged us all to focus on the right outcome. But I would have to question the member for Mansfield and all of those opposite: is the LNP focused on the right outcome in this debate or the right outcome for big liquor? How much did the LNP sell the right outcome in this debate for? The member also talked a lot about data. As the Attorney-General said, there are dozens upon dozens of peer reviewed, irrefutable pieces of research from Australia and around the world that supports the government's policy and this bill.

We know that alcohol is the most widely used drug in Queensland and that it is associated with more than 1,100 deaths and more than 33,900 hospitalisations each year. Those figures alone should be enough for the members opposite to support this bill. At the last election the Palaszczuk government made a commitment to the people of Queensland to keep their loved ones safe when they went out after dark. Similarly, young people want to know that they are safe when they go out with their friends and parents want to know that their kids will come home. One in six Queenslanders has been the victim of alcohol fuelled violence and two-thirds of Queenslanders, or 66 per cent, consider the city, or the centre of their town, to be unsafe on a Saturday night. The research also shows that, after midnight and for every hour that alcohol continues to be served, the risk of being assaulted or being the victim of alcohol fuelled violence increases.

After extensive consultation with industry and community stakeholders, the government developed a comprehensive multifaceted policy framework that will build a safer community and a vibrant night-life by tackling alcohol fuelled violence. Our key goal is to drive cultural change around drinking behaviour by promoting responsible practices that will create a safer environment for everyone and boost local economies. I support the bill's objectives to tackle alcohol fuelled violence, particularly late at night, through an evidence based multifaceted approach.

The bill will also provide greater clarity and improve operational efficiency in the regulation of licensed premises through miscellaneous amendments to the Liquor Act and will ensure consistency across Queensland's statutes dealing with directors' liability through amendments to the Fair Trading Act. The Palaszczuk government's policy and this bill are based on a large body of research and interstate and international experiences. In Newcastle, upon the introduction of liquor trade restrictions, there was a 37 per cent reduction in assaults and a 26 per cent reduction in night-time emergency department assault presentations. Can we argue with assault presentation data? In Kings Cross, upon the introduction of liquor trade restrictions, there was a 32 per cent reduction in assaults and in the Sydney CBD entertainment precincts, a 40 per cent reduction in assaults.

The government recognises that alcohol fuelled violence and antisocial behaviour is a complex issue. As such, it requires a collective response involving the whole community. The government will continue to consult and work in partnership with community groups and licensees to improve safety and amenity in and around licensed venues. As part of the comprehensive policy to tackle alcohol fuelled violence, the government will implement a number of non-legislative initiatives, such as a three-year multimedia education and awareness campaign targeting young people, particularly men.

Research has indicated that the total cost to the Australian economy of alcohol related matters is over \$14 billion. That figure can be broken down to being almost \$3 billion to the criminal justice system, \$1.6 billion to the health system, over \$6 billion to productivity and \$3.5 billion in costs associated with traffic accidents. Safer venues mean that more people go out at night and increased diversity in our licensed premises. Safer venues also makes it safer for employees, DJs, bar staff and musicians.

It must be clear that the government is not changing the hours of trade; the government is changing the hours that alcohol is served. Licensed venues will still be able to stay open beyond the hours of liquor service to provide other services such as food, non-alcoholic beverages and entertainment. In Newcastle, where a lockout has been in place since 2008, since the introduction of liquor trade restrictions the total number of licensed premises has more than doubled. That is a 110 per cent increase. There was also a 140 per cent increase in licensed restaurants and boutique bars.

There are many cities around the world that have venues with closing times of 2 am, including Boston, Los Angeles, San Diego and Sacramento in the US and Ottawa and Toronto in Canada, and the entirety of Ireland—or 2.30 am in the case of Dublin. The reality is that these international destinations are well-known tourist destinations. It is nonsense to suggest that these international tourist destinations do not have a night-time economy because they stop the sale of alcohol at 2 am.

Opponents of the government's policy have not presented any evidence to the government to support their claims of job losses or a loss of business income.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: I would love to see the member's data. I engaged with all of the 40 or so licensed venues in Rockhampton and the Capricorn Coast that are represented on the Rockhampton safe night out precinct committee and the Capricorn Coast Liquor Accord and asked for feedback regarding this bill. However, I have not had any response from any of the venues. There was certainly no flood of emails or phone calls with concerns about the bill. In fact, it was quite the opposite. I had no response at all. Also, to my knowledge I have not had—

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: I engaged with the constituents—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Keppel, I would ask that you direct your comments through the chair, not towards the member for Lockyer.

Mrs LAUGA: I engaged with the constituents of my electorate and in particular the 40 or so licensed venues that are represented on the Rockhampton safe night out precinct committee and the Capricorn Coast Liquor Accord and I received no response whatsoever. Also, to my knowledge I have not had any constituents who oppose this bill contact my office by email, phone or mail. In fact, two constituents called into my office on Monday to let me know that they think that this bill does not go far enough. They want to see alcohol sales limited to 10 am to 10 pm and a minimum drinking age of 21 years. Although this policy does not form—

An opposition member: Do you support that?

Mrs LAUGA: No, I do not. Although this policy does not form part of this bill, it is interesting to note that there is support in my community for even tougher alcohol laws than are on the table here.

On 5 January I received a letter from a constituent in Tungamull, which is in my electorate. The letter states—

Dear Ms Lauga,


I am writing to you in response to the tragic death of 18 year old Cole Miller yesterday after he was punched in the Valley on Sunday Morning. I want the Queensland Government to bring in laws that can't be challenged by lawyers to bring an end to the alcohol fuelled violence that currently plagues this great state.

There have been too many tragic deaths caused by one punch drunken perpetrators on innocent people who are simply out to have a good time with their friends.

I received a similar response from constituents when I engaged on social media about the bill earlier this week. It is no surprise then that a poll conducted in February this year by Galaxy, commissioned by the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education, found that almost three-quarters of Queenslanders support the late night trading hour measures recently announced by the Queensland government to reduce alcohol fuelled violence.

Introducing a closing time for pubs, clubs and bars of no later than 3 am was supported by 84 per cent of respondents. We would rather explain to a young person that the Palaszczuk government is imposing a call for last drinks at 2 am than explain to their loved ones that are not coming home because they are lying in a hospital bed or, worse, because they were killed by a senseless act of violence.

In considering their position on this bill, I urge all members to think about the families affected by too much alcohol, the impact on our health system of too many alcohol related hospitalisations and emergency department presentations and the unnecessary pressure placed on police and the justice system to deal with alcohol fuelled violence. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (8.00 pm): Much has been said about the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 in the lead-up to this debate. There has been media comment, social media comment, inflated innuendo, hypotheses, as well as the information provided by the 767 submissions to the committee. For every argument that is put forward for one side or the other there is another argument that offers a different point of view. As a person on the committee I base my decision on the 767 submissions.

I felt so strongly about this, after seeing all of the information provided and once we had finalised the report, that I actually penned an open letter to my constituents that I would like to read to the House that I believe sets out why I have come to my decision. The member for Mansfield has addressed the issues in a concise and eloquent way. His contribution was very well considered and well balanced. A lot of the points he made I have in my contribution, but I think that he has covered them and in the interests of time I will stick to a couple of things I would like to raise. I wrote this letter—

I pen this letter as the State member for Mount Ommaney, however most importantly as a mother of a teenager and two young adults. I would like to take the opportunity to discuss with you why I have decided to vote against the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Bill before Queensland Parliament this week.

I want to start by saying the safety of all Queenslanders is by far the most significant part of this very important debate about Alcohol Fuelled Violence ... The LNP Opposition is very much focused on ensuring the right outcome that provides an evidence-based policy framework to improve community safety.

I have travelled the state listening to Queenslanders about this bill as the Deputy Chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

From those conversations and after looking at all the evidence presented, the committee has recommended that more recent data is needed, reinforcing concerns that Labor's bill doesn't stack up. The LNP believes that governments should obtain data before legislating, not the other way around. I also found that the majority of people do not support the lockout laws.

Why do I say that?

An overwhelming 767 submissions were made and of those, 746 submissions (97.26%) were against the laws.

I believe that this issue again needs a multi-faceted approach, rather than simply reducing trading hours and introducing a lockout, which is the primary objective of the Bill.

From my perspective, I'm concerned that the approach adopted in Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Bill is inconsistent and won't have the desired outcomes of reducing alcohol-related violence in all its forms and in all urban, regional and rural communities across Queensland. I believe there are significant gaps in Labor's bill that Premier Palaszczuk has failed to address, namely:

1. Concerns about Casinos being exempt; allowing them to serve alcohol and allow gambling 24 hours a day creating inconsistencies with the night clubs. This exemption also includes adult entertainment venues.

I just pause on that point because this is where Queensland is different to anywhere else in the world. We are a diverse and unique state. We should be proud of that fact. In Cairns there is a nightclub precinct virtually next door to the casino. This is where there is an inconsistency. We are saying it is okay for the casino to stay open for 24 hours a day serving alcohol, but the guy next door needs to close and have these rules enforced. The average person does not see the common sense in that and neither do I.

2. Labor's refusal to insist upon having ID scanners in venues to crackdown on underage drinking and ban continual trouble makers has been put into the too hard basket.

I want to stress that in Cairns not one submitter—I repeat: not one—was in support of these laws. The member for Barron River attended the hearing for a short time. The member for Cairns also attended the hearing. In Cairns they have developed local solutions for the local problem. The chaplain in Cairns said—

Having spent so much time on the streets, I have seen firsthand that, despite what is portrayed by the media and some politicians, Cairns streets are not dangerous. The majority of club patrons only begin to arrive at nightclubs between 11 pm and 12 am and 99 per cent of people are not rolling around drunk. The majority of club patrons are walking around the city in a fairly sober manner—chatting, dining and enjoying themselves.

A government member interjected.

Mrs SMITH: You've had your turn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I would remind the member for Mount Ommaney to not use the term 'you' and to direct her comments through the chair.

Mrs SMITH: I apologise. I actually was on the committee and I would like to put my point across and I am sure that other members will have an opportunity to have their say and give their view. In Cairns they had come up with local solutions for local problems and it was working well. Everyone from the mayor right through said they do not believe they have a problem and the problems they have identified they are addressing. Two of the clubs that had introduced ID scanning had helped police in relation to other crimes so it had worked quite well. That needs to be taken into consideration when we hear it said that so many people are in favour of these laws because that certainly was not the feeling in Cairns and it certainly was not the view of the submitters.

In relation to Labor's decision to cease collecting police data on the assault rates in our entertainment precincts after June 2015, Mr John Lynch, president of the Cairns City Liquor Safety Accord, said that he had data that was provided by Bob Norton, the former Cairns and hinterland hospital and healthcare chair, Dr Richard Stone and Professor Alan Clough from JCU, who was researching alcohol fuelled violence. They had collected the data from financial years 2013, 2014 and 2015. There were an average of 160 presentations per day to the hospital. From those 160 presentations, two to four on average were alcohol related. That is less than two per cent of total admissions. The next point that he makes is that of these only 20 per cent are related to licensed premises so that would make it .03 of one per cent of total admissions relate to licensed premises. At the Cairns hearing, Mr Lynch said—

The peak time of hospital admissions is from 11 pm to 12 am. In second place is 12 am to 1 am. In third place is 10 pm to 11 pm. In fourth place is 2 pm to 3 pm.

He talked further about some of the problems that they have in Cairns. He said that it is a reality that Cairns and surrounding areas have presentations of itinerant people drinking in public areas not related to the nightclubs. That is interesting, because the one thing that came through loud and clear from the police and, in particular, the hospitals was that there is no way to identify whether somebody who is presenting with an alcohol related issue comes from the suburbs or from the precinct. In the Cairns hearing, one of the nurses said that more alcohol related presentations come from the domestic situation. It is really important to remember that when considering this legislation.

In Townsville, one councillor said—

As for the impact on the local economy, I will not go into that. In relation to unemployment, Townsville already has a higher unemployment rate than many other areas in the state, especially in relation to youth unemployment.

I do not think anyone is denying Townsville's unemployment rate and youth unemployment rate. The councillor continued—

We have heard about the QNI refinery, but we also have fly-in fly-out workers in the mining industry. Such changes as proposed will result, in my opinion, in those employed in the precinct losing their jobs and putting a successful tourism hub at risk.

That sentiment was echoed by Councillor Bob Manning in Cairns.

In both areas, nightclub owners have come together to look for local solutions. Townsville was applauded for the fact that nightclub owners had come together of their own accord and stopped half-price drinks or two-for-one drinks, which is a practical solution. It shows that nightclub owners do care about their patrons and to indicate anything else is very irresponsible. As one nightclub owner indicated, they do not want undesirable people at their venues. It does not attract the crowd that they want and they want that dealt with very quickly. The third point that I make in relation to both Cairns and Townsville is the fantastic relationship that the owners have with the police, with whom they have worked on the safe precinct accord.

Ms Pease: What would you know about that? You didn't attend the tour.

Mr Furner: Did you go out?

Ms Pease: You didn't attend the tour of the precinct.

Mrs SMITH: I am really pleased that the members mentioned that; I thought it might come up. It is a shame that it had to, but I can tell members what happened. It was the Labor people who wanted to do that. We were quite happy to do it, but what people have not mentioned is the fact that our secretariat member fell ill and went to hospital.

Ms Pease: I was the one who looked after him, member for Mount Ommaney.

Mrs SMITH: He was not there at the hearing, was he, Joan? I was there.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Mount Ommaney, I ask you to refer to members by their correct title and direct your comments through the chair.

Mrs SMITH: It is interesting that they bring this up, because I sought advice about going out on that committee hearing. It would not have been regarded as a formal committee hearing. I suspect that it was a night out that they wanted to have on the taxpayers. I was not having a bar of that. I would not have a bar of that.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Natural Resources and member for Lytton, I am calling order. I am speaking. That does not give you the right to attempt to speak over the top of me. Member for Ferny Grove, do you have a point of order?

Mr FURNER: I do, Madam Deputy Speaker. I ask the member for Mount Ommaney to withdraw the inference that Labor members were out on the town on taxpayers' money. That is such a horrid statement. I want her to withdraw that terrible statement.

Mrs SMITH: I said suggested—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Mount Ommaney, you are not helping.

Mr Watts interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Toowoomba North, I am seeking advice. Member for Mount Ommaney, will you withdraw?

Mrs SMITH: I withdraw. I would like to say that—

Ms PEASE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I take personal offence at the comments of the—


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lytton, the member from Mount Ommaney has withdrawn the comment.

Mrs SMITH: As I was saying, it was unfortunate that our secretariat member became ill and had to go to hospital. I found out that it was not desirable that we attend a particular committee event without the secretariat, because it would not be classed as a formal issue. I do want to make that point because I think there were other insinuations, which I did not take offence to.

The bill does not address preloading, the use of illicit drugs and the alternative of partying in suburbs. In 2014, the former LNP government introduced the Safe Night Out Strategy following a considerable amount of consultation and public debate. The \$44.5 million strategy was a comprehensive plan dealing with alcohol and drug related violence that included more than 60 initiatives

designed to change the culture that has developed in Queensland and prevent further deaths from violence. It also focused on individual responsibilities, rather than punishing the majority of people who do the right thing for the sins of a few. I believe that the Safe Night Out Strategy should be given a chance to work, given all the time and consultation that was involved in putting it together. It is a comprehensive strategy that takes a multifaceted approach to addressing this issue of alcohol and drug related violence. Initial police data indicated that overall assaults had decreased by nine per cent, which would be in line with what was said by the chaplain in the Valley; sexual offences decreased by 18 per cent; property damage decreased by 10 per cent; and drug offences proactively detected by police had increased by 26 per cent across the 15 safe night out precincts in the 2014-15 financial year.

As I said before, I understand that across the community there may be differing views on this matter. However, as the mother of a teenager and two young adults, I have always held their best interests at heart and I believe that making this decision is in Queensland's best interests in the long run.

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (8.17 pm): This evening I start by commending the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. This evening, I am very proud to be here, debating this fundamental piece of legislation that the Palaszczuk Labor government has introduced, as the chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. Before I get into the threshold parts of my speech, I wish to commend a number of people. I would like to commend some of the committee members from the LNP. I listened to the contribution of the member for Mansfield, who spoke about a six-person committee. Unbeknown to him, the committee started as a subcommittee, because some members had prior commitments. For example, the member for Morayfield was on his honeymoon and the member for Gympie had prearranged an overseas holiday, and that is understandable. However, those commitments meant that the committee was reduced to a subcommittee. The subcommittee started by travelling to New South Wales and visiting Kings Cross, the Sydney CBD and Newcastle. I put on the record my appreciation and that of the subcommittee of the New South Wales police, representatives from St Vincent's Hospital emergency department, the New South Wales Legislative Assembly and the Hon. George Souris, the former chair of the New South Wales Law and Safety Committee.

In Newcastle the police division was outstanding in their demonstration of the peer review facts. They were uncontested by the subcommittee. The committee in its full composition did not contest the data that was presented to the subcommittee. Professor Kypri, who holds a Senior Brawn Research Fellowship with the School of Medicine and Public Health at the University of Newcastle, provided peer review expert evidence and data to the committee.

From there we returned to Brisbane. I extend my appreciation to the subcommittee for their time—the member for Beaudesert and the member for Lytton. They and I went out to Fortitude Valley from approximately midnight through to around 5 am. We put in a decent stint going around the safe night out precinct. We had a look at the watch house and the emergency department at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. We were escorted by Inspector Ray Brownhill from the Fortitude Valley police.

In Townsville Superintendent Glen Ketchell, Inspector Roger Whyte and Sergeant Mike Sands from the Townsville police showed us around. The member for Lytton, the local member for Townsville, and I were the only members who took up the opportunity of having a look at the Townsville safe night out precinct and seeing the good job they do. We concluded our inspection around 2.30 am.

At the Gold Coast hearing we did inspections of Broadbeach and Surfers Paradise. I thank Inspector Simon Chase and Acting Senior Sergeant Byrne, all committee members and Bernice Watson for their involvement in this inspection. I thank Greg Thomson for his involvement in the inspections.

I want to make special comment about a young fellow who was being interviewed by the media when we were on the Gold Coast. I speak of Tobias Ridolfi. He was the latest victim of an assault in a nightclub. I hear a lot of arguments put forward that no assaults are occurring in nightclubs. He is now blind in one eye as a result of a severe bashing in the SinCity Nightclub.

I return to referring to the peer review data that was provided to the committee. What we heard from the industry was, in my opinion, built on a house of cards based on assumption and hearsay. The Public Health Association of Australia provided data and indicated that data collection in Australian hospitals, ambulances and things like that could be improved. That is why we as a committee recommended that appropriate data be provided—not hearsay and assumptions provided by the industry. We want appropriate data to be available to us so we can make informed decisions in the future. The witness indicated, however, that there are significant trends in the data over time to show

that there are more problems with alcohol in both emergency departments and ambulances. We heard from a number of submitters that there is an overwhelming unreporting of data and information on this issue.

There have been two systematic reviews on the relationship between alcohol and harm. Both were considered by the committee. They were by Tim Stockwell and colleagues in 2009 and Hahn and colleagues in 2010. Stockwell actually reviewed and examined 49 unique studies from many countries concerning the effects of trading hours and violence. Studies which did not provide controls from other potential harms were excluded.

Among those, 11 report at least one significant outcome indicating adverse effects of increased hours or benefits from reduced hours. It concluded on the balance of reliable evidence that extended late-night trading hours lead to increased consumption and related harms. Conversely, if we reduce the hours it will reduce the harm in venues. There was significant evidence in 10 qualifying studies to conclude that increasing hours of sale by two or more hours increases alcohol related harms. Policies decreasing hours of sale by two hours or more at on-premises alcohol outlets may be effective strategies for preventing alcohol related harms.

A study in Perth in 2002 found that bars being permitted to trade just one or two hours extra after midnight double the right of late-night violent incidents reported to the police. A Norwegian study found that each additional one hour extension to the opening hours of premises selling alcohol was associated with a 16 per cent increase in violent crime.

Professor Kypri provided new and very recent data to the committee which demonstrated a comparison between rates of reported assaults in Kings Cross and the Sydney CBD. The overall fall in assault rates in Sydney was 20 per cent in the months after January 2014. In Kings Cross they fell by 45 per cent.

A 2015 study by Professor Gordian Fulde indicated that there was a significant reduction in the number of alcohol related serious injury and trauma presentations to the emergency department in the 12 months after the introduction of the new liquor regulations. This change was seen throughout the week but it was especially marked on weekends. He found there was a 24.8 per cent decrease in presentations resulting from alcohol related injury when compared to 2013.

I turn now to the public costs. Professor Najman indicated at the Brisbane hearing—and I think these are reasonable questions to ask—

To what extent should we be using public funds to reduce the harm created by a private industry? To what extent are we as taxpayers obliged to pay for doctors, for nurses, for public health people, for a whole range of community health workers, to do things because commercial enterprises want to proliferate and increase their hours of sale?

They are reasonable questions to ask and they are reasonable matters to raise before a committee.

At the hearing Professor Kypri compared the cost and benefit of the proposed interventions with those for other health outcomes. He stated—

To achieve a 20 per cent change in assault rates, compared with my colleagues working in cancer prevention, those numbers are unheard of.

At the Brisbane hearing Ms Olsson from the RBWH appeared with the Queensland Nurses' Union. She indicated that from September 2014 to September 2015 they required security assistance 1,798 times in the emergency department alone. Three-quarters of those were secondary to alcohol related incidents.

Mr Tony Brown referred the committee to a study which indicated the cost of alcohol abuse in Australia was \$36 billion per annum. Dr David Rosengren said a yet-to-be-published snapshot survey of emergency departments across Australia and New Zealand at 11 pm on 26 January this year for 'incidents of alcohol association' attendance found Queensland recorded the second highest incidence in Australia of 19 per cent.

I turn to the impact on police. Cairns and Townsville police indicated to the committee that dealing with alcohol affected people had become their core business. Police are taken away from their real functions of protecting our society from criminals to babysitting intoxicated young adults and, in the process, being assaulted themselves. How much crime could be solved if they did not have to perform this? Police overwhelming support these laws as well.

The President of the Queensland Police Union of Employees, Ian Leavers, provided the committee at its hearing on the Gold Coast an explanation of his campaign which commenced in 2009. It is a campaign with the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons to change the violence mixed with

alcohol consumption. He indicated to the committee that he was sick and tired of police being belted senselessly day in and day out. It is too much. Sadly, police officers are being assaulted on a regular basis far more often.

Mr Leavers also went on to express his experience in terms of the impact on police resources. He indicated that in terms of safe night precincts they were funded up to \$5 million a year for Surfers Paradise, the Valley and Townsville. He referred to it as a bandaid solution. Former premier Campbell Newman offered \$20 million to fund that but that money was never forthcoming. There was a drain on police resources around the state. To put extra police into one of the precincts—and he referred to Airlie Beach—it meant police needed to travel from Mackay, which is 130 to 140 kilometres south. This is not feasible.

In relation to the impact on business, it was submitted to the hearing that ‘there may be an initial reduction in the number of licensed premises and jobs, but an altering night-time economy will see the introduction of new types of lower risk premises, which in turn will see jobs and revenue figures strengthen’. There is evidence that young people in Newcastle are now spending more money in the night-time economy in that city than they did prior to 2008, when the reforms came in. In the Sydney CBD, the number of licensed premises has increased by 13 per cent and the number of licensed premises has more than doubled in Newcastle. To put this into perspective for Queensland licensees, there are approximately 7,300 licensees in Queensland and only 105 licensees, or 1.4 per cent, have approval to trade between 3 am and 5 am.

Professor Wayne Hall indicated that the alcohol industry argues that ‘the one-way door will shut down Queensland’s night life and reduce tourist numbers’. He referred to a study by the National Local Government Drug and Alcohol Advisory Committee which ‘found that between 2009 and 2011 there was a 9.6 per cent decline in “drink” sales revenue in Newcastle after the restrictions were introduced but this was offset by a 10.3 per cent increase in revenue from “food” sales’. There is a balance in delivery and return to savings in these particular areas where this has been tried and tested.

I congratulate the Katter’s Australian Party for their support on this bill and the amendments they put forward, because the committee did hear examples of the need to consider some measures to make sure that time is permitted for the introduction of these laws.

I would like to turn to one particular argument about the effect on the music industry. I would like to refer to a good friend of mine who is a strong musician, Ali Gibbs. She put a blog on Facebook recently indicating that some venue owners have stated their opposition to these law changes, saying it will destroy Brisbane’s live music scene. She said—

I would recommend these venue owners, many of them musicians themselves, consider the culture of the live music scene being too closely linked with the sale of alcohol. Then they would realise that as venues with the objective of promoting live music and using acts as a drawcard for more alcohol consumption they destroyed it a long time ago.

A recent Galaxy poll indicated that 74 per cent of Queenslanders want these changes. No argument should be permitted to accept these laws based on the number of submissions received.

The question is: do we have a problem? Dr Green from the emergency department on the Gold Coast informed the committee that alcohol is the ‘most pervasive drug in society’. He is correct. Alcohol is a legalised drug and is preferred amongst all society.

I would like to refer to a DANTE executive summary researched by Professor Miller that was tabled and provided to the committee—once again, peer reviewed evidence that is uncontested. It examines in length what has happened after the reforms. In Newcastle, for example, there are now more than 12.6 per cent of people who go out more than weekly. With regard to the amount of alcohol consumed before going out—this goes to the argument about preloading, which is certainly a federal government matter that needs to be resolved; it is not a state government matter other than changing hours—in Newcastle, 37.1 per cent do not have any, 37.8 per cent have one to five drinks, 19.1 per cent have six to 10 drinks and so on. Overwhelmingly, the type of alcohol consumed is beer—heavy—at 31.8 per cent. Why do they pre-drink? Because of the price and the ability of people to get into nightclubs after they preload where the RSAs are allowing that to occur.

I was asked on the Steve Austin program in one radio interview why I believe the LNP stands in the way of these laws. At that particular time in that interview I said that I have a suspicion. Steve Austin asked, ‘What is that suspicion?’

Mr Crandon: Here it comes.

Mr FURNER: That is right. Here it comes. Bring it on. I will table a document by the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education. It refers to the alcohol industry donating \$408,000 plus more to major Queensland political parties. But, out of that \$408,000, \$374,000, or 92 per cent, went to the Liberal National Party. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Document, dated January 2015, titled 'Alcohol Industry Donations to Queensland Political Parties: 2011-12 to 2013-14' [179].

You can draw your own conclusions on that basis. I had my suspicions, but I am not going to draw on those suspicions.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr FURNER: I want to go to a person who generally supports those opposite, and I am referring to Wendy Francis from the Australian Christian Lobby. A recent press announcement states—

... Wendy Francis said the lock-out laws were a natural extension to the current Safe Night Out strategy.

"The LNP could have included the Lock-Out laws as part of the Safe Night Out Strategy. It decided at the time to ignore advice from the expert panel it established to review lock-out laws.

"It now has the opportunity to rectify the situation by getting behind the Labor government.

Get behind the Labor government! Listen to your friends from the ACL.

I want to refer to a substitute member on the committee and that is, no doubt, the member for Moggill. The LNP's Dr Christian Rowan has really sold out his profession, his colleagues and the families of Moggill for political gain.

Dr ROWAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find the member's comments personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr FURNER: I withdraw. The Palaszczuk government has introduced legislation that can decrease violence and make the community safer. This evidence has been presented to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, and those proposed laws have the backing of numerous proponents, people like the Australian Medical Association Queensland, the Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Law Society, the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, the Metro North Hospital and Health Service, the Public Health Association of Australia, the Australasian Professional Society on Alcohol and Other Drugs, the Queensland Police Union of Employees and the Queensland Nurses' Union.

The member for Moggill has ignored the evidence presented to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. He has ignored evidence in the medical literature—the entire basis of his profession. He has ignored the Australasian Professional Society on Alcohol and Other Drugs, of which he is a member. In fact, he is probably the only alcohol and addiction specialist in Queensland not supporting this bill. This disgraced former head of AMAQ has ignored his colleagues and his own professional society.

Dr ROWAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find the member's comments personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr FURNER: I withdraw. Worst of all, he has completely and repeatedly ignored his duty as a medical professional to progress his selfish political career.

Dr ROWAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr Crandon: You're a disgrace. Now we know why you're no longer in Canberra.

Mr FURNER: You'll never make it there, sunshine, ever!

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! This is a very heated debate. Let's try to make it to the end of the evening.

Mr FURNER: I am doing fine, Madam Deputy Speaker. The member has stated publicly that he will not support this policy—

Dr ROWAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Again, I ask the member to withdraw. I find his comments personally offensive.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Ferny Grove to withdraw and I ask you to desist from making remarks that could be considered personally offensive. You are obviously inviting the interjections that are being made.


Mr FURNER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I had withdrawn. I do not know what—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could I ask you to—

Mr FURNER: I do withdraw whatever I had to withdraw. The member has stated publicly that he will not support this policy because they ignored other factors contributing to violence. So we cannot reduce the violence caused by alcohol because we are not addressing all drugs. By this same logic he would not support a cure for 30 per cent of cancers, in my opinion, because it did not also address heart disease.

The LNP's policy is inconsistent with their interstate counterparts and the professions of their members. They have sold out the safety of the young people of Queensland, the medical professionals, parents' peace of mind and the safety of our front-line emergency workers.

In conclusion, for the sake of those family members of Col Miller and Trevor Duroux and the spouse of Melissa Abdo, do not let this opportunity pass you by, be on the right side of history and support this bill.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (8.39 pm): There were 767 submissions to this bill and the vast majority were against the bill. What we have seen from the member for Ferny Grove tonight in the way of his personal attacks on the member for Moggill, his selective use of statistics and false analogies is the way that this mob over there govern. They do not have the evidence or the gumption to put together a strong case so they resort to vicious personal attacks on a reputable member of the medical profession, a member of this parliament, that are irrelevant to the consideration of this bill, and they insult the vast majority of submitters to this inquiry who oppose this bill. They insult the intelligence of those submitters who are against this bill.

Mr Furner interjected.

Mr Bennett interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! I ask the member for Ferny Grove and the member for Burnett to cease having conversations across the chamber. If you wish to have a conversation, please take it outside the chamber. The member for Beaudesert has the call. Can we please afford respect to members who are speaking so that they can be heard.

Mr KRAUSE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The key issue in this inquiry is one that the committee unanimously agreed on, and that is there is a need for more evidence on this issue. The evidence on all sides of the equation is equivocal. There is a need for proper data collection by all agencies of government to assess the impact of alcohol in relation to police violence and hospital admissions. That is what the recommendation agreed to by all members of the committee determined. That is the key to understanding this inquiry and that recommendation.

In this inquiry we heard evidence in Cairns that most alcohol related injuries occur in the home, not in the precinct. I refer to the evidence given by Mr John Lynch in Cairns, which the member for Mount Ommaney referred to earlier. They have data from financial years 2013, 2014 and 2015 where they have about 160 presentations a day to the hospital. From those 160-odd presentations, two to four, on average, are alcohol related—less than two per cent. Of those, only 20 per cent are related to licensed premises. From the licensed premises in the CBD of Cairns that are most affected by this bill, the injuries coming to hospital that are related to that precinct are 0.3 per cent.

We heard from the emergency department at the RBH in Brisbane, although this did not make it into the report, on the night we went there as a committee that the peak time for admissions for alcohol related injuries was between about 11 pm to about 1 or 1.30 am, not 3 am, not 5 am, not at any of the times that are affected by this bill—not any of the times affected by the winding back of hours or the lockouts in this bill.

We also heard that violence in our club precincts has declined over the last few years. In particular, I refer to the evidence from Reverend Lance Mergard, whom we met during our trip to the Valley on 20 December from 12.30 am to 5 am. Reverend Mergard says he majors in vomit and blood. He has seen it all in the years he has worked in the precinct helping people out, and he urges the government to take a multifaceted approach. Interestingly, Reverend Mergard says that a lockout could make things worse by squeezing more people out onto the streets at an earlier time. He is backed by other witnesses, too. The inquiry heard from witnesses about that.

This gentleman specialises in helping out in situations of sickness and illness. As he puts it, he responds to people 'when they start to make silly decisions'. He says that the violence has decreased and the steps of the Bligh government, to their credit, with drink safe precincts, carried on by the

Newman government with the safe night out initiatives, have worked to decrease the incidence of alcohol related violence in the Valley. He said that the incidence of violence in the Valley is far less than three, four, five or six years ago.

There are so many conflicting views on this from academics, police, ambos, people like Lance Mergard, hoteliers, DJs and patrons whom we heard from. In particular, when you refer to DJs and other people involved in the industry, they give compelling evidence in Cairns, Townsville and Airlie Beach about the impact it will have on their livelihoods and the impact it will have on their local cultures. The committee unanimously agrees that we need more information on this. It has been announced today by the government that it will be conducting a review after two years. It should not be legislating until it has the information right. It is irresponsible for the government to legislate before it has the evidence right. It has admitted in its policy proposal today that it will undertake a review after 18 months or two years because it does not have the evidence right now.

The member for Ferny Grove is the chairman of the committee, some of whose members are government members, and he has recommended that we get more information on this issue. Most submissions were against, but in addition we heard many submissions that we do not need a one-size-fits-all approach to dealing with issues of excess alcohol consumption and violence. In Cairns there was not one witness who attended the public hearing—not even the member for Cairns attended the public hearing—to support this legislation. We know the member for Cairns does not support the legislation, but he has been strongarmed into voting for it tonight.

Mr Dickson interjected.

Mr KRAUSE: The member for Cairns has been strongarmed into voting for this legislation tonight. In Cairns not one single person supported this legislation. Do members know why? Because they took proactive steps five or six years ago to address the issues they had in relation to violence or excess alcohol consumption in their precincts.

Ms Pease: At a huge cost to taxpayers.

Mr KRAUSE: I take the interjection from the member for Lytton because, when they started doing it, it was not at a huge cost to taxpayers. They did it of their own accord, it was voluntary and they sorted out their own issue on a local basis.

The Cairns hoteliers and the Cairns community do not want these lockout laws, because through their liquor accord and their safe night out board they have resolved their issues. All the evidence was that the issue of alcohol fuelled violence is under control in Cairns and they have worked out a solution to deal with it. I have spoken about the evidence from the Cairns Hospital in relation to the cause of alcohol admissions. In Townsville there was very limited support for this bill.

The bill does not address the issues of preloading, drug use or human behaviours. I am flabbergasted to see that the government has not got behind the concept of mandatory ID scanners in our precincts so that we can have a mechanism to ban people who are behaving badly and who are causing violence from those precincts. When the subcommittee went to the Valley in December we visited one of the clubs that has implemented ID scanners, and we heard evidence that they were able to ban people from all the other clubs in Brisbane which have those scanners in place. In fact, they can ban people who have misbehaved from all other parts of Australia if they are linked into that system. They say that it has worked incredibly well in keeping people who are causing trouble out of their club. They did not have any issue, as was flagged by the Attorney-General in her second reading speech, about the time taken for people to have their ID scanned. In fact, they welcomed the opportunity to scan their ID and they said that patrons welcomed it as well, because they knew it was a mechanism to keep the bad people out so they could have a good and safe night out. I do not know why the government is not getting behind the concept of mandatory ID scanning.

There are criminal law changes that need to be looked at in relation to behavioural issues. I note that Labor when in opposition last term opposed our introduction of an unlawful strike causing death offence. It is on the record. They divided and opposed the introduction of that new offence which gives some legal teeth in the criminal justice system to people who are going about unlawful striking causing death.

We need cultural change—I make no bones about that—but the cultural change is about the responsible use of alcohol and people taking responsibility for their actions. We need education about that, and that was part of the safe night out initiative. I am very disappointed to see that that has not been adopted by the new government. We need more data, and that was the committee's

recommendation. We need legislation that is not one size fits all because what may be needed in the Fortitude Valley, the Gold Coast or wherever else you talk about may not fit another area like Cairns, Townsville, Airlie Beach or the Sunshine Coast. We need to recognise that drug use, preloading and behavioural factors are just as important—if not more so—as trading hours.

In the time that I have left—well, I have plenty of time available—I want to mention a couple of other aspects that are being included in the bill tonight. I refer in particular to the provisions that were drawn out of the private member's bill introduced by the member for Mansfield in 2015—the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill—especially the provisions relating to craft brewing. From a local member's perspective, I have a number of craft brewers in my electorate and I welcome the government's support for the introduction of provisions that will allow craft brewers to be able to sell their product in more venues.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr KRAUSE: We have the Scenic Rim Brewery and the Beard and Brau brewery at Tamborine. They are very small businesses and this will enable them to take their product along to small markets and get their product out there and grow some small business, and that is a good thing. So I welcome the government's support for that tonight.

I also mention a local issue in relation to trading hours generally of licensed premises. In my electorate, there have been some approvals in recent times for 3 am trading hours in rural and semirural locations. On the one hand we have a government talking about reducing trading hours, but on the other hand one of their bureaucracies is actually approving 3 am trading hours for rural and semirural locations—where there is very little demand for that, there is no public transport and there are limited police and ambulance services. Almost all of the submissions from the public are against those extended trading hours and I do not understand why the OLGR has approved them. I think the OLGR needs to go back and look at that. It shows that the government is going in the wrong direction by allowing those extended trading hours applications to go ahead when no-one is actually in support of them—apart from the hoteliers—and while on the other hand they are trying to wind back hours more generally.

The government need to listen to local concerns, just as they need to listen to the people of Cairns and Townsville who do not want the provisions of the reduction in trading hours to come into effect because they have got effective local solutions. They need to listen to the local people in my electorate and in other electorates when they make submissions about applications for extending trading hours because it has got to be horses for courses. Some places are suited to extended trading hours but some are not. We need to have localised solutions and local decisions that take into account all of those factors.

On that note, I make the point that the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming, who is the head of the agency that makes the decisions about that, appeared at a public hearing on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill and he conceded that he was not even involved in much of the consultation about the tackling alcohol fuelled violence bill. That just shows the limited scope and the closed scope of consultation that the government undertook in relation to the tackling alcohol fuelled violence bill. If the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming is not even involved in that consultation, then what sort of consultation is it? He is the chief decision-maker about liquor and gaming hours.

I think I have made my position clear in relation to the bill. We need more information. The government needs to take account of local factors in a better way, and I commend that recommendation to the House. I will not be supporting the bill tonight.



Mr CRAWFORD (Barron River—ALP) (8.52 pm): I rise tonight to talk about alcohol fuelled violence and to support the government's bill before the House this evening. I have stood in this House a number of times and referred to my 15 years as a front-line paramedic with both the Queensland and the Victorian ambulance services. I feel to date that there is no speech that I have done that is more relevant, more important and more pertinent to my background than this one. There are very few people in this House who have literally seen what happens on our streets in the middle of the night—who have been there and not only witnessed it but who have had to put up with it, who have had to see it, who have had to smell it, who have had to touch it, who have had to put their hands in people's chests to try to keep them alive, who have had to deal with bystanders who have been trying to assault you and threatening to cause you harm, and who have had to deal with other agencies and the like.

For 15 years I worked an average of four to six shifts per week and probably two or three of those were night shifts, and generally it is fair to say that when we are debating this bill we are talking about the middle of the night. I have read the reports. I have heard the evidence. I have heard what has been said tonight. I have heard a lot of statistics.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr CRAWFORD: Thank you. I take that interjection. There were a lot of statistics, but I have heard nothing that has convinced me. We have heard that task forces and local efforts have worked to reduce the amount of violence, and that is great. I heard the Attorney-General say that the number of alcohol related assaults in Cairns has reduced from 266 down to 257. I have heard people say how fantastic that is. That is 257 people who still got assaulted. That is 16 alcohol related sexual offences that still occurred—and this is just Cairns. Over the years that those statistics came from—2014 and 2015—I attended many of those cases myself. I was there. No-one else in this House was. I was there. I dealt with it. I put up with it. I saw it. How many assaults per night are we going to decide as a House is acceptable? Is it 100? Is it 50? Is it one? I say it is none, because my fellow comrades—and I will call them comrades; the paramedics out there working right now on the streets of Brisbane and across Queensland—are out there dealing with this right now. How many is enough for us to say enough is enough?

I want to commend the Attorney-General, Minister Lynham and the Premier for the stance they have taken on this. I support this 100 per cent. Governments must take the lead. We must set the bar and we must set it at a standard so that others will follow.

I have been verbally threatened with my life. I have been threatened physically, often by a drunk, most times by a drunk, well-meaning friend of an intoxicated person often found lying in a gutter. I was there to help you. I was there to sort you out. I was there to patch your wounds and pick up the contents of your handbag that had been strewn all over the pavement—your lipstick, credit cards, money and everything. I was there to cover your exposed personal areas from the dozens of onlookers who were there for a cheap look. I was there to help you call your mum because your phone was broken or stolen or you had no credit, so I used my phone to call your mum only to find out you were 17 years old and your mum did not even know you were out, yet you had a whole heap of nightclub stamps on your arm. What is the answer to that?

Why is it that when your friends arrive on the scene they want to punch me instead of trying to help me? They want to abuse me. They want to threaten me. One of them even said that they will find me and kill me, that they will find my kids and kill my kids, that they will find my home and hurt me. Why is it that people do that? And I am speaking from actual memory. Why is it that people would spit on me or try to encourage the crowd that has developed around us to jump the ambos and teach them a thing or two when I was called there to help you, called there to try to sort this out for you? The next day people have a great excuse; they blame the alcohol, 'I'm sorry. I didn't really mean it. I was drunk. I had too much to drink. It wasn't really my fault.' I am sick of apologies. I have had enough.

As I said before, I have done hundreds of night shifts on the streets of Cairns, and I heard the many references to Cairns earlier and I thank honourable members for those. However, I am the one here who can speak with credibility about the streets of Cairns because I have been there more times than anybody else. I want to address Cairns for a second. We do have a problem. I heard a statement before that Cairns does not have a problem. Cairns does have a problem. The Cairns streets are dangerous. I would not walk them late at night. Many of my friends are police and they say to me that they would not walk them late at night. This misbelief that Cairns is a safe place after hours—it is not. The Cairns I know and the Cairns I want to know is one that embraces tourism: one that embraces overseas and domestic visitors, families, couples and groups. It is not marketed as a drinking destination for people who want to do shots until 5 am. If that is what people want, I urge them to not come to my city but to go somewhere else; they are not welcome. I do not want to have to walk the footpaths where the blood drips from their broken noses line the streets at 3 am like a breadcrumb trail to find them. I do not want to step over their vomit in the doorway of a business that takes on a fine aroma once the sun comes up.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr CRAWFORD: I heard someone say that every town has that, and that is exactly what we are talking about. Those people should go somewhere else so I do not have to step over them lying dangerously in the street at sunrise covered in their own urine, luckily, maybe finding that their wallet has not been stolen.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr CRAWFORD: I am not saying that we should close business at eight o'clock at night.

I want to recognise the Leader of the Opposition for a statement he made in 2010. The Attorney-General commented a bit on this before, but I want to pull out a couple of sentences. He stated—

Through my travels around the state I have been horrified and disgusted to see the results that a night of alcohol and crowds has on local communities. The rubbish, the stench and the general disarray that greets people as the sun rises the morning after a night out is disgraceful and is not something that anyone should have to confront.


...

That happens in not only Townsville but also Mackay, Cairns and our major provincial centres. Tourists and a range of people are out there trying to enjoy the morning and they are confronted with that. They are confronted with something like that, and it is not a pretty sight.

That was the Leader of the Opposition. In 2016 things have not changed much, yet we are essentially having the same conversations as he had in 2010.

Let me conclude. I want to give huge praise to everyone who is out there on the streets right now and who will be over the coming days, weeks and months working or volunteering to curb this scourge: the ambos, the fireys, the coppers, the Salvation Army, the chaplains—everyone out there—especially the ambos who do a great job. I support them 100 per cent. I say thanks to the police who try to be everywhere, pick up the pieces night after night and try to keep the streets safe knowing that the next night they will have to go back out there and do it all over again; and to the emergency department staff—not just the doctors and nurses, but the administration staff, the security and the cleaners—who deal with endless alcohol abuse and aggression night after night in every single one of our emergency departments. They then go home to their own families and try to enjoy some sort of normal family life.

Alcohol fuelled violence cannot be reduced in stats by a few digits so we can give ourselves a pat on the back and move on. We must end it. We must end it soon. Around the corner is the next punch, king-hit, coward punch or rape. It is simply a matter of time. I joined the paramedics to save lives and for 15 years I did that with my hands. But tonight I get to be part of something special: making a larger difference to save countless lives and prevent incalculable carnage. All I have to do is sit in my seat and vote with the government on this bill, a government which I commend for taking this bold step of change. I commend the bill.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (9.04 pm): I rise to speak on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill. This is about balancing the primary responsibility of governments legislating and regulating for community interests. The point here is that we live in a society that values individual autonomy and freedom. We dislike paternalism, which is implicit in this government's proposed lockdown laws. There is a danger in treating our population as infants, as children incapable of making their own decisions. Nanny-state regulations and bureaucratic red tape are becoming an increasingly significant barrier to a vibrant Australian culture. This Labor government has a love of both. The key question is: what should be the role of the state and, more precisely, the role of the government?

When we approach legislation we should ask ourselves: what do we want to achieve? Can we achieve this with the tools we have? What is the best and most prudent way to achieve our goals? In this legislation we owe it to Queenslanders to be very honest when assessing the data and not cherry-pick to suit the causes of individuals no matter how worthy their sentiment. This is where the government has got it wrong. There is no convincing evidence that these laws can achieve what the government has been promising. Once again, the government has come up with a proposal that is one dimensional and narrow—proposals that are designed purely to appease the wishes of the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. If the government truly wanted to tackle alcohol fuelled violence, as shown in our night precincts, it would have embraced a multifaceted approach. That multifaceted approach was being realised under the Safe Night Out Strategy. It followed months of consultation and discussion about the issue of alcohol and drug related violence. The \$44.5 million strategy was a comprehensive plan that included more than 60 initiatives—initiatives which were designed to change the culture that has developed in Queensland. It also focused on individual responsibility. It did not seek to punish the majority of people who do the right thing for the sins of the few.

In my own experience as a councillor on the Gympie Regional Council I saw the success of liquor accords. They did not require these nanny-state lockdown laws. The liquor accords were developed with clear and detailed input from local hoteliers, owners of licensed premises, police and council to achieve local solutions to real or potential issues. As I said earlier, we owe it to Queenslanders to be very honest

when assessing the data and not cherry-pick to suit the causes of individuals, no matter how worthy their sentiment. There is no reliable data on which to base the legislation—so much so that the committee has had to recommend that the government start collecting data now. There are no grounds on which the government can honestly argue that the data is there to support its position.

The figures presented to the committee did not come from Queensland. They did not reflect our unique position as a decentralised state. In many cases the figures were quite old. They were not able to establish the relationship between people arriving at emergency departments and alcohol related violence. When we visited New South Wales, the committee was advised by Mr George Souris, the minister who introduced the New South Wales laws, that the laws were specifically targeted for the Kings Cross and Newcastle experiences. They were targeted for only certain areas. He pointed out that it was not a statewide approach and cautioned us about implementing a statewide approach in Queensland.

Different communities have different needs, expectations, demographics and conditions. The explanatory notes stated that alcohol is related to around 3,000 deaths and 65,000 hospitalisations each year Australia-wide. The Attorney-General's own department confirmed to the committee that those figures are from a Melbourne study that is more than 15 years old. They also confirmed that nowhere do those figures specify the relationship between those hospitalisations and alcohol related violence. Dr David Rosengren, the Chair of the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, Queensland faculty, confirmed to the committee that—

... there is an absolute lack of clear and definite data around many of the arguments that have been put forward ... It is close to impossible for us to truly quantify the impact of alcohol on the community simply because we do not have any mechanisms, certainly in the health system in Queensland, to actually record it or document it with any certainty. Therefore, to rely on arguments of absolute evidence for and against is significantly challenging, as is often the case with many of our public community health and safety initiatives that we have tackled as complex problems in the past.

The government is using questionable data to justify its approach. Only last week we saw Dr Don Weatherburn, the director of the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, contradict the oft-quoted claim that lockdown laws in New South Wales have caused a reduction in assaults. He pointed out that assaults had already been declining long before the lockdown laws and that the reduction was a continuation of that downward trend. This is a complex issue which requires a multidimensional approach. The government is fixated on the magic silver bullet. They are looking for a direct, effortless and immediate solution to a problem. They are being simplistic and populist in creating the illusion of a miraculous fix by way of their magic wand. They are not being genuine with the families of Queensland. If they were genuine, then there would be no exemptions for casino precincts. There would be one rule throughout the state for all precincts.

The government would have addressed the issue of displacement, of moving the problem from one area to another, of the culture of violence, of the need for night-time public transport and of ID scanners. They would have addressed the problem of preloading. Only last week I heard on the radio that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines told a meeting in North Queensland that lockdown laws will help to reduce preloading. I heard the Attorney-General claim that people will go to these bars and nightclubs earlier. I suggest that this legislation will be useless in tackling preloading.

If the government really wanted to tackle violence it would address the issue of recreational, illicit and synthetic drug fuelled violence. It would give weight to the survey from the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education which identified the top four initiatives needed to address issues around excessive alcohol consumption: increasing penalties for people involved in alcohol related violence; closed-circuit television in and around licensed premises; increasing police numbers at times and places where alcohol related violence is greater; and more public transport options in areas where there are pubs, clubs and bars. If the government is genuine in its intentions, then it would reconsider and reinstate the key elements of the Safe Night Out Strategy which provided multidimensional solutions to the task. This government cannot help itself. It somehow believes that creating unnecessary regulation is providing good government. It somehow believes that government is about interfering, and it believes it is not necessary to back up its measures with proper research and evidence.

It is the same with the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015. I want to confine my remarks to campdrafting. I have had a long association with campdrafting, which is another community based activity which showcases the wide variety of skills within regional Australia. Currently for other than a small regional show a community liquor permit, or CLP, must be obtained if alcohol is to be sold. A CLP can only be granted if the commissioner is satisfied that the proceeds will go to the benefit of the community, and the event must start and end on the same

day. The bill seeks to put campdrafting on the same footing as a small regional show, so that alcohol may be sold for campdrafting fundraising events that go on for more than eight hours and are held up to three consecutive days. A small regional show does not need to obtain a CLP, even if it sells alcohol for more than eight hours and it lasts a number of days. Campdrafting events are also often held over multiple days and tend to sell alcohol for more than eight hours.

Government members have opposed introducing a liquor permit exemption for campdrafting events. They have argued that the exemption would not create a responsible atmosphere for the service of alcohol and would not be an appropriate influence on the amount of alcohol consumed at these events. Campdrafting is family orientated, it is run by reputable people and it largely self-regulates. During the committee's deliberations I specifically asked the Department of Justice and Attorney-General for evidence. Let me quote the exchange. I asked—


Is the Department aware of any problems currently occurring in relation to the sale of or availability of alcohol at campdrafting events?

Guess what the executive director of the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulations said. He replied—

No. We have no evidence of any problems there. They are largely family-type events, so we generally do not have problems with those sorts of events.

Once again we have a government seeking to regulate where there has been no evidence of any problem. All of us here want to do the right thing, but regulating for the sake of regulating creates more problems. Treating Queenslanders like juveniles is not doing the right thing. Creating a nanny state is not doing the right thing. Not letting communities take control when they know the nature and extent of their local issues is not doing the right thing. Legislating and regulating without any clear evidence of problems is not doing the right thing. You cannot do the right thing if you are not given correct and accurate data. You cannot fix this complex problem with piecemeal solutions.

We owe it to all those not-for-profit hardworking campdraft committees to reject the government's recommendations to remove the exemption for campdrafting in the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Bill. We owe it to all Queenslanders to reject the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Mr Deputy Speaker, I stand by the LNP's Safe Night Out Strategy as the best method to reduce alcohol fuelled violence in this state.

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (9.13 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise in this place to give my contribution on the issue of alcohol fuelled violence. I have spoken on this previously in 2015 when I articulated the impacts of some of the things I have seen during my previous role as an intensive care paramedic with the Queensland Ambulance Service proudly serving the people of the northern region for a little over 25 years—a role, albeit not with the same skill set, that I continue to perform now as an unpaid volunteer in the role of honorary officer attached to the Kirwan Ambulance Station in the Thuringowa electorate. People may ask why I would continue with that role now that I am a member of government. My answer is very simple: it allows me to look after people and, importantly, keep in touch with the coalface and the very people who deliver a professional service and provide aid to the injured in the line of duty. It is our paramedics who, amongst others, have to endure the side effects of alcohol fuelled violence. We only have to look at the rising incidence of assaults on paramedics to see there is a clear crossover with alcohol fuelled violence. Let me paint a scene for those paying attention in the House.

Paramedics are on their knees providing aid to a young man who is lying on a footpath at what is clearly a chaotic scene. There is noise from loud music pumping from inside the nightclub on Flinders Street very late on a Friday night. Police nearby are trying to bring a sense of calm as mostly intoxicated bystanders surround the scene. They are angry, frustrated and some just want to fight the person who 'did this'. That action would most likely just lead to another victim. But on that footpath a young man lies unconscious and bleeding from facial and head wounds with a likely traumatic brain injury. He is now vomiting. If untreated and if he survives he may go through life with a form of disability that is commonly called—and correctly diagnosed as—an acquired brain injury. How strangely apt that we now have to accept there is a name for these patients who are the victims of drunken and possibly drug affected individuals who are out there just to get drunk, brawl, fight and show how tough they are to their friends. My God, Mr Speaker, our society needs a wake-up call. This cannot go on. It is completely unacceptable to allow this behaviour to continue, because if we do nothing it becomes accepted behaviour.

As someone who forms government I will not accept this behaviour. I implore this House to take a cold, hard look at the facts. We have had deaths on our streets throughout this state because—and solely because—of alcohol fuelled violence. Collectively as a government, which rightly should put the

public safety for its citizens paramount, we cannot allow this situation to continue. I ask that fellow members in this House please think long and hard about any decisions they will make that go against the core fundamental values of ensuring a safe and just society. Please check your moral compass when you enter this place, and I hope that it points you in the direction of common sense. We know that over 70 per cent of Queenslanders want change. Parents want to know that when their children go out at night they will come home safely. I know that feeling because, like many of you in this place, I am the parent of a 19-year-old. If he does go out into the drink safe precinct his mother and I will be constantly checking with him via his mobile phone, asking if he is okay and waiting up until he gets home. We should not—nor should any parent—need to stress about our loved ones going out for what they hope will be a good night out with their friends.

I come back to that scene. After vital signs are checked, intravenous lines put in, bleeding controlled and medication drawn up, should the worst happen and the patient starts to have a seizure, he is packaged up and wheeled to the ambulance. Some intoxicated person then comes in to spark up the scene, pushing and grabbing the paramedic as he is simply trying to get the patient into the safety of the ambulance and get out of there. The stress of that environment is not nice. As we have seen recently and as is often the case, these patients will wake up, if the injury allows, and want to fight the paramedic inside the ambulance—fists flying, kicking, ripping out IV lines. He just wants to fight. Is it hypoxia, lack of oxygen? Is he combative because of a brain injury? It is a bit too early to tell. Police are requested. The patient is subdued and sedated and, in this case, transported to the Townsville Hospital for scans and a night of observation.

I know this case well because it was mine just a few years ago. I go back to the station some time later to change my shirt due to the blood from him pulling out his IV line. Police ask if I want to fill out an assault form. On that occasion I choose not to, thinking he was hypoxic from that lack of oxygen and that just impeded his judgement. But in my time I have filled out quite a few assault forms.


The worst thing about doing that Friday night job is returning to the nightclub strip another four times, well into the hours of Saturday morning, to back up other crews called to pick up drunken, intoxicated, vomiting or unconscious patrons. From my experience, after a shift like that, just the thought of having to go back on Saturday night and repeat it is sometimes all too hard. It is a tough, demanding, sometimes horrible, stressful job when over the years you see the same thing, shift after shift. I feel for my peers who continue to do this.

Hopefully with a change in these laws there will be a reduction in these cases, but only time will tell. The evidence I see from the changes in New South Wales and other countries that have implemented changes to address the issue is a sure and telling sign that lockout and liquor laws, reduction of hours and common sense will and in fact do make a change for the better and point us in the right direction as a society that is indeed the correct course to chart.

Luckily, the patient I previously described does survive without a traumatic brain injury. He does not need to live on a disability pension due to having an acquired brain injury, but there is a cost to society—the ambulance response, the police response, the night in hospital, the scans, the nursing and medical staff who look after him. If he does have an acquired brain injury, he goes into an intensive care unit and is intubated and ventilated at a cost of over \$2,000 a night. The cost from his length of stay in the hospital as he is rehabilitated is enormous. He does not have an income due to his injury and his time off work. His life will have changed forever. From some reports, looking after just one head injured patient like that can cost up to \$12 million over the course of a lifetime of care.

I note with interest the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Southern Downs, in this place in 1992, 2005 and 2010 asking that the issue be addressed and debated in the House. In fact, in 2010 he went on an early morning run while in Townsville, came across a stench and witnessed drunken people coming out of nightclubs on Flinders Street as the sun was rising. He said that we needed to address that. The member for Southern Downs now has the opportunity to add his views, hopefully in a positive manner, to this debate.

I would also ask opposition members, particularly the members for Gaven, Mudgeeraba, Burdekin and Moggill, who have all played an important role either in emergency services or in the health sector, to listen carefully and to use their experience to point them in the right direction on this bill. We each have an opportunity to make the correct decision as a responsible government, to leave a legacy from the 55th Parliament to have morally made the correct decision in addressing the terrible issue of alcohol fuelled violence and its horrible effects on our community across Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (9.24 pm): I rise to address alcohol fuelled violence and the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015. I am well qualified to speak on this topic, given I am an addiction medicine specialist, having been awarded my fellowship of the Royal Australasian College of Physicians Chapter of Addiction Medicine. I am also a member of the Australasian Professional Society on Alcohol and other Drugs. I am registered with the Medical Board of Australia in not only this medical discipline of addiction medicine but also medical administration as a fellow of the Royal Australasian College of Medical Administrators. As a former president of both the Australian Medical Association of Queensland and the Rural Doctors Association of Queensland, for many years I have been actively involved in pursuing the public health issue of respective governments adequately addressing all forms of substance related harms and disorders and the development of whole-of-government, evidence based strategies and solutions.

According to the Australian Education and Rehabilitation Foundation, the cost to society of the misuse of alcohol is \$36 billion per year. Alcohol fuelled violence, which is a subset of the above public health issue, needs to be comprehensively addressed through sound, evidence based policy. On this there is no political disagreement. All parliamentarians in this place want to reduce and eliminate alcohol fuelled violence. What we disagree on is the best way to do this.

As a community we need to rethink our relationship with alcohol and commit to cultural change in order to achieve a reduction in the physical, psychological and social harms of excessive alcohol consumption. Unfortunately, our binge-drinking culture is now at record levels, with significant harms and at-risk behaviours for many not only in Queensland but also across Australia. It can be said that, whilst the individual human costs of substance related harms can be catastrophic, the community implications are also immense and destructive, with our cohesiveness as a society jeopardised.

I have witnessed firsthand the clinical consequences of alcohol fuelled violence, having worked in a number of emergency departments as a doctor and having also been involved in the management oversight of emergency services as a health administrator. Treating those with chronic, long-term alcohol or drug dependency syndromes can also be a significant challenge. This requires compassion, empathy and a complex set of highly developed clinical skills, and I take this opportunity to recognise those teachers, mentors and health professionals whose invaluable knowledge and imparted insights have allowed me to develop the required skills to be a well-developed clinical specialist.

We must be cognisant that often today alcohol is consumed by some along with amphetamine type stimulants such as crystalline methylamphetamine or new synthetic drugs or even anabolic steroids. This can then often heighten an altered sense of perception and situational awareness, leading to enhanced erratic and violent behaviour. Alcohol fuelled violence, with or without other drugs, is also certainly a major occupational health and safety issue for emergency services workers including paramedics, police officers, doctors and nurses.

In order to reduce any form of substance misuse and abuse, a balanced investment by government in supply reduction, demand reduction and harm minimisation via access to alcohol and drug treatment services must occur. We must take this approach as a matter of urgency given the plethora of substance misuse and abuse issues, from alcohol to illicit drugs to synthetic substances to prescription and over-the-counter medication dependency disorders which are affecting many in communities in urban, regional and rural Queensland. But we must take a whole-of-Queensland-government approach and not focus on one-dimensional solutions.

In my view, it is far too simplistic to simply focus on lockdown laws and trading hours—in essence, crowd control. There is nothing in the current proposals that addresses illicit drug, synthetic drug and volatile substance fuelled violence in all communities, not just entertainment precincts. Taxing alcohol products by volume and not price, preferentially taxing low-alcohol products and also ending alcohol marketing to young people, along with enhanced school, community and social education programs and further developing a range of ambulatory and inpatient services, along with therapeutic communities, is also vitally needed. Community alcohol outlet density provisions also need reviewing, along with strategies to address preloading.

While there is some variance of views in academic circles as to their translational effect, it is my view that mandatory minimum sentences for serious alcohol or drug fuelled violence offences are also important in sending a zero-tolerance message to the broader community. Strengthening fines for related antisocial behaviour should also be considered.

The hospitality and liquor industry, including pubs and clubs, must be part of the solution with respect to this problem when it occurs in entertainment precincts. The vast majority of licensed venues and their patrons take a responsible attitude to the consumption of alcohol.


I do hope that these comments are not confined to history on the pages of *Hansard* and that the knowledge, skills and expertise of those in the 55th Parliament, regardless of political persuasion, are used to good effect in order to build upon the principles of the multifaceted, comprehensive and considered plans of action for the sustained long-term reduction in the harms associated with excessive alcohol consumption and drug use which were developed by the former LNP government. In 2014 the former LNP government introduced the \$44.5 million Safe Night Out Strategy following months of public consultation and discussion about the issue of alcohol and drug related violence. It should have been given a proper chance to work given that the early results revealed a reduction in a range of offences including physical and sexual assaults as well as property damage. Key elements of the strategy included establishing 15 safe night precincts across Queensland; drug and alcohol education in schools from years 7 to 12; stronger and better coordinated liquor licensing provisions; and enhanced penalties for offenders, including a new offence of unlawful striking causing death resulting in a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. I am pleased to note that the Queensland Alcohol and Other Drugs Action Plan 2015-17, which was developed by the LNP when in government, was launched last year. This well developed initial plan has the potential to reduce the physical, psychological and social harms of alcohol and other drugs.

There should be bipartisan political leadership on this important public health and societal issue. Despite the rhetoric of the Labor Party that it was going to seek individual contact with all current parliamentarians about this issue prior to the introduction of this legislation, I have in fact not received any formal contact from the Labor Party. The Attorney-General said a few months ago, quite correctly, that all of us here are parliamentarians first before being politicians. Unfortunately, those words of Labor are not matched by actions. I would like to acknowledge my professional medical colleague the member for Stafford, Dr Anthony Lynham, for his clinical work and public advocacy with respect to alcohol fuelled violence and assaults. I do not doubt his genuine commitment in having these matters addressed. I know on both sides of the House we all recognise the need for cultural change and sustained action to eliminate alcohol fuelled violence. As a father of four, as a doctor and as an elected representative to this Queensland parliament, I feel a great deal of personal and professional responsibility with respect to ensuring that senseless violence related to alcohol and drugs is addressed through not only legislation but also long-term strategies and action plans which are adequately resourced. Unfortunately, the current one-dimensional, zealot-like proposal within a narrow supply reduction legislative framework currently before the Queensland parliament is inadequate and deficient given that it is not an enhanced, multifaceted, broad-ranging, whole-of-government solution building upon previous LNP and former Labor government initiatives. The current proposed legislation also has legislative inconsistencies with casino precincts being exempt. It is also clear that current data collection mechanisms on this issue are flawed, inadequate and require an urgent process of rectification in order to develop evidence based public policy.

All forms of substance fuelled violence and harms within all Queensland communities must be addressed. This includes urban, rural, regional, Indigenous and non-Indigenous. No one individual nor one political party is entitled to moral or ethical ownership of this issue. We all agree alcohol fuelled violence must end. What we disagree on is the best way to do it. This issue is complex and multifaceted. I want substance fuelled violence, including alcohol fuelled violence, to end. But Labor's inadequate legislation will not achieve this outcome for Queensland with respect to the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015.

In conclusion, I also support the commentary of the LNP members with respect to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report on the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015. As always, my door remains open, regardless of the outcome of the vote this week, to sound evidence based public policy for Queensland in relation to substance harms and substance fuelled violence in all its forms. Given that Katter's Australian Party MPs have now indicated their support for the bill, I look forward to seeing the independent review and evaluation of the laws in 2018 following implementation later this year.

Finally, I am pleased to have made a professional contribution to this debate as opposed to the shameful contribution, personal attacks and conduct of the member for Ferny Grove during tonight's proceedings. In conclusion, I pay tribute to the thousands of Queensland patients I have treated and assisted in dealing with their alcohol and/or drug problems over many years.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.34 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I begin by thanking my fellow members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: chair, Mark Furner, the member for Ferny Grove; deputy chair, Tarnya Smith, the member for Mount Ommaney; Jon Krause, the member for Beaudesert;

Tony Perrett, the member for Gympie; Mark Ryan, the member for Morayfield; as well as substitute members Joan Pease, the member for Lytton; Don Brown, the member for Capalaba; and Verity Barton, the member for Broadwater. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of the secretariat staff: Bernice Watson, research director; Kelli Longworth, principal research officer; Gregory Thomson, principal research officer; and Lorraine Bowden, executive assistant. I also want to thank the submitters.

Alcohol fuelled violence is costing our society dearly—not just in lost lives and injuries but it is a drain on our emergency services, our health system and our criminal justice system. It is estimated that each year alcohol fuelled violence problems cost the Australian economy more than \$36 billion. Those are not just my words; they come from an open letter signed by, amongst others, the Queensland Attorney-General, Yvette D'Ath; Professor Jake Najman, Chair of the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol; Dr Chris Zappala, President of the Queensland Branch of the Australian Medical Association; Ian Leavers, President of the Queensland Police Union; Doug Flockhart, the CEO of Queensland Clubs; and Gerard Byrne, Operations Manager of Australia Eastern Territory of the Salvation Army. The open letter points out that a Galaxy poll found 80 per cent of Queenslanders believe we have a problem with excess drinking. The poll also found that 59 per cent of Queenslanders believe that governments are not doing enough to redress alcohol misuse and 66 per cent of Queenslanders believe their city or town centre is unsafe on Saturday evenings.

That is why the Palaszczuk government went to the last election with a commitment to make the difficult decisions required to address the complex problem of alcohol fuelled violence. Last year in one voice this parliament said enough was enough to violence in our communities, and alcohol related violence should be treated no differently. As the Attorney-General pointed out in her first reading speech, the government recognises that safe night precincts are uniquely equipped to implement high-visibility policing, late-night transport options and other initiatives for managing the elevated risk of alcohol and drug related risk associated with late liquor trading. Accordingly, the amendments proposed will provide for safe night precincts to be prescribed by regulation to allow for 3 am liquor trading and a 1 am lockout following a thorough consultation and application process. If local boards do not wish their precinct to be subject to the lockout, they may opt to remain as a 2 am precinct.

High-alcohol and rapid consumption drinks such as shots will be banned after midnight. The definition of what constitutes a high-alcohol and rapid consumption drink will be determined after further consultation with stakeholders. To address preloading, no new applications to sell takeaway liquor post 10 pm will be approved. Existing licences allowing trade to midnight will not be affected. The Queensland Nurses' Union acknowledged in its submission to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee that the QNU welcomes the introduction of the bill and its aims to tackle alcohol fuelled violence through the restriction of service hours and lockouts in licensed venues across Queensland. The QNU has a significant interest in any measures that will serve to protect its members and the community from the aberrant behaviour of those who drink to excess and to reduce the significant cost to the health system. Nurses and midwives comprise the largest professional group in the health workforce and as an occupational group they have the highest exposure to non-fatal violence and also report the highest levels of violence amongst healthcare workers.

In 2014 the New South Wales government introduced changes to the Liquor Act imposing a 1.30 am lockout and 3 am last drinks at licensed venues in the Sydney CBD and Kings Cross after the deaths of two men in alcohol fuelled attacks. Non-licensed venues in the area are now required to close at 10 pm. As the New South Wales Premier, Mike Baird, said recently, the laws may present an inconvenience, but they have led to a significant drop in assaults. He went on to say—

Alcohol-related assaults have decreased by 42.2 per cent in the CBD since we introduced the 'lock-out laws' ... And they're down by over 60 per cent in Kings Cross.

Premier Baird added that the number of small bars in Sydney had almost doubled during the same period. These statistics just cannot be ignored.

In 2014, the same year that the New South Wales government restricted late-night trading to reduce alcohol fuelled violence, in Queensland the Campbell Newman government launched the Safe Night Out Strategy that lifted a moratorium imposed by the government in 2009 on late-night trading applications and established safe night precincts in 15 locations in Queensland. In the following six months, 107 applications were made for late-night trading beyond 12 am. The majority sought to trade until 3 am. Applicants came from across the state, but the highest proportion came from Brisbane and the Gold Coast. With the Sunshine Coast safe night out precinct, there is a voluntary lockout at 3 am and a similar self-imposed lockout exists in Bundaberg. International tourist destinations have reduced

the sale of alcohol to 2 am in places such as Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco in California and Toronto in Canada, while in Ireland it is to 2.30 am. So this bill is not proposing something new. It is a strategy that has been proved to be effective to control alcohol fuelled violence.


So what have we learned about the effectiveness of restricting trading hours to reduce alcohol fuelled violence? Based on international, interstate and local examples, we know that lockouts and a reduction in the hours that liquor can be served has been effective in reducing alcohol related violence. We know that, with this strategy, the safer people feel, the more they go out, the more tourists come, the more money they spend and the more jobs there are.

Recently, Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk and senior ministers met with a cross-section of stakeholders ahead of parliament debating the bill to reduce alcohol fuelled violence in Queensland. As she said after those meetings—

The community wants these laws. The community knows there is too much tragedy, too much injury and too much violence ... These laws are for young Queenslanders. These are laws for police and ambulance officers on the frontline who are putting themselves on the line. These are laws for doctors and nurses who have put too many faces back together.

These laws are for our welfare services like The Salvation Army who have to put too many lives back together.

Premier Palaszczuk stated further that to maintain the status quo is just not good enough. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (9.42 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise to contribute to the debate on alcohol fuelled violence. But, like my colleagues on this side of the House, I will not be able to support the government's bill and that is because I personally do not believe that it addresses the issues.

All members of this House would acknowledge that these are incredibly complex issues, but I just do not think that the banning of shots and high-alcohol-content drinks, lockouts and earlier closing times are the panacea to the ills that the government wants to address. There are cultural issues that we as a society need to address around violence, around excessive alcohol consumption and around the illicit use of drugs. As I said, I am just not convinced that the solution that the government has put on the table is the answer to the ills that it seeks to address.

I found particularly disappointing the almost sanctimonious and patronising way in which the government seeks to lecture the opposition members as though we do not care. The reality is that all 89 members of this House care about alcohol fuelled violence. All 89 members of this House care about the culture of drinking, about illicit drug use and about making our streets and community safer but, as my colleague the member for Moggill said, we just have different ways of achieving it. On this side of the House there are 39 members who are parents. Each and every one of those members—and all 42 members including the three who are not parents—care very much about the entertainment precincts across Queensland, whether they are on the Gold Coast, in Brisbane, on the Sunshine Coast, in Townsville or in Cairns. Across the length and breadth of this state, whether it is an entertainment precinct or just a venue that serves alcohol, we all care about making sure that people are able to have a safe night out and that they are able to get home safely.

We have seen from statistics that violence was already beginning to decrease and it is disappointing that the government has not been prepared to give an evidence based approach, such as the one that the Newman government introduced, a chance. During the last parliament I had the opportunity to serve on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and I had the opportunity to sit in on one of the public hearings during the current committee's inquiry into this bill. That continued to show to me and reiterate in my mind that these draconian laws are, as I said, simply not the panacea to a great number of complex issues.

I have a number of concerns that I do not feel that this legislation addresses. A significant concern that I have in representing an electorate that is near an entertainment precinct but not in one is the displacement of people who will not be able to go into venues at five past one, who will feel that they are being discouraged from consuming a legal substance. I have very significant concerns about what that means for the safety of communities right across Queensland.

In addition to my concerns about moving the excessive consumption of alcohol and potentially related violence to suburbs and displacing it from the entertainment precincts, I also have significant concerns about what that means for people who need our help and our support. Entertainment precincts have access to well-trained police officers, ambulance officers and, of course, as the committee saw, a number of chaplaincy services—people who give up freely their Friday and Saturday nights to help those who have consumed too much alcohol and need help because their friends either have not gone

out with them or have simply left them on the side of the road. Those chaplains do an amazing job. The chaplains themselves have also expressed concerns. Only a couple of weeks ago the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee had the opportunity to hear from chaplain Lance Mergard, who expressed significant concern about what this means for displacing violence and the impact that that has on not only entertainment precincts but also communities right across Queensland.

I am very concerned that we are not doing anything to address preloading. We are not talking about educating our young children. We are not talking about how we can educate teenagers about the consumption of alcohol and illicit drugs and the impacts of that. I am really concerned that there is no additional talk of transport measures. How are taxis and buses going to cope if at three o'clock in the morning thousands of people are being forced onto the streets where there are limited public transport resources? People are trying to get home and there is simply no way for them to do that.

I also have significant concerns about the inconsistencies that have been highlighted by my other colleagues. Of course, the key one relates to casinos. I appreciate that the government has raised significant concerns and says that it wants to address alcohol fuelled violence across Queensland. If it wants to do so, why would it seek to exclude casinos or suburban venues? My colleague the member for Mansfield and shadow Attorney-General often refers to the fact that a person could be refused entry at a venue at Fortitude Valley at one minute past one, but if that person goes to a venue in Mansfield or Carindale in Brisbane at five minutes past one, that person can get in and it is not a problem.


I think that we need to talk about culture more broadly. I am really concerned that this legislation does not seek to do that. Earlier, I referred to my membership of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. One of the things that the LNP did when it was in government was take the opportunity to look for an evidence based approach. We wanted to make sure that we did not have a draconian measure that was simply seeking to prohibit people from consuming a legal substance and that we did not have draconian measures that sought to punish the 99.9 per cent of people who are able to go into entertainment precincts and consume alcohol without getting ridiculously inebriated and without engaging in violence.

One of the things that the LNP talked about in particular that I am disappointed has not really been discussed by this government is how we as a society can tackle antisocial behaviour. When we were in government, one of the things that I was most proud of was the introduction of the particular offence of striking.

Members of the government talk about statistics and refer to Newcastle. If the government is going to look at statistics and refer to Newcastle and put it up on a pedestal as the be-all and end-all and what we should be looking at then I would suggest that they have a look at other areas around New South Wales that did not have draconian measures imposed on them. Between March 2008 and March 2012 the Newcastle local government area saw a decrease of around 25 per cent in assault rates, but in Campbelltown there was a reduction of more than 40 per cent, in Gosford a reduction of more than 35 per cent, in Wollongong a reduction of just under 35 per cent and across all of New South Wales a reduction of 30 per cent. Those significant changes were achieved without the need to impose draconian lockouts and without the need to provide for a prohibition on the service of particular drinks.

It is particularly frustrating that the Premier talks about being a leader of a government of consensus. Clearly the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee did not give any consideration to what the submissions said because if the Labor Party had wanted to be a government of consensus then it would have paid attention to the fact that the vast majority—in excess, I understand, of 90 per cent of the submissions made to the committee—were opposed to the bill. We have a responsibility to get this right for Queensland. I have quite serious and significant concerns that this is an attempt to put a bandaid over the issue. It is an attempt at a quick fix and I genuinely do not believe that this will improve safety in entertainment precincts.

We have an obligation to get this right on behalf of all of Queensland which is why I think we need a broader strategy, not one that seeks to impose nanny state regulations on a population that is engaging in the lawful consumption of alcohol. Like my colleagues on this side of the House, I cannot and will not be supporting the government's legislation tonight. These are complex issues and the government does not have the panacea that it thinks it has. It is a shame that it has sought to bully members on this side of the House and it is a shame that it seeks to be patronising and sanctimonious like it has the answer to everything when clearly the evidence shows that it does not. The committee itself has said that there is not enough data to say that this is going to work. It is disappointing that we are seeing rushed through the House nanny state laws that will impact the well-behaving young adults of Queensland who are simply engaging in what is lawful behaviour when we believe that they should have a safe night out as well as a good night out.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (9.52 pm): The Palaszczuk government is committed to tackling alcohol fuelled violence. We want the parliament to pass laws to limit the hours alcohol can be served to reduce the incidence of violence. The government's legislation proposes to call last drinks across Queensland at 2 am. Safe night precincts will have the option of applying to call last drinks at 3 am if they impose a 1 am lockout. There is too much violence, too many injuries—too many tragedies. As members of parliament I think we should make our decisions based on our own experience and the available evidence.

My electorate experiences many of the issues this bill seeks to address. We are home to many of Brisbane's iconic venues: the historic Regatta and Normanby hotels; famous student drinking haunts like the RE; we are home to the world's best sporting ground, Lang Park, which features some 32 bars and last financial year sold two million schooners of beer; the venues that tens of thousands of people visit before and after those games in Paddington and Caxton Street; not to mention any number of smaller venues that I am not cool enough to have visited. I will be at one of those on Saturday—Brewski—launching a new beer that raises money to support the Great Barrier Reef, but much of the other beer flowing into all of those venues comes from my electorate too—the famous Castlemaine Fourx brewery.

I am proud to represent these entertainment districts. I know the proprietors of many of these establishments. They are good people. I know that some of them will be disappointed with my support for this bill. I can understand that. But the fact is that alcohol and violence have an impact on our neighbourhoods and on the young people who flood into them to enjoy a night out. The residents of Petrie Terrace in particular experience regular unpleasant side effects of living near a late-night venue precinct. One of the tragedies that started the public discussion about alcohol fuelled violence also happened in my electorate in January 2005. It was one of those terrible one-punch-can-kill tragedies. An early morning fight between two groups of men erupted after someone apparently jumped an unofficial taxi queue on Petrie Terrace. In the ensuing scuffle 31-year-old Nigel Lee was punched in the face and knocked to the ground unconscious. Medical evidence presented to a court revealed Mr Lee's nasal bridge was destroyed by the punch and he drowned in his own blood within minutes. At the time the then opposition justice spokesperson, the member for Caloundra, said about this high-profile case, 'There is no human activity more serious than killing someone.'

More recently at the Regatta, also in my electorate, a paramedic experienced a horrible assault. Ambos see the absolute worst scenes imaginable day in, day out: car accidents, overdoses, strokes and heart attacks. They endure these heartbreaking scenarios so that they can help people when they need it most. Alcohol fuelled violence against our ambos is now so bad that they have taken the unprecedented step to upgrade their self-defence training. Minister Dick outlined that to the House this morning.

I speak from other experience too. It is hard to believe now, but there was a time that I myself used to have fun. Before I had kids, before I became this cranky old man, I did on rare occasions visit some of these venues. In that time I have discovered two truths which I think should help people get some perspective on these laws. The first thing I have learnt is this: nothing really good happens after 3 am. You know it is not going to get better after 3 am. I know sometimes it feels like it really might, that you have had an awesome time and it can only get better, but it will not. The second thing—and I can guarantee this—is that you will not wake up the next day wishing you had drunk more. You will not wake up wishing the club had been open longer. You will not say, 'This hangover is too mild; I need a bigger headache.' You will not say, 'Curse those alcohol fuelled violence laws.'

Having reflected a bit on my experience, I will turn to the evidence. I know we have heard about the sheer weight of opinion in research circles, but let me describe some. Miller et al in 2014 synthesised existing evidence and knowledge to improve our understanding of good practice in minimising harms associated with alcohol misuse. They found that lockouts reduced preloading. Mazzerolle et al in 2012 conducted a longitudinal study of violence in entertainment precincts with lockout laws. They found lockout laws reduced violence inside premises. The New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research looked at the impact of their lockout laws a year after their introduction and found that in Sydney there was a 32 per cent reduction in assaults in Kings Cross and a 26 per cent reduction in the CBD in the first eight months. Miller et al's research in 2012 looked at, amongst other things, Newcastle emergency department data and found a reduction of more than 340 emergency department attendances per year—all this while their night-life continued to flourish. As figures supplied by the New South Wales police show, there was a 110 per cent increase in the number of licensed venues in Newcastle. But, more importantly, Newcastle has experienced a cultural change with patrons

preloading less. That is because, as that 2012 research also found, they are going out earlier and spending more at venues. Business and tourism grow when patrons feel safe. Compare that with the 65 per cent of Queenslanders who consider the city to be unsafe on a Saturday night—up from 52 per cent.

I stand here in clear conscience supporting these laws based on my experience and the evidence, but what are those opposite doing? We know the evidence is conclusive and we know that many of those opposite support these laws based on their own experience. We have heard the fulsome statement from the Leader of the Opposition in 2010, when he said—

Through my travels throughout the state I have been horrified and disgusted to see the results that a night of alcohol and crowds has on local communities.

'Horrified and disgusted', Madam Deputy Speaker!

We know that many of those opposite have said privately that they support the laws. I listened to the member for Moggill's speech earlier, which contrasted with what he had to say when he was the president of AMA Queensland. In a press release dated 2013, Dr Rowan is quoted as saying—

As President of AMA Queensland and as an Addiction Medicine Specialist, I am deeply concerned by the number of seriously injured people presenting to emergency departments following a night of alcohol-driven mayhem.

He went on to say—


AMA Queensland agrees with the views already expressed by Maxillofacial surgeon Dr Anthony Lynham who says 'the 3 am closure is a great initiative but won't work on its own.'

Lockouts need to be maintained and measures must be in place to prevent venues that now close prior to 3am from extending their trading laws.

He further stated—

The lockout and restrictions need to apply to all pubs and clubs, we can't allow people to simply move from one venue to another—the rules have to be consistent ...

Something has changed and it is not public opinion. We know the Queensland public overwhelmingly supports these laws. So what is going on? What is motivating them? It is politics and nothing else. The Leader of the Opposition thought that, if the government were defeated on this legislation, which we support so strongly, it would help his claim to finally be premier. That is all he cares about. He has no interest in the lives that will be lost or the evidence. He even disregards his own views. It is shameless and reckless and, as the Premier has said, on their conscience be it. This government stands with the community when it comes to taking action on alcohol fuelled violence. The LNP would rather do nothing, even in the face of overwhelming evidence.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (10.01 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Whilst I have enjoyed the sanctimonious lecture from those opposite who have all taken the high ground, I would like to tell members of my own experience. I have been involved in the club industry for a long time. I have stood on a lot of doors and worked in a lot of pubs. I absolutely empathise with the comments of paramedics, doctors, those in venues and in streets who pick people up and those who have had to fix up individuals' faces et cetera. To think that anybody in this House, on our side or the other side, does not want a safe place for our young people is naive and, frankly, a little offensive. To think that, simply because we support an industry that supports us, is frankly offensive. The simple fact is that, if we do what the government is proposing, it will create a culture around drinking that is very dangerous for the people of Queensland. What I think will happen comes from lecturing at university, running sessions where I have tried to encourage people to control their drinking, talking to lots of young people over many years and working in the industry for 25 years. There is a tipping point. If you close the venues too early, people will drink in other places, because they will not be bothered going to where the entertainment is. It will all become too hard for them.

We have been told about solutions that have worked wonderfully in New South Wales. First of all, they had three, four or five times the problems we have. Already we have much better results than they were achieving. The figures and percentages have been danced around and all the statistics have been given, but I can tell the House what will happen. Currently, people are going to venues that have cameras out the front, security for one to 80, direct contact with City Safe cameras that cover the streets and direct contact with emergency services and people who are trained in first aid and CPR. They go to class 9B buildings that are built and designed to Australian building standards, with air extraction and fire suppressant features so that people do not die in a fire but have clear airways to get out. Currently, our young people go into that highly regulated environment. But what will happen if that environment is shut down too early?

I have four teenage kids. If we can get them to go to bed before 11 o'clock on a school night, it is a good start. Therefore, the idea of getting young people to go to bed by one o'clock or two o'clock on a Saturday morning is laughable. You are off in la-la land if you think that that is going to happen. If people want to go out and drink, they can go to a venue such as I have described, where regulations provide them with a safety cauldron. We need to improve those safety cauldrons. We need much harsher penalties for venues that are run inappropriately. We need harsher penalties for people who act inappropriately and we need scanners to identify those individuals. We need to make sure that the cauldron that we create for people to enjoy entertainment is safe.

What motivates me to oppose this legislation is my grave fear that, if that cauldron is shut down early, young Queenslanders will be put into real serious danger because they will find themselves in situations where people can quite literally get away with murder. We know that, if someone gets assaulted in a safe night precinct, the police are there, the cameras are there, the ambulances are there, there is support there and there are people everywhere watching out for them. However, can members imagine what will happen when the party moves to the suburbs? Imagine that someone decides to post on Facebook, 'We're not going out; we're going to have a party.' There will be darkened streets, no public transport, no security and no ID checking. If someone does get too drunk and passes out, say, a young 18-year-old or 19-year-old girl, there will be three or four bedrooms down the hallway for her to lay down in. Won't that be a safe environment, as hundreds of people mill through the house and dance in the backyard and in the street? Won't the neighbours enjoy the bottles being thrown over the fence?

Considering the liability and the responsibility, nobody in their right mind would host at their house a party for hundreds of young people. Therefore, young people will be going to parties that, by definition, will be hosted by people not in their right mind. When the paramedics turn up because someone has been belted, instead of having security trying to help hold people back, instead of having the police on scene, instead of working under a video camera in a safe environment that is close to extra support, they will be working in a darkened suburban street with a whole bunch of unruly people running around, possibly throwing bottles, trying to absolve themselves from any responsibility and running in all directions. When the police arrive and try to find out what happened, there will be no videotape. There will be no evidence. There will be no safety cauldron. The government is trying to grasp the quicksilver that is young people's desire to go out and have a good time. It is trying to grasp it and control it. Let me tell you, it will squeeze straight through your fingers and you will have created one of the most dangerous environments that our young people could possibly be led into.

On the upside, let us assume that as the party finishes no-one has been assaulted and nothing else has happened, but we know that there will be no public transport. This solution was applied in New South Wales to 25 square kilometres, but the government is going to apply it to hundreds of thousands of square kilometres all over Queensland. In my area, unfortunately, many young people have been killed in car accidents either getting to or coming back from out-of-town parties. Maybe they did not want to pay to get into a club. Maybe someone had organised a party on a property. We are not talking about one or two a year. Unfortunately, we are talking about a much higher number.

As members opposite sanctimoniously lecture us about why we should support early closing times and clamour to claim the high moral ground, I caution them. Yesterday, the Premier said in a tweet, 'If these lockdown laws can prevent one death or one sexual assault, my God it's worth it.' Yes, it would be worth it if it did, but can members imagine what will happen to a young girl who is sexually assaulted at a private party where hundreds of people have arrived in response to a Facebook invitation? There is no security, there are no cameras, there is no protection, there is no support, there is nobody coming, the police are unaware the party is happening and there are no paramedics. Can members imagine what will happen to her?

The good news for those opposite is that it probably will not make it into their statistics because nobody will record it. They can all sit there with a clean conscience and say, 'Isn't it fantastic? We have cured the world.' That will not have helped her because there was nobody to report it to. As those opposite sanctimoniously lecture us about the benefits of their legislation, they should be careful as they clamour for the high moral ground because they do not own it. We care about our children too. We can work together on this. There are many benefits of the safe night out precinct that we can learn from. There are many things that can be done. Reducing hours may well be one of those.

Those opposite cannot take the culture that exists in Queensland today around drinking and tell everybody to go home to bed instead. They are going to be partying in your suburbs. They are going to partying next door to your house. They are going to be making noise. They are going to be having sex in the gardens. They are going to be getting drunk.


Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: You do not think they will? You are in a dream world. You are creating one of the most dangerous environments to send our young people into and you need to take responsibility for that.

What would be much better is if we worked together to get some solutions on the ground and solve this problem. Like I said, if you want to wind back hours, let us get some education in place. Let us change the culture first. We are not going to change the culture by locking the door. We are going to send them somewhere else. We are going to send them to an environment that I fear is going to be so dangerous.

Instead of someone getting arrested for murder, someone will get away with murder. Someone will be laying dead. They will need the ambulance and it is not coming. They will need security and it is not there. They will need the police and they are not coming. These violent offenders are going to go to these parties when they see them on Facebook.

(Time expired)

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (10.11 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Binge drinking and alcohol related violence remains a leading social issue to be addressed not only in our state—we know this—but indeed across Australia and further abroad. A vibrant night-life is something to be valued, but surely its vibrancy can only be assured when those who engage in it feel safe and secure.

Despite previous liquor reform measures, alcohol fuelled violence continues to destroy lives and families and divert valuable police, emergency service and hospital resources. In 2010 the former Bligh government established drink safe precincts to combine local, state, industry and community resources to reduce alcohol related violence. It followed an inquiry into alcohol related violence and an appreciation that immediate action had to be taken to reduce antisocial behaviour. The key components of that trial were: increased and high-visibility policing; provision of support, rest and recovery services; coordination between venues, police, ambulance, community services and transport providers; and improvements to taxis zones, transport information, lighting and crowd reduction and queuing measures.

The bill before the House seeks to improve on the existing safe night precinct framework by introducing a reduction in liquor trading hours across Queensland and the service of rapid intoxication drinks after midnight. There is no question that tackling alcohol related violence and community safety issues is a challenging and complex task. But this complexity, along with vested interests, must never get in the way of taking action when it is required. When senseless deaths continue on our streets doing nothing is not an option.

This is why the Palaszczuk government went to the last election with a commitment to make the difficult decisions required to address this complex problem in our community. When people feel safe and when people come home safely after a night out, more go out at night, translating into more patronage and venues and more jobs in the industry.

Evidence shows that for every hour that you wind back the service of alcohol after midnight, violent assaults are reduced. Research from Sydney and Newcastle shows that calling last drinks earlier and stopping the service of alcohol in pubs and clubs earlier has a major impact on driving down the number of violent assaults. In Newcastle it was a 37 per cent reduction, in Kings Cross it was 32 per cent and 40 per cent in the Sydney CBD entertainment precincts. These results clearly indicate that reducing trading hours for alcohol service, even by only a couple of hours, has a demonstrable effect—a demonstrable effect on the safety of those who are out and a demonstrable effect on the police, ambulance and medical officers who pick up the pieces when things go wrong.

I had the opportunity or perhaps some would think the misfortune of touring a CBD watch house in the early hours of the morning with former police minister Neil Roberts and former police commissioner Bob Atkinson to experience a typical Saturday night on the beat. To say that the watch house was full of the misery and despair of alcohol abuse was an understatement.

What was immediately obvious to me upon entering the watch house was the lingering smell of vomit and urine from extremely intoxicated patrons who had been arrested. Almost all of the holding cells were full and a number of the detainees, again heavily intoxicated, were yelling, kicking and bashing on the doors of the holding rooms.

The officers remained professional throughout and commented that it was a usual experience for them. The drain on front-line police and emergency services crews, on our health services and on the criminal justice system from alcohol related violence is significant. Enough is enough.


I appreciate that the proposals before the House to reduce liquor trading hours, to introduce an earlier lockout and place limits on certain types of alcoholic drinks after midnight are highly contested, as they have been in other states. I commend the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for providing such a thorough report into their considerable deliberations.

I read the opposition members' statement of reservation to the committee report and found the comparison they sought to draw, as part of that statement, deeply disappointing. The comment was made that rather than punishing the majority of people who do the right thing for the sins of a few, initiatives should focus on individual responsibility.

This bill is not about punishing the majority at the expense of a few. It is about making our night-time economy, our streets safer for the benefit of the whole community. Surely that is the responsibility of everyone in this House.

We need to do everything we can to change people's attitudes towards drinking and violence. We need to do everything we can to make sure that our kids are getting home safely after a night out. Reducing the service of alcohol, particularly rapid intoxication drinks, in licensed venues is a courageous step. No-one here has said it is the panacea for all ills that come from drunken behaviour, but evidence in other jurisdictions shows it will decrease assaults.

I have two young boys of my own. One day it will be their turn to partake in Brisbane's night-time culture. If I can make decisions as a member of parliament, as a parent to make our community safer then there is no question as to my position. Queenslanders have said enough is enough. Members on this side of the House are saying enough is enough. It is time for those opposite to have the political fortitude to say enough is enough because doing nothing is not an option. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (10.17 pm): I rise this evening to contribute to this important debate on addressing alcohol fuelled violence because I want the people of Glass House to know why I will not be supporting the Palaszczuk Labor government's so-called lockout laws. In so doing, let me start, as the Attorney-General did, with dispelling a few myths: firstly, that the Australian Labor Party has a monopoly for caring for Queensland's children and young people. It does not. I should know.

The fact is that for eight years while I worked for the Beattie and Bligh governments, including four years in the department of child safety, I listened to what the Labor leaders and ministers of the day were saying about their social justice hearts, about their genuine care and concern for the downtrodden, for the abused, for the young people of Queensland, yet I watched what happened on the ground, at the coalface with kids in care. The reality was just so, so different. It distressed me so much, I joined the LNP. I joined the LNP to offer real solutions, to offer real alternatives to some of the hardest challenges our communities face. That has brought me to this chamber tonight.

What Labor does seem to have a monopoly on is sound grab policies. Lockout laws are easy to sell. They sound sensible. They sound marketable in the seven seconds we often get to promote such policies. But hear me Queenslanders: sound grab policies are not necessarily good policies. Know this also: the LNP cares about our kids and young people too. I am a father—a father of five. My eldest child is nearing his 15th birthday. My youngest nearing her sixth. Do I care for my kids? Too damn right. Do I care for their friends, for their generations? Too damn right, because they are the future for this state and for this nation. So do not tell me Labor is the only party that cares about our kids and young people.

When my kids are old enough to go out and enjoy a night on the town—to have a drink with their mates and maybe to listen to some fantastic home-grown music—will I want them to be out after midnight, let alone after 3 am? Of course not. What parent would? But at the end of the day that will be their decision, not mine. I suspect they will make mistakes. I hope and I pray that they learn from them. Of course I will want to know where they got the money from in the first place. I will want to know that they have a designated driver or a means to get home. I will want to know that they are with a sensible, positive group of friends. That is what I will want. Will I get it? Time will tell. But, like other parents, when my kids get to 18 my opportunities to influence their decisions will diminish. So I, as a parent, as a legislator and as a policymaker, do want to make sure that the state is also providing an element of care.

That brings me to another myth being propagated by those opposite—that by voting against the lockout laws, I and we in the LNP are somehow ignoring the issue that is alcohol and drug fuelled violence. That is offensive. That is false. That is base politics at its worst. The people of Glass House

and Queensland need to know just how offensive and false that is. As part of the former LNP cabinet, I can tell you we were concerned about the increase in alcohol and drug fuelled violence not only in our entertainment precincts but across the entire state. We collected the evidence. We collected information on the strategies that have been implemented across the nation, indeed across the world, and we formed a strategy that was designed to address the problem head on and holistically.

What was in that strategy—our Safe Night Out Strategy? It included an awareness campaign on standards of behaviour and a mandated education campaign for years 7 to 12 on culture, attitudes and social expectations of alcohol consumption and illicit drug use. It included new or modified laws that created a new offence of unlawful striking causing death with a maximum penalty of life in prison; changed sentencing rules so that being intoxicated could not be used to reduce a person's sentence; required convicted intoxicated offenders to perform community service work as part of their penalty, as well as alcohol and drug assessments, education and counselling; increased the maximum penalties for aggravated serious assaults on public officers, like paramedics, from seven to 14 years imprisonment; increased penalties for anabolic steroids; allowed penalties such as lifetime bans from licensed premises; and increased fines and sentences for violent or antisocial behaviour around licensed venues.

Our Safe Night Out Strategy also increased the number; the visibility; the types of operations, particularly around drug detection; and the powers of police operating in our entertainment precincts. It trialled 'sober safe centres' in the Brisbane CBD. It strengthened the responsible service of alcohol programs that included introducing a network of ID scanners across venues in our safe night precincts. It enhanced enforcement and compliance by the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation and strengthened licensing systems. It created local boards to oversee the implementation of these and other strategies across the safe night precincts. Importantly, it increased access to public transport from our precincts.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a comprehensive response to a complex social issue. That is what the previous LNP government, of which I was proud to be a part, developed and began to implement—and it was working. Early results in 2014-15 showed overall assaults down by almost 10 per cent, sex offences down by 18 per cent, property damage down by 10 per cent and drug detections increased by 26 per cent across the 15 safe night out precincts. That Safe Night Out Strategy is what the current Labor government failed to continue to implement. Instead, we have a simplistic, sound grab policy on the table—lockout laws.

I want to set the record straight on another myth—and I know the member for Broadwater also addressed this earlier—that these proposed laws have worked in Newcastle. True, they have. But, in similar regional centres that applied a more comprehensive solution, the results have been far greater. The New South Wales licensed premises and environs assault rate charges from March 2008 to March 2012 showed that in the Newcastle local government area the reduction was 25.3 per cent but, in Campbelltown, it was 42.7 per cent; in Gosford, it was 37.7 per cent; in Wollongong, it was 34.6 per cent; and the average across all of New South Wales was 30 per cent—all of them far greater than what was achieved in Newcastle. Again, it is testament that for such a complex issue such a simple solution does not go far enough. It needs a comprehensive package, and that is what the LNP had in place.

The final myth I want to put paid to is that every Queensland adult over the age of 25 is in favour of these laws. I received an email earlier this week from a constituent who resides in Maleny. It reads—

I am a 66 year old grandmother writing to ask you to VOTE AGAINST the proposed Queensland 'lockout laws'.

As a mother and a grandmother, my heart would be broken if Col Miller was my son. I cannot begin to imagine his family's grief at the senseless act of violence that took his life. However, lockout laws are a knee jerk reaction to a problem that runs deep within our culture; and a reaction that will destroy jobs and business that trade in the night time economy. I am not a part of the night time economy. I don't even drink, but I have family members whose lifestyles are based in this economy. I am privy to stories of the changes and evolution within this Brisbane night-time economy for more than the past decade.

...

The tragic violence that initiated lockout laws in Sydney and now proposes the same for Queensland, is so deeply ingrained within our culture that it deserves to be addressed in a manner that goes to the core of a culturally accepted social norm.

...

I don't support violence, the problem runs deep within our culture. Destroying the night-time economy is not the answer.


My very best wishes for all your endeavours.

I do not believe in myths. They make interesting reading but dreadful policy. I know we have an alcohol and drug fuelled violence issue in Queensland and, indeed, in Australia. It is a terribly complex issue and one worthy of a comprehensive, holistic response. That is why I will not support Labor's lockout laws.

Debate, on motion of Mr Powell, adjourned.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Same Question Rule

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have considered the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill and Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill in relation to the same question rule. Standing order 87(1) provides that, unless the standing orders otherwise provide, a question or amendment shall not be proposed which is the same as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

A number of Speaker rulings in relation to this issue have been made in recent years. In summary, the matters do not have to be identical, merely the same in substance as the previous matter—in other words, it is a question of substance, not form; there is no rule preventing the presentation of two bills on the same subject or, indeed, opposite intent—however, if a decision of the House has already been taken on one bill, the other is not to be proceeded upon; and an amendment cannot be moved to a bill that has already been moved to another bill and defeated or is substantially the same as a bill that has been defeated.

The relevant provisions of both bills propose to amend the Liquor Act 1992 and Liquor Regulation 2002 to provide clarity in relation to the regulation of the liquor industry and streamline regulation. Both bills also propose to repeal section 96 of the Fair Trading Act 1989 with respect to directors' liability. I am satisfied that the same question rule is enlivened for particular clauses of the bills.

I foreshadow that the second reading question for the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill—the government bill—will be put first. If the government bill passes its second reading, the second reading question for the private member's bill can still be put. In the event that the private member's bill passes its second reading, I will immediately make a ruling in relation to the application of the same question rule for particular clauses during consideration in detail. In relation to the private member's bill, the following parts and clauses of the private member's bill would be ruled out of order under standing order 87(1): part 2 clause 6; part 3 clauses 8 to 10, 12 to 13 and 17 to 46; part 4 clauses 49 to 51.

In the event that the government's bill fails its second reading, the second reading question for the private member's bill will be put. In this case, the same question rule is not enlivened for particular clauses. This is because the overall objective of the private member's bill is different to the overall objective of the government bill. The private member's bill will proceed through consideration in detail. If members would like a copy of this statement, it is available from the Table Office.


TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 resumed, on motion of Mrs D'Ath, and Liquor and Fair Trading (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015 resumed on motion of Mr Walker—

That the bills be now read a second time.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (10.30 pm): I rise tonight to support the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I am the proud father of two children aged 18 and 21 and, like most parents, my wife and I are extremely proud of both of them. They are every bit the children that we aspired to raise. They have grown into young adults with many friends and, the same as we did at their age, they enjoy a fun night out on the town.

My identical twin brother is a senior police officer stationed in Gladstone who often speaks to me about the horrors of alcohol fuelled violence that he witnesses in Gladstone without fail every weekend. His recounts make us as parents, and I am sure many other parents here in the chamber, fear the out-of-control behaviour of highly intoxicated people and fear for the safety of innocent bystanders who could well be one of our own children. Sadly, at any time my brother could be knocking on the door of any one of us with tragic news caused by alcohol fuelled violence. We must start listening to those at the local coalface about the horrors of violence which is directly related to the excessive consumption of alcohol. The recurring recounts of sad and often fatal scenes from first response officers—our emergency services personnel—are proof that these problems are spiralling out of control at a terrifying rate.

On a recent weekend in my electorate of Gladstone, a 15-person affray at 2.10 am in the Gladstone safe night precinct saw a young man hospitalised and subsequently flown to Brisbane with a fractured skull after being coward punched from the side. A female police officer was presented with the task of trying to stabilise the victim who was covered in blood on the side of the road while other police officers tried to defuse the situation and arrest those idiots involved. The five who were arrested at the time provided alcohol breath tests in the watch house with the results of .200, .180, .148, .135 and .061 being recorded.


Despite the downturn in workers, Gladstone is still a vibrant, productive town, and local pubs and clubs are full to capacity most Friday and Saturday nights. From the coalface, once again, my brother has said to me that the one thing in his 15 years of policing that concerns him the most is the constant return of intoxication readings in people aged between 18 and 30. He reports a weekly occurrence in the safe night out precinct where heavily intoxicated patrons are evicted from pubs and clubs in the early hours of the morning and are involved in street disturbances and public nuisance offences. Though he has been involved with the onset of ice and other illicit drugs in our community, the constant substance is the legal and easily accessible drug of alcohol in serious assaults in and around the Gladstone area. His words ring in my ears. He says, 'Nothing good ever happens after two o'clock in the morning. I would rather go to a noisy party and shut it down than be confronted by 20 or 30 intoxicated patrons spilling out of a nightclub and fighting.'

There is undeniable proof that these lockdown laws work. Looking at the report from one of Australia's most renowned medicos, St Vincent's Hospital emergency director Gordian Fulde, assaults have fallen about nine per cent across the state and alcohol related injuries have also dropped significantly. Mr Fulde says, 'Some voices call for the laws to be removed, to go back to the way things were. As time passes, it is harder for people to remember just what those days were like, but those of us who work in the front line remember. Quite simply, it was a war zone.' St Vincent's Hospital reported a 25 per cent drop in seriously injured patients coming through the emergency room since the introduction of lockdown laws two years ago. Head of trauma, Tony Grabs, said the laws had been a 'breath of fresh air for the hospital'. He said that before the lockdown laws once a month they would see a seriously injured patient in intensive care. Since 2014 they have only had three patients from lockdown areas, which is a dramatic reduction.

To be viewed as a responsible government doing all it can to protect young adults, including my two children, on a night out touring the night-life circuit, we must tackle the problem alcohol adds to the danger head-on by passing this bill tonight to support last drinks at 2 am; statewide safe night precinct local boards being able to apply for approval for venues to continue selling alcohol until 3 am provided they have a 1 am lockdown; all venues throughout the state being able to remain open beyond 2 am or 3 am in approved precincts to serve food, non-alcohol beverages and provide entertainment; and banning the sale and supply of high-alcohol-content and rapid consumption drinks such as shots after midnight.

I am confident I can say without fear of contradiction that most of us present in this chamber tonight have witnessed a lapse of judgement of someone who is proverbially 10-feet tall and bulletproof after consuming way too much alcohol in a licensed public setting. As a government, we can determine to make it harder for that opportunity to present by passing these laws to protect our communities and our children. After the horrendous statistics that have been gathered, how much more evidence is required to prove that one punch can kill and that a coward filled with alcohol is a recipe for disaster?

One of the roles of a responsible government is to use powers to legislate and keep all communities safe. We must act to do just that and keep faith in those who have placed trust in us. I implore every member of this chamber today to join with me and 74 per cent of Queenslanders in my urgent plea, which is that the government sitting here today be that responsible government tonight. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (10.37 pm): I rise tonight to speak against the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. I am also a father—a father of four children between 25 and 30 years of age, young people who would frequent establishments in safe night out precincts. Tonight I am against this particular legislation, not as some would make out, very cheaply, such as the member for Ferny Grove and the Premier, because of so-called vested interests. I find that totally offensive. Even the member for Stafford said that anybody who is against this is playing a political game. I am against this because this is bad policy. We are all concerned about alcohol fuelled violence. We all want to see a reduction, but we need to have good, effective laws that will make a difference.

I am against this particular legislation for two reasons: the first reason is that I am against it in principle. I am totally against the fact that 99.9 per cent of people who do the right thing should be penalised by the idiotic 0.1 per cent who do the wrong thing. Time and time again we have this nanny state legislation that comes from those opposite thinking they are doing the right thing by the public.

Mr Furner interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will take the interjection from the member for Ferny Grove and mention the absolutely sanctimonious attack he made on the good member for Moggill, because when this man does not have a good argument he has to get personal. It is totally inappropriate and totally offensive.

I am against this in principle because prohibition does not work. In the history of our trying to curb the oversupply of alcohol, when has prohibition worked? It has never worked, so again it is a bad law. I never thought I would agree with Paul Syvret from the *Courier-Mail*, but on the weekend he made a tremendous argument and I am actually jealous because he pinched my argument. He said that this was the equivalent of banning cars on the road between 3 am and 5 am because there is an increased number of drink-driving accidents. This is exactly the same.

The argument here is that this is just simply wrong and it is based on the wrong principles. If we look at what has happened in New South Wales, which is now re-examining these laws, we see that, yes, they have had reductions in some areas, but it is also very well known that the outer suburbs now have an increased traffic—

Mr Furner: Rubbish.

Mr MANDER: No, it is not rubbish. The crackdown in the CBD has totally done that. I also quote Rod Bogaards, a former Productivity Commission director, who said—

The NSW reforms appear effective in reducing alcohol-fuelled violence, but they appear to do so by lowering patronage rather than improving individuals' drinking behaviour.


This legislation does not go to the core issue of why people are doing this in the first place. You cannot legislate against stupidity, which is how these people who go out and cause these problems behave. We have to address the core issue.

I am against this in principle, but I am also against this particular legislation because of the practicalities of it. This is an incoherent and inconsistent policy. To have some areas of this city exempt and other areas not exempt leads to confusion, but it gets worse. Those licensed establishments that are in the safe night precincts get 12 exemptions per year. If you multiply that across the city, you will find that you will be literally walking down the street and you will see that one facility will be under lockout laws but another facility will not be, that one area of the city will be under lockout laws but another area will not be. It is total and utter confusion and it is an incoherent policy. It simply will not work.

The LNP's view is in contrast to this. I will not go through it again because my colleagues have already gone through it tonight. We had a comprehensive strategy, a holistic strategy, a strategy that was working, but this government stopped it for political reasons. They stopped taking statistics for political reasons because they had to drive the agenda of the member for Stafford. The things that we talked about were education, stiffer penalties, an increased police presence, sober safe centres, enhanced enforcements of liquor licensing laws and ID scanners. I can tell the House that the industry did not like ID scanners because that was going to cost them money, but of course we pushed that because we believe it is a good way of banning those people who should not be in the precinct. We also talked about secure taxi ranks and local solutions being decided by locals.

The issue remains that we will bring these lockout laws in and then in three months time or six months time we will inevitably have another coward punch incident. What is the government going to do then? What is the government going to do when it happens at 10 past 10 or at 12 o'clock? Is the

government going to bring the lockdown laws back before then? Inevitably, there will be another coward punch incident unfortunately, because these laws will not have an effect. We will constantly have that problem unless we address the core issue and have a comprehensive strategy. This is bad policy.


 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (10.42 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Alcohol fuelled violence remains at unacceptable levels in Queensland. It is too often that young Queenslanders and their families are being impacted by harm caused by alcohol abuse, misuse and associated violence. We need to take action, and our evidence based approach is proven to achieve decreases in assaults, ultimately saving lives and lessening the impact of this issue.

As a parent, I never want to have to open the front door to have police standing there waiting to tell me that my daughter has been assaulted or, worse still, seriously injured while out with her friends. I want my daughter and her friends to go out and have a good time but I want them to come home safely. As Minister for Disability Services, I have unfortunately heard devastating stories from families whose loved ones have received permanent injuries as a result of an altercation during a night out. These stories always start with a few friendly drinks at their local, but as the hours pass and more alcohol is consumed the stories quickly turn into a nightmare. In a split second, a wrong decision has changed the course of someone's life forever—not to mention the impact this has on their families, their friends and their community.

I was not surprised to read that 65 per cent of Queenslanders believe their city or town centre is unsafe on a Saturday night. I know that Flinders Street in my hometown of Townsville can sometimes be cause for worry, and I am not the only one who holds that opinion. In 2010 the member for Southern Downs said that he had visited Townsville and was appalled at what he saw in the early morning along Flinders Street. He saw people staggering out of venues as the sun was coming up and he said, 'The place looked like a cross between a pigsty and a slum, to be quite frank.' He acknowledged that these issues were happening not only in Townsville but in Mackay, Cairns and our major provisional centres and he stated that 'we should be seriously looking at trading hours so that we can clean up some of those areas'.

There is extensive research demonstrating that, for every hour that liquor trade is reduced, there is a corresponding reduction of up to 22 per cent in alcohol related harm. This government is prepared to take action by implementing evidence based measures in order to lessen the human cost of alcohol fuelled violence. Over the past few months during public debate on the legislation, the primary contact my office has received about our legislation being unreasonable has been from club owners whose concerns are around lost revenue, but what we have seen and heard is that the safer people feel the more they go out and the more money they spend, which is good for our economy, jobs and tourism.

This policy builds on existing legislation to ensure the best possible mix of measures is in place to prevent alcohol fuelled violence across all of Queensland. Based on international, interstate and local examples, we know lockdown and a reduction in the hours liquor can be served works. We are confident that these measures will not only improve safety for patrons and staff of licensed premises and entertainment precincts but also ensure a thriving night-time economy. It is for these reasons that I support the bill and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (10.46 pm): The objectives of this bill are to tackle alcohol fuelled violence, particularly late at night, and to provide greater clarity and improve operational efficiency in the regulation of licensed premises. Let me say from the outset that the prevalence and severity of violence that has erupted on our streets, especially in entertainment precincts, in recent years has sickened and worried us all, regardless of our political persuasions or our other differences. These concerns are felt genuinely by the opposition, the crossbench and government members alike. To say otherwise is to make light of these deadly, harmful behaviours in the hope of cheap political point-scoring.

LNP members, like others in this House, have kids and we have mates who we want to be able to enjoy a fun night out with and then return home safely with. I am therefore deeply disappointed that some government members through their language in this debate are treating this frighteningly serious issue as a political football. The Labor government does not have a mandate on compassion and empathy. What we have before us in this legislation is not a panacea. A something-is-better-than-nothing attitude will not guarantee the safety of our kids.

Unprovoked late-night violent attacks are not a new phenomenon; they have been creeping up for a decade or more. We can look back 10 years to the number and severity of this type of incident and then add the emergence of drugs like ice and steroid pumped young males and, more recently,

young females. On the Gold Coast why is the Palaszczuk government taking away our police officers with countless years of operational experience, intel and respect? Three top cops were moved on in a matter of months: Superintendent Jim Keogh, Assistant Commissioner Brett Pointing and then head of our Rapid Action Patrol, Inspector Shane Holmes.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, whom I wish to commend for the many hours of work that they have put into this bill, was not able to reach agreement on it. I note that recommendation 1 highlights the need for more data. So where is the data? Where are the stats for self-inflicted alcohol injuries caused in the home? Where is the data, full stop? A number of commentators and submitters noted conflicting figures were being presented and the government was cherry-picking the findings. Presentations at EDs are highest between 10 pm and midnight. I have worked in EDs, like a few other members in this House. I know what trauma looks like and I know what it is like to hold the hand of a dying child. Labor had to back-pedal on their original 1 am scenario after much community outrage and have now come up with a complicated regime that is still destined to fail. Government members were so concerned about public backlash that they even wanted to change the word 'lockout' to 'one-way door'.

On Friday, 6 November 2015 I held a law and order forum with community leaders across the Currumbin electorate with the honourable member for Mansfield and the shadow Attorney-General in attendance. This round table discussed law and order topics, most prominently the current VLAD laws and Labor's proposed blanket lockout laws. There was strong opposition to Labor's plans from all present at the forum. The concept of punishing those who conduct business ethically and responsibly alongside those who do so unethically and irresponsibly is unfair and un-Australian. Bandaid solutions for entrenched cultural problems will not stop this happening. Worse, these proposed changes have the ability to cause more harm than merely punishing the good with the bad by forcing a large number of intoxicated people out of venues—where their behaviour can be monitored in a safe environment—into the streets all at once, increasing the likelihood of aggressive clashes between intoxicated patrons. In a disgruntled and judgement impaired state, individuals may be more easily offended and more inclined to resort to violence, increasing the chances of coward-punch attacks as well as clashes with our police who face the brunt of lawless behaviours. Even worse still, nearby suburban residential areas will be hit by a sudden influx of intoxicated individuals looking for other means of entertainment or trouble. As one of my local licensed premises reported, the government should be looking at ice and steroid use, which is a bigger problem than alcohol.

I am a very proud Gold Coast resident of almost 30 years and I take great offence to the fact that Queensland and especially locations like my home, the Gold Coast, are being likened to Newcastle. The Gold Coast is a highly desirable premier tourism destination—an expensive destination at that—compared with many of our Asian neighbours and we need to be competitive. It is important to note that the 2008 Newcastle reforms to alcohol service hours were part of a broader intervention, and the Geelong liquor accord included a number of interventions such as a shared banned patron list, agreed levels of security surveillance, implementing ID scanners, encouraged use of two-way radios and a community education program, increased police presence and increased penalties for antisocial behaviour. These are very similar initiatives to the LNP's Safe Night Out Strategy, a comprehensive package which was working. We had something. We had something good. Where was the education from this government over the Christmas-New Year period? I understand the LNP had allocated funding for this.

I recall very clearly a random incident that occurred in November 2007 when a vicious gang attack took place in Coolangatta's main streets. This brutal and unprovoked attack by nine teens upon an off-duty police officer, Constable Rawson Armitage, and his girlfriend sent shock waves through the Gold Coast and beyond. The footage captured on CCTV showed the terrifying ordeal that this young couple were subjected to and the truly sickening moment when one of the gang, just 15 years old, climbed onto a fence so he could jump onto the defenceless officer's head as he lay on the pavement. The youngest member of this gang was 11 at the time. One has to wonder why these kids from across the border in Tweed Heads were roaming the streets several kilometres away from home in the middle of the night. Where were their parents? What has become of them now that they are adults? Are they continuing this behaviour?


After this shocking attack, vigorous efforts were made to make the southern Gold Coast a safer destination and to restore our damaged reputation. Police walk the beat at night and community engagement brought everyone together to make it very clear to would-be perpetrators that this

community would not tolerate further incidents. Tragically though, a father and grandfather lost his life 10 days after he was coward punched in the back of the head outside the Coolangatta Hotel on Friday, 4 December 2015.

Tourism is a \$23 billion industry in Queensland and, as I said, we need to be competitive. Airport arrival figures in two of Queensland's premier tourism meccas, the Gold Coast and Cairns, could well suffer if these lockout laws are passed and so will countless jobs in this volatile industry. On the Gold Coast 16 flights land over Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights between 8 pm and the 11 pm curfew, carrying more than 2,000 passengers. A percentage of these will be keen to go out and experience the night-life. Likewise, Cairns has about 45 flights per week that carry over 7,000 passengers landing between 9 pm and midnight.

In Saturday's *Courier-Mail* from 13 February, Fortitude Valley night-life association chief Nick Braban said that the nanny-state restrictions may destroy the night-time economy of the Valley. He noted the LNP's Safe Night Out Strategy was gradually working with the number of assaults declining; the most hurt will be done to the little underground bars that do not have violence, anyway. Trent Meade, who runs two Valley nightclubs, fears lockouts may exacerbate violence rather than curb it, with 30,000 young people forced out onto the streets at 2 am. Where do they go, what do they do while they wait for limited buses and taxis? Townsville and Cairns operators say the same. Backpackers, who are a vital resource as hospitality workers, have also taken to social media to voice their opposition to these laws.

These complicated laws will cause confusion, anger and frustration as venues in popular night-life precincts such as the Valley lock their patrons out while casinos can serve alcohol all night long. Pubs in the suburbs can trade til 2 am and our thin blue line will be stretched. Failure to address public transport issues such as Uber and taxis will see more unrest as partygoers pile out onto the streets at the same time. On a number of occasions alcohol was not involved, nor was it after midnight, when these attacks occurred. The well-meaning intentions of respected surgeon-turned-politician, Dr Anthony Lynham, have unfortunately been enmeshed into bandaid legislation that fails to address the real issues behind this all-too-often unprovoked violence wreaked by thugs. I cannot support this bill.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.57 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I will not be speaking as a parent. The greatest danger posed at my daughter's birthday party on Saturday will come from rollerskates. That does fill me with great trepidation. I will be speaking as a nurse most recently working in rehabilitation. I have worked in ED and I have worked in ICU, but I cannot speak from recency of practice. So I cannot tell honourable members what it would be like to be an ED or ICU nurse and see a young person wheeled in with a broken body or to be an ICU nurse and see families arriving at the hospital, ripped from their peaceful Sundays to suddenly be in a hospital waiting room agonisingly wondering what the fate of the child that they have brought through 18 to 20 or 25 years of life holds. I could not imagine what it is like to be with those people as they make terrible decisions about whether to continue treatment or to turn off life support, nor could I imagine what it is like to make those agonising decisions—but thankfully people do make those decisions—to donate organs. I can only imagine how difficult that situation must be for emergency room nurses and intensive care nurses, but I am a rehab nurse.

I think about my colleagues in aged care, community care, disability support workers and I want to talk about the sorts of things that we see. These are the sorts of things that do not make it on to the front page of the local paper because these stories take decades to tell. We see the groups of friends and the parents gathering in vigils with flowers and prayers, and as the years go by we see those friends naturally, and through no fault of their own, drift away. We see the fiance who never gets to the altar. We see the mums and the dads who do not see the graduation ceremony, who do not see the wedding, who never hoist the baby, who never celebrate the 21st, the 30th, the 40th or the 50th. We see the parents grow old and worried. We see them wonder what will become of their loved one. We see the siblings who thankfully step forward to provide care. This story takes decades to tell and you cannot compare one tragedy to another. They are both great tragedies and we have it in our capacity to avoid them.


I have grown up in a culture that has accepted very high levels of alcohol consumption. I have grown up in an environment where alcohol fuelled violence is acceptable and certainly normally. I was at the Breakfast Creek Hotel celebrating a nursing exam, as we did, with my nursing colleagues who had gathered from the Royal Brisbane Hospital and the PA Hospital. At the end of the night while walking home fairly late I was king hit from behind. Perhaps I deserved it; I do not know. I do not tell

this story to garner any sympathy. I am lucky to be here. I hit my head hard enough to break my wisdom teeth, so I was left with a hole in my mouth and a dental bill which I could not really afford at the time. When I was preparing this speech probably the saddest thing was that, upon reflecting on that time in life over 25 years ago, nothing about that struck me as unusual. That was a Friday night. Or a Tuesday night. Or a Wednesday night. That was just what happened. There was a fight somewhere, someone was involved and this particular night it was my turn.

That is all extremely emotive, but I am a healthcare professional. The emotions make me want to act, but the evidence tells me what to do and the evidence for these measures is strong. I am not going to rehash it because that will be done plenty of times tonight as it has already. Professor Janet Ransley's excellent article in the *Brisbane Times* summarised it well, but what we need to do is use that evidence to change the culture. Once we accepted that smoking was a normal part of our culture. When we started to challenge that notion, as we did in 1972 just by writing a small warning on a packet of cigarettes, there was outrage and outcries. The industry said, 'We'll all be ruined, Hanrahan.' But here we are many years later still changing and updating smoking legislation. Smoking rates are down to 14 per cent and we have not been ruined.

I accept that alcohol is different to smoking. There are safe levels of consumption, and we are not proposing to eradicate people enjoying a couple of beers with their mates, a nice glass of wine or a whiskey. What we are proposing to do is to intervene in our society and re-establish a safe drinking culture. We are basing this on evidence and, just like the smoking legislation that our brave forebears started to introduce in 1972, I hope that this is the start of a much broader conversation because I know that these laws are not just simply about one measure: they are about a range of measures.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when I come to vote this evening I will be thinking about the people who nurses like me care for. I will be thinking about the people who are damaged for decades. I will be basing my vote on the evidence, and I would urge all members of this House to do the same. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (11.03 pm): Madam Deputy Speaker, since human beings made that extraordinary breakthrough and became able to ferment simple sugars to produce alcohol, it has modified the behaviour of people who consume it. That is a fact. Let's be honest: alcohol can be used responsibly. It can be genuinely enjoyed by people who consume it or it can help to create a more agreeable social environment. Alcohol can also be used irresponsibly. Its consumption can be abused and people can do or say things that they would not otherwise do or say. However, this bill is not about the virtues or otherwise of alcohol in and of itself. If it were, this would be a bill proposing prohibition. But no-one is talking about that, are they.

History tells us what a monumental screaming failure that policy was in those jurisdictions where lawmakers got carried away enough to think that they could force people to abstain completely. Otherwise law-abiding people who enjoyed a drink were suddenly placed on the wrong side of the law. Fast-forward to the recent past and come a little closer to home. Former prime minister Kevin Rudd embarked on his own personal social engineering crusade when he determined that people were consuming excessive volumes of premixed alcoholic drinks, dubbed alcopops. Labor's solution was to introduce an alcopop tax to try to reduce the consumption of premixed alcoholic drinks. This was another attempt to try to alter the behaviour of consumers with respect to alcohol. The result was the opposite of what was intended by Labor's bright spark social engineers. Priced out of premixed standardised drinks, people went to the bottle shops, purchased large bottles of unmixed spirits and mixed their own which were usually much stronger in terms of alcohol content. That was another monumental screaming failure by certain lawmakers who think that they can defy the love/hate relationship that human beings have had with alcohol for thousands of years.

Furthermore, the eye-watering levels of taxation imposed on alcoholic products in Australia for decades has similarly failed to prevent the violent, irresponsible and antisocial behaviour that is objected to by the overwhelming majority of people in the community. So we know that making alcohol unlawful and we know that making alcohol more expensive has not addressed the problem. This brings us to the mechanism that is being proposed in this bill: fiddling around with the trading hours of licensed premises, locking people out and picking winners on the drinks menu. We should again look at history as a guide.

I am too young to remember when pubs closed at 6 pm, but I am aware of the practice during the period known as the 'six o'clock swill'. The law which was intended to reduce alcohol consumption instead encouraged rapid consumption within a short time frame. Reduced trading hours did not have a significant effect on reduced alcohol consumption. In many cases patrons would buy alcohol at bottle

shops to consume at home after the six o'clock swill. What on earth makes the Labor Party and the Katter party think that fiddling around with trading hours and lockouts and making up new rules about when a licensed premise can serve a certain type of drink to their patrons is going to stop violent, irresponsible and antisocial behaviour by people who have consumed alcohol. History tells us that it will not and it will have unintended consequences.

Prohibition, taxation and restricted trading hours have all failed dismally to deliver the outcome that the Labor Party and the Katter party are seeking to achieve through this bill. More recently we have had lockouts in our entertainment precincts and a moratorium on extended trading hours for licensed premises, yet here we are proposing to impose the lockouts earlier and reduce the trading hours of licensed premises. The definition of insanity is doing the same thing again and again and expecting a different outcome. What are the Labor Party and the Katter party going to do next time when these measures do not work? Will we be back in here doing the same thing again? What will their rationale be the next time when a small minority of people continue to abuse alcohol and revert to unacceptably violent, irresponsible and antisocial behaviour?

While I am too young to remember the monumental screaming failure that was closing pubs at six o'clock and the six o'clock swill, the fact is that I am now a little bit too old to go out until three o'clock in the morning. The measures that are being proposed by Labor and the Katter party are not going to impact on me personally, but this is not about me; it is not about my personal preferences. The fact is: what are these measures going to actually do to reduce violent, irresponsible and antisocial behaviour in and around licensed premises?

Why should the overwhelming majority of people who do the right thing and go out to have a good time have their options and their choices taken away because of a small minority of idiots, which is exactly what these people are? If we could solve the problem by passing a law today to erect signs in and around licensed premises right across Queensland saying 'no idiots past this point' we would do it, but, of course, idiots rarely self-identify when asked to do so.

Lastly, I ask all Labor Party MPs and all Katter party MPs to be honest with themselves for just one moment and ask this simple question: do they really think people are going to cop this sweet, go home and tuck themselves safely into bed because the Labor Party and the Katter party say so? They are not. They are going to spread out into the suburbs, into private homes and back yards, where they will be even more difficult for our very good officers in the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Ambulance Service to deal with.

Furthermore, they are prepared. They knew before they went out that the Labor Party and the Katter party had already decided that they would be locked out of licensed premises earlier than they used to be. They also knew that, even if they are inside after the earlier lockout, they can only consume beverages that the Labor Party and the Katter party have decided they are allowed to drink. Not to worry: as I mentioned, they are prepared. They have been to the bottle shop earlier and that bottle of spirits, those bottles of wine or that carton of beer will be waiting for them at home or at their friend's place. They are not going to be told by the Labor Party or the Katter party what they can and cannot do. The Labor Party and the Katter party are kidding themselves if they think this will not happen.

We have to make people more responsible for their own actions. The consequences and the penalties for violent, irresponsible and antisocial behaviour need to be more significant to get the message through to the public. We have to remove this minority of idiots from licensed premises so that everyone else—the law-abiding majority—can go out and enjoy themselves. This is exactly what the LNP's Safe Night Out Strategy was doing, and it was proving to be successful where it had been deployed properly, with the required resources. It was properly consulted on during the term of the previous LNP government, and it should have been supported by the Palaszczuk government when it came to office just over 12 months ago.

In my part of the state, in North Queensland, the parliamentary committee hearings in Cairns and Townsville delivered very clear feedback from a range of relevant and well-informed stakeholders. They do not want these earlier lockouts and reduced trading hours. That feedback is being ignored by the three Labor MPs from Cairns, the three Labor MPs from Townsville and the Katter party.

I do not support the government's proposed interventions in relation to alcohol fuelled violence because I do not think history shows that the interventions being proposed will have any material effect on the antisocial, violent and unacceptable behaviour demonstrated by the minority of idiots, who have been perpetuating since that wonderful breakthrough in the mists of time when we were first able to ferment simple sugars into alcohol.



Mr STEWART (Townsville—ALP) (11.14 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bill before the House. I do so because I believe that this legislation will curb the amount of violence and the number of physical assaults in our vibrant city nightclub areas.

Upon the bill being introduced into the House, I requested the committee chair to hold a public briefing in Townsville. It did this on Friday, 22 January and heard from a range of groups representing a wide range of interests. Inspector Roger Whyte of the Queensland Police Service articulated some very alarming data sets taken from the QPRIME system. In his statement the inspector continued to outline data for assaults for the last 3½ years. That continually showed assaults at around the 11 per cent mark, while good-order offences remained around the 40 per cent mark in the drink safe precinct alone, in comparison to the rest of the Townsville area. What are good-order offences? As Inspector Whyte articulates, they are threatening violence, altercations and so forth. He stated—

But what is not clearly revealed is police intervention which subsequently alleviates the propensity for further violence later on that night or, for example, that incident.

Blind Freddy can see that alcohol fuelled violence is an issue that needs to be addressed, and addressed through some clear intervention to reduce the level of assaults. The drink safe precinct, introduced in 2010 as a trial for two years, was unclear in delivering the anticipated reduction in alcohol fuelled violence in Townsville. However, many of the police officers I spoke to support the concept of the DSP. While I, like many others, acknowledge the impact the drink safe precinct has, we need to continue to implement strategies that will reduce senseless injuries and injuries caused by people fuelled up on alcohol, given the data provided by the Townsville police.

Appearing at that public briefing in Townsville was Dr Graeme Maw, a senior staff specialist at Townsville Hospital emergency department who has been working in the ED for 17 years. He stated that Townsville is a level 1 trauma unit and sees approximately 76,000 people per annum. Dr Maw stated—

Just for this month so far—

22 days in January—

we have had 13 code greys. A code grey is a pre-notification of a violent patient coming into the department. Six of those had documented alcohol. Two were associated with methamphetamines. The other five were unaccounted for. Some of the other five probably had alcohol involved as well. When these patients come into the department, it is a massive drain on our resources. It takes multiple security guards, multiple doctors and multiple nurses. They are difficult patients to look after. They take time and they consume resources that could otherwise be deployed elsewhere within our department.

Dr Maw then cites work done by Dr Fulde. He said—

New South Wales changed their liquor licensing laws in about 2014. He looked at the data for the 12 months before they brought the change in the licensing laws in and he looked at the data for the 12 months after they brought the licensing laws in. He only looked at triage categories 1 and 2—they are the most severely injured patients, the really sick patients. He found a 25 per cent reduction in patients in triage category 1 and triage category 2 after the introduction of the change in liquor licensing laws in New South Wales.

Nightclub owners are not the enemy in this bill. Not one nightclub owner wants to see alcohol fuelled violence and the devastation it can cause at their establishment. They want to protect their patrons and provide an enjoyable evening out for everyone. So does this government, but we need to put safety ahead of the almighty dollar. Imagine the devastation that suddenly crashes through a family because of alcohol fuelled violence. This evening, members have the ability to do something to prevent this.

If members do not support this bill, every morning they wake up and look in the mirror they need to hope and pray that no-one has had their cheekbone shattered, their eye socket smashed or their vision or memory lost due to a traumatic head injury attributed to alcohol fuelled violence, because when these members who have not supported the bill look in that mirror every single morning they will know that they could have done something to prevent those injuries but they chose not to. I commend the bill to the House.



Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.19 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. Alcohol fuelled violence, particularly in our night-life precincts, is a scourge that we need to address to preserve the safety of young people in our communities. As a mother I want to know that my kids are safe when they head out with their friends. I want to know that we have taken every practical step to ensure they do not fall victim to a coward's punch or other forms of physical violence. As an elected representative I want to keep my constituents safe to ensure that no family in my electorate ever has to wake up to their loved ones

having been subjected to senseless violence in our community. That is why as a member of the 54th Parliament I voted in favour of the former LNP government's Safe Night Out Strategy, which was a well thought out, concrete plan aimed at delivering a safe night out rather than no night out at all.

When I spoke on the Safe Night Out Legislation Amendment Bill I reflected on the fact that my electorate of Mudgeeraba is home to many who use our Gold Coast night-life precincts in Surfers Paradise, Broadbeach, Main Beach and elsewhere for a good night out with their friends. These young people drink responsibly, look after their mates and they do not inflict harm on other people. I also said at the time that unfortunately there are always those rare few who try to turn a good night out into a night in hospital for those who behave well, drink responsibly and look after their mates. Our Safe Night Out Strategy was established to address this issue and followed months of consultation and discussion about alcohol and drug related violence. We committed \$44.5 million to deliver a safe night out which included over 60 initiatives designed to change the culture of night-life in Queensland, particularly in areas like Broadbeach and Surfers Paradise, which are frequented by young people from my electorate.

Unlike those opposite, we knew that good policy does not punish the majority, who do the right thing and head out for a responsible and safe night out, for the sins of a few. We knew that a quick fix or a one-size-fits-all blanket approach to policy-making would cripple our night-life, put industry at risk, impose hardship on business and restrict the freedom of our young people in our communities to enjoy a night out with their friends. We knew that to stop the violence we needed to change the culture. We knew that we needed to crack down on those who are making our night-life precincts dangerous and, as a result, our Safe Night Out Strategy included compulsory drug and alcohol education from years 7 to 12, establishing safe night precincts to ensure a coordinated prevention and support approach, creating a new offence called unlawful striking causing death—a specific legal penalty for coward's punches—increasing penalties for antisocial behaviour and empowering our police to get tough on offenders, and an awareness campaign for responsible behaviour. In turn we saw our night-life precincts safer, better policed and with young people who were more aware than ever of how their actions can impact others. The data spoke for itself: assaults down by nine per cent, sexual offences down by 18 per cent, property damage down by 10 per cent and drug offences being detected more effectively by police.

Unfortunately, just 18 months since we passed our Safe Night Out Strategy, the Labor government is attempting to replace it with a hastily cobbled together, misguided blanket approach to what is an important social issue. What is worse is that it is doing this without any reliable data, as has been confirmed by the committee, attempting to legislate first and ask questions later. Of greatest concern is that there is no certainty that this bill will deal with the real issues behind violence in our streets. This government's plan is a complicated patchwork set of rules that will force a 1 am lockdown on some businesses and let others trade till 3 am. Meanwhile, nearby casinos like Jupiters Casino on the Gold Coast in my electorate will apparently be allowed to serve alcohol all night long while others are forced to stop. After a year in office this Labor government is still presenting no real solutions to problems which were already being addressed by the former LNP government. We on this side of the House know that this issue is far too important for a quick political fix and, unlike those opposite, we want to see a real policy solution to this very real problem.

The government's bill does not address alcohol fuelled violence in the home. As a survivor of domestic violence, it would not have mattered if a pub or a club was open till 6 am. The violence was brought home anyway and it did not have a curfew. Alcohol fuelled violence in my home started at 7 pm on a Friday night and after lunch on a Saturday afternoon, and if we were really unlucky it continued after the Catholic hour on a Sunday whilst we went to mass and my father had his mates around drinking. If there was no alcohol brought home then my father would just drive to a mate's house and drink there. Both my mother and I could easily have been victims of a one punch at home. One shove in the wrong direction towards the piano or the kitchen bench could easily have resulted in a death in my house. You did not have to be in a nightclub precinct for that to occur.

Having observed a shift at Gold Coast University Hospital I watched more young drunk girls taking up beds in the ED than I did men. They were ugly and they were nasty and they were violent to the staff and they did not care if they hit out at those trying to help them. I watched a woman assault a nurse in front of me. The woman had drunk an entire bottle of vodka and passed out on the street, where a good Samaritan had called an ambulance. The woman was a frequent flyer to the staff at Gold Coast University Hospital and when she woke up from her stupor her fists started to fly. It was 10 pm and the nurse that she assaulted was my sister. Like everyone in this House, I want to keep our young kids safe. But I believe that this legislation will only push the problem out into areas where there are no police or no cameras and that this complex matter requires much more consideration.



Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (11.25 pm): Tonight I rise to speak in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and I am very happy to speak in support of this important bill, as this is a matter of public safety—a matter of great significance to our state, my community and to me personally. I have two kids—a 24-year-old and a 22-year-old—and they and their friends enjoy going out, having fun, listening to music, bands or DJs. As a parent we never stop worrying about our kids and I want to do everything within my power to ensure that when my kids or their friends go out they come home safe. I remember my son's and my daughter's 18th birthdays and their first night out in the Valley. I was excited for both of them with their new independence. However, my husband and I were terrified, to be quite honest. My son had his older cousin and my daughter had her big brother as their guide and chaperone. I took both of those chaperones aside and gave them strict instructions and reminded them of their responsibility to look after their cousin and little sister, to be very careful, to stick together, do not drink too much, drink plenty of water and never leave your drink unattended. Sound familiar? I am sure that many members of this House and indeed many parents in our community can remember similar conversations. Peter, my husband, and I waited by the phone for them to get home and only then could we go to bed ourselves, and this has not changed. My son does not live at home anymore. However, I still worry about him and his mates when they go out and I still wait up for my daughter.

My kids love to go out, and this is their right. They and their friends and all sons and daughters have the right to be safe in public. When it comes to violence, no matter what type, the Palaszczuk government says enough is enough. Parents want to make sure that their children are safe and I believe that each of us has a moral and ethical obligation to ensure this. This obligation is even more prominent when we are elected to represent our communities. As MPs we are given the responsibility to make informed decisions which will improve our community, our society and, importantly, ensure public safety. To enable us to make these decisions, we must be informed, gather information from appropriate experts, listen to evidence from experts and understand the data and research that is presented. It is also important to ensure that the data and research that we rely on is unbiased, that it is reliable and peer reviewed, that it is collaborated and supported by academic peers. It is then that we can use this data and evidence gathered from experts to form an opinion that is clear, informed and not influenced by specific interest groups or political agendas.

The harm from alcohol in Queensland is significant and we all offer our love and support to those families who have lost loved ones or been affected by alcohol fuelled violence. I raise a point of order: I am actually a committee member and I think I am entitled to 20 minutes.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Yes, that is correct; thank you. We will just reset the clock. Thank you, member for Lytton, for drawing the attention of the House to that. That has been corrected. The member has the call.

Ms PEASE: Thank you. The harm from alcohol in Queensland is significant and we all offer our love and support to those families who have lost loved ones or been affected by alcohol fuelled violence. We need to do something. We need to ensure that, if our loved ones choose to go out to a safe night precinct or to the local hotel or club, they come home safely. Everyone has the right to enjoy a night out with friends without becoming a victim. If we are to reduce alcohol related violence, it is essential that we draw on research, literature and data and implement policies that are grounded in evidence. I am proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government, as this bill is based on research and evidence. It is about us meeting our moral obligations to our communities and ensuring public safety.

The bill consists of four key measures: 2 am last drinks statewide with no lockout or, if the premises is located in a safe night precinct, the safe night precinct boards can apply for last drinks to be extended to 3 am coupled with a lockout, which will be introduced in 2017. High-alcohol and rapid consumption drinks such as shots will be banned after midnight. The definition of what constitutes a high-alcohol and rapid consumption drink will be determined after further discussion with stakeholders. To address preloading, no new applications to sell takeaway liquor post 10 pm will be approved. Existing licences allowing trading to midnight will not be affected.

This bill is based on scientific research. The government's policy is backed by the Queensland Tourism Industry Council, the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol, the Australasian College of Emergency Medicine, the AMA Queensland, Clubs Queensland, the Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Police Union, the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education and the Queensland Ambulance Service, just to name a few.

Sadly, the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education 2014 annual alcohol poll finds that one in six Queenslanders have been a victim of alcohol fuelled violence and that two-thirds of Queenslanders consider the city or the centre of their town to be unsafe on Saturday night. Queensland Health's 2012 annual report indicates that there has been an increase of 45 per cent in the number of treatment episodes where alcohol was the main drug of concern. These figures are not something that any Queenslander would be proud of. I would rather explain the Palaszczuk government's call for last drinks at 2 am than explain to people why their loved ones are not coming home because they are lying in a hospital bed, or worse. Research shows that, after midnight and for every hour that alcohol continues to be served, the risk of being assaulted or being a victim of alcohol fuelled violence increases by 20 per cent. Conversely, cities where the hours of sale of alcohol are restricted see a decrease of 20 per cent per hour of the restriction. Queensland police officers, our ED departments, nursing and medical staff and paramedics are all at the coalface and witness this violence firsthand and often are themselves the victims of alcohol fuelled violence.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee had the opportunity to visit the Fortitude Valley, Surfers Paradise, Cairns and Townsville precincts and meet with stakeholders and service providers. It was sobering to visit the RBH and to see and hear the staff experience. The Australasian College for Emergency Medicine undertook a two-year research project and reported that one in 12, or 8.3 per cent, of all presentations to emergency departments were alcohol related. A snapshot survey conducted on 13 December 2013 in 92 hospitals found that one in seven patients were there because of alcohol. A repeat snapshot survey conducted at 2 am on 6 December 2014 found that one in eight patients were in the ED because of their drinking. Over 9,600 patients were screened as part of the study, which found that alcohol affected patients were more likely to require urgent resuscitation and arrive by ambulance and with police. That puts enormous pressure on staff, taking them away from the patients in their care. The RBH hospital staff indicated that alcohol affected patients are more demanding, often violent and require more attention.

In 2015, in the CBD and safe night precinct areas across the state, there were a total of 324 alcohol related assaults on police officers, which is an increase of 11 from 2014. That figure includes 78 alcohol related serious assaults on police officers, which represents 24 per cent of all alcohol related assaults on police in 2015. In 2015, across Queensland, alcohol was an indicator in 5,229 assaults, which is down by 169, and 427 alcohol related sexual offences, which is also down by 39. However, these decreases in the number of offences have come at a huge cost to Queensland taxpayers. For example, in 2014 in Cairns, there were 266 alcohol related assaults and 21 alcohol related sexual assaults. In 2015, whilst there was a small reduction of nine assaults and five alcohol related sexual assaults, to achieve that decrease the cost to the taxpayer was an extra 12 to 18 police rostered on in the Cairns safe night precinct every Friday and Saturday night.

In fact, during the committee's public hearing in Cairns, the police advised that policing the safe night precinct on a Friday and Saturday night is their core business. Police in Townsville advise that they are losing almost one-third of their staffing on weekend night shifts to the safe night precinct. There is an undeniable nexus between this commitment and the ability of the police to properly address crime in areas outside the SNP. That is not an efficient use of police resources and taxpayer funds. Across Queensland, our police should not be used to deal mainly with drunks. Instead, they should be allowed to focus 100 per cent on protecting our community.

In Townsville, the Queensland Police Service planned for the committee a thorough and extensive tour of the Townsville SNP, which gave the committee an opportunity to see the great work that is done by our police officers, to witness firsthand a regional SNP and to talk to venue operators and owners and patrons in the regional area. Unfortunately, non-government committee members did not attend this comprehensively planned tour. I felt that that was a total disregard of our hardworking QPS officers in Townsville and a further disregard by non-government members by not fulfilling their obligations and responsibilities.

Mr RICKUSS: I rise to a point of order. I ask the member to withdraw that statement. It goes against common practice, if members do not turn up for some function, to not be criticised in the House for that.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! I am sorry, can you clarify? I missed what the member said.

Mr RICKUSS: The member mentioned that some members did not turn up for a tour.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms PEASE: Evidence presented by witnesses during these public hearings suggest that, from 3 am, things are starting to wind down in the safe night precincts. In Townsville, one venue owner spoke candidly, saying that these changes will simply mean a reduction of two hours twice a week, which is a reduction of only four hours a week, during a time when he said they were generally packing up and selling very little alcohol or no alcohol to very few people.

As a tourist destination, our great state is on so many people's bucket list. Be it Cairns, the Gold Coast, the Whitsundays, Townsville, the outback, or everywhere in between, Queensland is an international tourist destination. There is much, much more to do in Queensland than just drink alcohol. Visitors want to feel safe and the safer tourists feel in Queensland, the more tourists will visit.

Newcastle has been a leader in reducing alcohol fuelled violence. In 2008, Newcastle introduced a range of reforms, which included venues closing at 3.30 am with a lockout at 1.30 am. As a result, alcohol fuelled violence was reduced by 37 per cent and this reduction has been sustained. Of the 14 venues that were operating prior to the new conditions, 12 of them are still operating. One was burnt down and the other was closed by BOSCAR. The Newcastle precinct is now a vibrant, safe environment for tourists and locals alike. There are now small bars, new restaurants and all of them are thriving. Since the introduction of these conditions, Newcastle has effectively halved its alcohol related crime rate. It is estimated that that has prevented 5,000 young people from being bashed in the street.

Prior to the introduction of these conditions, the Newcastle CBD was described as a violent drunken bloodbath. In 2006 alone, the cost to the ratepayers of Newcastle for cleaning up the blood, vomit and excrement in the CBD and repairing vandalised public assets was approximately \$1 million. Newcastle's reputation as a safe destination was destroyed and many young people were traumatised by the alcohol fuelled violence and fear.

In 2010, the Leader of the Opposition voiced his concern about his observation of areas around licensed premises in Queensland. He spoke of his experiences in Cairns, Townsville, other major provincial centres as well as Brisbane, stating that he was disgusted and horrified to see the results that a night of alcohol and crowds had on local communities. He went on to say that the rubbish, stench and general disarray that greets people as the sun rises the morning after a night out is disgraceful, citing early morning walkers and tourists as being confronted with patrons exiting venues and that the mess and stench was unbelievable and disgusting. On this occasion, I agree with the member for Southern Downs. I do not want tourists to leave our wonderful state with these types of lasting images. I remind him and those others on the other side of the House that we all have a responsibility and an opportunity to put public safety beyond politics.

I want to do whatever it takes to make it safer for my kids, their friends and everyone's sons and daughters to enjoy a night out. Although I, like so many other parents in Queensland, still wait up for my children to get home, I know that this bill will make it safer for them. It is time for each and every one of us to take the responsibility given to us by our communities, to make a stand to protect our children, to respond to matters of public safety and concern, to ensure that if our kids choose to enjoy a night out that they get home, full of laughter and stories about what a great night they had, not to end up in hospital or worse.

I thank the members for Dalrymple and Mount Isa for putting public safety first, putting the safety of our kids before politics, and I know that parents across the state also thank you. Let me say again that when it comes to violence, no matter what type, the Palaszczuk government says enough is enough. I commend the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 to the House.



Mr CRAMP (Gaven—LNP) (11.40 pm): I rise tonight to speak on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. This is without doubt a very important and emotive issue that many previous and current state governments are seeking to address around this country. Alcohol fuelled violence forms part of a larger multifaceted problem. Violent assaults, including coward punches, are something that should never be tolerated in our communities. It is devastating that we continue to see a loss of life as a result of these actions. During the last half of my 14 years in the Ambulance Service a large part of my role was to manage and coordinate ambulance responses to emergency incidents in one of the busiest emergency operation centres in Queensland. I know from my experience in this environment that many violent acts and encounters, especially those in the public precincts that have gained the majority of attention from the media, can also be caused as a result of drug use or the fact that there are those in our communities who do not need to be under the influence of any substance to inflict injuries on others. To simply make an assumption that this violence is only caused or fuelled

by excess alcohol is a knee-jerk reaction to this problem. In its haste to act without a comprehensive understanding of the issue, the Labor government is failing to address the numerous other factors that can contribute to these assaults.

The previous LNP government understood the complexities surrounding this issue. It understood that a well considered, well consulted multifaceted approach to the issue of alcohol and drug related violence was required and the Safe Night Out Strategy was developed. As it has already been noted tonight, it was a \$44.5 million comprehensive plan that focused on the responsibility of the individual rather than punishing the majority who did the right thing, for the sins of a few. Very importantly, it provided a focus on the education of our youth so they understood the dangers and the effects of alcohol and drug use. Whilst education programs did focus on year 7 to 12 I believe that we should be starting to see these programs start even earlier with our primary years children. Only last week I met with Roberta Cava, a brilliant author, public speaker and champion of child and community protection on the Gold Coast and someone whom I have spoken about previously in this parliament. Roberta and I were discussing her latest book *Keeping our children safe* and the new program that has been borne out of this book to educate primary and secondary school children on the dangers and effects of alcohol, synthetic drugs and the ice epidemic. The LNP understands that this type of multifaceted education is the first line of defence in what is a war to protect our children. Without having education programs such as this our youth are defenceless in making informed choices and decisions when they are faced with drug use which will unfortunately occur for many long before they are ever old enough to enter a licensed premise.

As an operations supervisor in the QAS Southport operations centre incidents in any nightclub or bar area always had the potential for danger to our responding paramedics. The establishment of safe night precincts across popular night spots in Queensland, including Surfers Paradise, was testament to how an integrated and coordinated approach to alcohol and drug fuelled violence that was well planned and executed could assist the safety of not only the community but also the police and ambulance officers as they responded to an incident. The vast majority of violence-related incidents in the Surfers precinct had police on scene or proceeding at the time of dispatch of the ambulance. In many cases the CCTV within the precinct would also monitor the incident scene to ensure that further resources could be dispatched if required. Considering that a core focus of my role was to ensure the protection and safety of QAS resources responding to incidents, the LNP's action on this issue was of great assistance.

The safety of our community, especially our youth, is at the very heart of this issue. The previous LNP government and we here on this side of the House today understand that tough penalties for those who do harm others must form part of the deterrent. The Safe Night Out Strategy introduced tougher fines and penalties, including unlawful striking causing death so that coward punch deaths are punishable with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment and to serve a minimum of 80 per cent of their sentence before applying for parole; changing sentencing rules so that being intoxicated cannot be used as a reason to reduce a person's sentence; and, very importantly, increasing the maximum penalties for aggravated serious assaults on public officers, such as ambulance officers, from seven to 14 years imprisonment; it increased policing powers; enhanced compliance regulations; provided awareness campaigns for patrons and education programs for our youth. The strategy was producing results and should have been given the opportunity to continue by the current Labor government. Initial police data indicated that overall assaults had decreased by nine per cent, sexual offences by 18 per cent, property damage by 10 per cent and drug offences detected by the police had increased by 26 per cent across 15 safe night out precincts in the 2014-15 financial year.

What we do not want to see are any statistics similar to those occurring in New South Wales currently with regard to the business community in Kings Cross which is also subject to lockdown laws. The Sydney City Council states that foot traffic has fallen up to 84 per cent in this area. It has also been reported that up to 42 bars, clubs and small businesses have closed as a result of the introduction of lockdown laws in the first year alone. The media coverage of Queensland's lockdown legislation has been extensive and due to the complexity of the issue there have also been a multitude of varying reports. On Channel 9's *Today* show on Tuesday of this week, presenter Karl Stefanovic actually provided some very sound commentary on this issue, highlighting there are many factors to be considered. It is funny that when it was suggested that the lockdown law be run as an experiment to see how it worked even Mr Stefanovic rightly explained that if you do run a business in this area and you go out of business due to these laws, if there are arguments that suggest that the lockdown laws will not prevent this type of death then this is the business owners' livelihoods that are being affected by something that may not even work. The potential damage that implementing these lockdown laws could do to Queensland small

businesses, even conducting a trial before having the sufficient statistics and evidence that this policy will be successful, could be enough to close many small businesses down as we have seen in Kings Cross. With all due respect to New South Wales Premier Mike Baird, who is doing a good job for New South Wales, we have all seen this past week on social media the outcry from the community when you cherry-pick statistics or, in this Labor government's case, you do not actually have any comprehensive or adequate statistics to go on in the first place. Premier Baird's Facebook post defending his lockout laws saw close to 17,000 people comment, with the vast majority disagreeing that the lockout laws have been effective. As some colleagues have noted tonight, Premier Baird is now having the New South Wales lockout laws reviewed.

I have received almost no support for these lockout laws from within my own community. Gaven electorate locals John and Denise Collins did take the time to contact me via email advising that based on what they had heard in the media they would not support the LNP or myself in the future if we voted against these laws. I contacted Mr Collins and provided him the very reasoning that I am using tonight. Once Mr Collins understood how Labor's lockout laws absolutely paled in comparison to the LNP's Safe Night Out Strategy he was satisfied that I should not vote for these lockout laws.

Mr Rickuss interjected.


Mr CRAMP: Pretty much. I take that interjection. Yesterday I was also contacted by another fantastic local, Mr Martin Collis, an extraordinary community volunteer in our area. He felt compelled to contact me to provide me with his view. If I did not quote Mr Collins, with his permission, word for word, I would be doing him an injustice. Mr Collins advised me—

Community attitudes need to change, not lockout times. Education, respect for others and the law need to be the focus in any new laws or political debates. Changing opening times is a bandaid approach. We need governance for the future, not just the now.

I could not have said it better myself.

Yes, every life lost due to violence is an absolute tragedy and no-one should ever accept that there is a reason for such actions from those who seek to harm others. That being said, as I have noted, from TV presenters to locals in my own electorate, people understand that Labor's simplistic sledgehammer approach is not the correct way forward on this issue. Labor's logic on this issue is best summarised in a recent media article when, in reply to Premier Baird's stance on New South Wales's lockout laws, New South Wales Young Liberals president Alex Dore stated—

... when foot traffic falls, so does the volume of incidents. If we ban cars, we'd have fewer car accidents.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11.48 pm): I rise to support the bill before the House and I do so for a number of reasons. I live in Fortitude Valley. I have a 21-year-old daughter. I know exactly what goes on in that precinct. I have met with many licensees, both before and after the election. I have never refused a meeting with any licensee who wanted to come to see me. In fact, both before and after the election in my office I met personally with many who presented to the committee. They came to raise their issues and concerns. I listened. I stressed that the commitment that this government took to the election—and on which they campaigned against me—has been very clear and precise. They knew exactly what the Labor government was wanting to do. I support the changes. I think they make eminent sense. At the end of the day, this gives the licensees time to adjust to the changes. In fact, now they have at least two years in which they will be able to put in place the changes that this legislation will bring about, particularly in the Valley entertainment precinct. If they are to trade with last drinks at 3 am and the lockout at 1 am, they will have at least two years to adjust to the commitment that we took to the election in January 2015.

There are three things that convinced me that these changes are necessary. Do nothing was not an option that this government would go to the election with or do in relation to this matter. I am in the Valley regularly. As I said, I live in the Valley, I see what goes on and do nothing is definitely not an option. We need to bring about a cultural change when it comes to these precincts and other areas in Queensland. That cultural change is about sending a message. What is Labor's message? Labor's message is that alcohol fuelled violence is no longer acceptable or a normal practice for young people on the streets, whether they are in Fortitude Valley, Surfers Paradise, Mount Isa or anywhere else in the state. How do you get cultural change? I firmly believe, and I keep telling the licensees, that one of the safer places for youth to be is not on the streets late at night, but in their venues. If they have the product to attract young people, they can keep them in their venues. Venues that are licensed to operate until 5 am can have people in their venues until 5 am. It is better for them to be there, because most

incidents occur on the streets of Brisbane in the early hours of the morning when young people, who are restless and full of beer or other alcohol, are roaming around and venue picking. That is the issue that is causing the problem and it needs to change.

The cultural change will be to go out and have fun, but make up your mind where you want to go. If you want to stay out until three o'clock or five o'clock, depending on the hours of the licensed venue, you can do that. In fact, after these laws are passed, any one of us can decide to go to any venue in the Valley that is licensed until 3 am or 5 am, stay there all night and have quite a good time. That is part of the cultural change that we are trying to bring about: make up your mind about where you want to go early and do not roam the streets. If you do roam the streets because you have decided to leave the venue, you have a choice: you can either go straight home or get something to eat, have a coffee, sober up and then get transport home.

We talk about the Safe Night Out Strategy. It was in place long before the LNP government was elected. When I was first elected, I knew what was happening in the Valley with the safe entertainment precinct policy that was put in place and working extremely well under the auspices of the Fortitude Valley Police Station. That is where all of the relevant parties met to work out what was needed for transport, lighting, ambulance services and to assist with the great work that Lance Mergard and his team at Chaplain Watch do. We funded them. We put in chill-out zones, which were working extremely well. When the LNP came into power, it tried to take all the credit. It wasted money on sober centres and boards that are run not by the police but by the licensees. I do not think that there is anything wrong with licensees, but that is a little bit like putting Dracula in charge of the blood bank. There are issues that need to be addressed and you have to have a level head when you do it. I agree that there is not one simple solution. However, do nothing in relation to trading hours—and this is what we went to the election with—was not an option that we could stand by and allow to carry on.

The safe sober centres wasted about \$1 million. The former government could easily have spent that money on upgrading a number of things required in the Valley. Instead, those opposite wanted to play politics with the safe night out precincts. We had all the ideas. They claimed the credit, but nothing could be further from the truth. It was all in place before they were elected, and I was there at every single meeting. I have met with every single licensee who wanted a meeting.

Mr Rickuss: What about the scanners?

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection about the scanners. I can tell the honourable member who is most opposed to the scanners: It is the licensees. Before the election, the licensees came and saw me and said that the scanners would not work. They have their own scanners—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order!

Ms GRACE: They do not like it when they hear the truth. The licensees who met with me raised two issues. I have to be honest: they did not like the lockout laws, but they did not like the scanners even more, because they were very fearful that they would not work. Some licensees have voluntarily installed scanners, but they could not see how they could possibly be interconnected. They were very fearful that the technology was not there to deliver that and that it would cost them a lot of money. They were vehemently against it.


Opposition members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Lockyer and member for Mansfield, the minister is not taking your interjections generally speaking, so I ask you to desist.

Ms GRACE: Let us not confuse lockout with closing time. There is a big difference between the two. There is misinformation that everyone will be spilling onto the streets at the same time. Whether it is 3 am, 5 am or whatever, there will be a closing time at some point and the licensees accept that. Let us not confuse people by providing misinformation that a lockout is the same as a closing time. If you enter a premises before the lockout, you can stay there until three o'clock or five o'clock if it is licensed to open until those hours. Any misinformation that confuses that issue for young people is completely wrong and totally rejected.

I support the fact that we are giving licensees time to adjust. If they have the product right, they will get the young people through their doors. In the Valley we see line-ups that seem to go on forever and I must admit I would like to see them reduce. That is where a lot of this stuff happens. If you drive through the Valley at any time, you will see those line-ups. The young people get frustrated that they cannot get into the venue. I am hoping that, as part of this cultural change, the line-ups also disappear.

I congratulate both Minister Lynham and the Attorney-General on the work that they have done in bringing this bill into the House. I think these laws will work. I think it gives a good transitional ability. I believe that the Valley will continue to thrive. It will be a safer place. It will be one where alcohol fuelled violence will hopefully be curtailed. We can work with the licensees to educate them on this and all the other things that we brought in for safe entertainment precincts. Those things will continue. I look forward to meeting with any licensee who wants to see me. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—LNP) (12.00 am): I rise to speak on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. From the outset, I would like to stress that the LNP wants to improve safety on our streets. It goes without saying that all of us want safer streets for our kids, for ourselves and also for our communities. We want our entertainment precincts to be safe places. We want our families, our friends and our loved ones to come home safely after a night out.

As a father of two sons, undoubtedly like many others in the House, I have sat up late at night and been relieved to hear the keys in the lock when my two boys arrive home from a late night out. My heart goes out to all of those who have lost loved ones to alcohol fuelled violence. How can one not be touched when we hear stories of injuries and death as a result of alcohol fuelled violence and the terrible impact on the victims' families? We have felt this so many times on the Sunshine Coast. How can one not want to act to help to protect those families and friends from the experiences of such a devastating loss? When we learn of people getting gravely injured or even killed on our streets on their way home from a night out, we know that as an elected representative of our community we are obliged to do something.

We all want safer streets for our kids and for ourselves. The LNP was achieving just that with our Safe Night Out Strategy. It was a comprehensive plan to a very complicated problem. It involved scanners and banning and harsher penalties for violence, but also education and coordinated safety initiatives. It was a multipronged approach that was having a positive impact right throughout the state.

I remind those opposite that the early results in 2014-15 showed that overall assaults were down by almost 10 per cent, sex offences by 18 per cent, property damage by 10 per cent and drug detections increased by 26 per cent across the 15 safe night out precincts. The lockout laws as proposed by the Labor government have pushed much of this multipronged approach aside. I am concerned that this simplistic lockout will not address the real issues behind the violence on our streets.

It is a confusing proposal that will force a 1 am lockout on some businesses, however let others trade until 3 am and let casinos serve alcohol all night long. Why is a casino considered safe enough to provide alcohol and entertainment around the clock, but a well-known party precinct across town is forced to be in lockout at 1 am?

What are we doing to target excessive alcohol consumption, the preloading before people go out and venues continuing to serve people who are extremely intoxicated? What are we doing to look at the contributing factors such as the use of steroids and other illegal drugs? It is worrying that the committee had to point out that the proposal was lacking solid data.

This is an issue that deserves bipartisan support. While the rhetoric from those opposite is about a consultative approach, what we are seeing is a government hell-bent on getting this flawed legislation through parliament come hell or high water. 'If you are not with us, you are against us,' those opposite shrilly insist. It is up to Labor to stop playing politics and rushing through laws that even the parliamentary committee said had no reliable data to support them.

How are we not playing politics when the member for Cairns is quoted as saying, 'I don't support these laws in Cairns but will vote for them anyway'? We would be happy to support legislation that is based on solid data that shows that these lockout laws would work. The statistics that would be most relevant and measurable are alcohol related presentations at hospital emergency departments, prosecutions by the DPP around alcohol related violence and where and when those offences occurred.

'The heart is willing, but the case is weak'—the headline of the editorial in yesterday's *Courier-Mail* does sum it all up. It questions if the government's crash or crash through approach of crowd control and liquor-licensing measures will reduce alcohol related violence. It raises a whole set of pertinent and valid questions that are sorely lacking an answer at this stage. It urges the Premier to hasten slowly and to heed her own message about consultation as she has fallen woefully short on this particular issue.

I have heard so much from those opposite tonight about what great legislation this is, but it is the most simplistic legislation that I have seen in this House. It does not take into account so many different factors that we all know are factual and will affect so many people right throughout this state.


I ask those opposite what is going to happen when the first person is punched and knocked to the ground and possibly dies? What is going to happen when a young girl who is in the suburbs and pushed away from the city is maybe molested, beaten or worse? Are those opposite going to take that responsibility on board? The government should have taken its time with this legislation. It should have consulted more with all the proprietors across Queensland and had unilateral laws. We cannot have higgledy-piggledy laws across the state.

People are going to buck the system. Young people are going to continue to drink. I heard colleagues speak earlier tonight about the old mixer drinks people used to be able to buy. At least they were measured. When somebody goes the bottle shop and buys a big bottle of OP rum or tequila or whatever and takes it back to a party, they do not know what quantities they are pouring into a glass after they have had a couple. They will get smashed. They will get into a lot of trouble.

I think those on the other side of the House need to think about this. Tonight is not about blame. Tonight is about making a conscious decision about where the Labor government is going. This is going to represent the future of the Labor government. It will be the line in the sand in terms of what Labor stands for. We are demonstrating what we on this side of the House stand for. We stand for logic. We stand for common sense. We stand for a bipartisan approach that would deliver great outcomes for this state.

This issue has been bubbling away for a very long time. I think Labor will always take the easy way out. That is what those opposite are doing tonight. They have brokered a deal with the Katter party. God knows what that entails. I am sure there will be a new hospital or something pop up unexpectedly in the future. That is the way Labor operates. Let us get a deal.

They did not get the numbers in the House, but they can buy the numbers. That is what greatly concerns me. When this legislation goes through tonight they can happily go to bed and say, 'We bought the votes to get this through. We paid people off to get this legislation through.' That honestly sickens me and I am sure it will sicken Queenslanders.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (12.07 am): We have not got one minute to lose on this issue. There are those who advocate that we should take our time. People are being injured. People are being disfigured. People are, in some extreme cases, losing their lives on the streets today because of alcohol fuelled violence. We have not got a minute to spare in terms of whether we have action on this or not.

I congratulate Minister Lynham and the Attorney-General on their very successful stewardship of these highly responsible laws. Where certain liberties have a direct causal impact and take away greater liberties, it is our duty to examine those. It is our duty, where that is proven to be the case, to act to make sure that those greater liberties are protected.

What we are seeing is that the greater liberty of public safety is being impacted. The evidence has been mounting over the last 10 to 15 years. This is not an issue that started yesterday. It has been getting worse out there. I do not hear from the opposition any position that there is not a problem. I think there is an acceptance that there is a problem, and I acknowledge that. The issue is: will we deal with this problem?

The evidence out there is very strong. As the Minister for Road Safety, we regulate and take liberties off people for the safety of the public all the time. In the 1970s there were 31 fatalities per 100,000 people in this state. It is now down to five. How has that happened? It has happened because we have taken various liberties off people such as being able to drive a car while they are drunk or while they are taking drugs.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Lockyer, you are making a habit of interjecting tonight. I ask you to desist.

Mr BAILEY: We enforced them to wear a seatbelt. We enforced them to stop speeding because it is a danger to other Queenslanders. We use that principle in this parliament all the time. So let us not hear any rhetoric about this being unusual or unacceptable. We do it all the time. It has been an effective policy outcome that we have to keep getting better at. It has saved thousands of lives. There are thousands of Queenslanders here today because of road safety measures where we have taken liberties off people for the greater good. That is exactly the same principle that we are applying here today when it comes to alcohol fuelled violence.

What are we talking about here? We are talking about the prevention of disfigurement of people. We are talking about the prevention of violence and in some cases death. We are talking about the prevention of crime. I have not heard too much from the other side about this. They like to lecture us fairly piously about Labor being soft on crime, yet I have not heard an opposition member mention the word 'crime' once in this debate. Why? Because they are choosing to do nothing about crime. Violating somebody physically and violently is a crime. The evidence is very clear in other states. There is a huge amount of peer reviewed evidence that the reduction of alcohol trading hours will reduce alcohol fuelled violence. The evidence is overwhelming. It is peer reviewed. It is very strong. I might add there is the experience of Minister Lynham as a surgeon.

Consider this, Madam Deputy Speaker. Here is a man who is highly dedicated, who has decades of experience as a surgeon saving people's lives and who was prevented from doing his job because increasingly his time was taken up with putting back together the smashed bones of young people in this state and stitching together their slashed skin. Increasingly, he had to operate on those kinds of people more and more and on other people less because of this problem. Is that not evidence? Why would a surgeon leave such a highly skilled profession or at least put it aside to come into politics unless it was his experience and his evidence that motivated him to do that? We have to consider that.

It is not a fair and reasonable thing for us to say that somebody's pleasure is a greater right than somebody's safety. That is not fair and that is not on. The rights of somebody to continue drinking between 3 am and 5 am pales into insignificance compared to the right of somebody not to be disfigured, not to be smashed up and in the emergency department and in some cases with brain injuries and in some cases dead. It is not fair for us to be backing somebody's right to pleasure over the general right to safety.

The opposition have put up a number of arguments that need to be dealt with. It is interesting that there are members on the other side who support this legislation. I have not heard any of them have the courage to actually say that, but it is easy to spot them because you get history lessons, you get philosophical discourses, you get verbal ballet. They barely speak about the bill. If you listen to the speeches, you know who really supports it because they do not want to talk about the bill very much in their speech. We get routine rhetoric from the opposition. Trite phrases are no substitute for evidence, and the evidence is overwhelming. This is the opportunity for MPs today to stand up for Queenslanders who are being maimed needlessly in this state. This is the time for them to stand up and show us whether they have the courage to back those people and to stop those disfigurements happening. That is the challenge.

This is a pivotal moment in the parliament in terms of responsibility in this state. It is a pivotal moment, and the outcome and how people vote will be on their conscience. In a future debate when I get a lecture about Labor's position being soft on crime, I will remind every single opposition MP that they voted against action on alcohol fuelled violence. Do not ever give us a lecture about preventing crime if you are going to vote against this bill, because this bill will prevent crime. That is what the evidence shows in other states. It is very clear. You are going soft on crime. If you are voting against this bill, you are going soft on crime in this state. It is the easy way out for you.

Importantly, we are supporting this legislation. Why? Because there is a clear evidence base. Yes, there is majority support out there—up to 74 per cent of Queenslanders support it. But, importantly, we are backing this because it is the right thing to do. It is a compassionate thing to do. It is the responsible thing to do by Queenslanders. It is evidence based. It is an act of care on behalf of this community. I agree with Minister Miles. When I was in my 20s I went out in the Valley. I love live music. I have been there and not a lot positive does happen after 3 am. It is a minor infringement of people's rights for public safety which I support.

I heard a few people talk about how offensive certain things are. What is offensive is not acting. That is the most offensive thing to do. This is the chance for opposition MPs to stand up for their communities. This is the opportunity for them to stand up against crime. I acknowledge the contributions, particularly of the member for Thuringowa and the member for Barron River—ambulance officers who have been picking up the pieces and taking them to hospital to people like Minister Lynham to fix up. They understand the damage that is going on out there. I acknowledge that front-line experience. That deserves to be acknowledged as evidence. Their experience, their career experience, deserves to be acknowledged as evidence.

It is an insult to say that there is not enough evidence. It is an insult to the Queensland Tourism Industry Council. It is an insult to the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol. It is an insult to the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine. It is an insult to the AMA. It is an insult to Clubs

Queensland. It is an insult to the Queensland Police Service and to the Queensland Police Union of Employees. It is an insult to the Trauma Committee of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons. It is an insult to the Nurses' Union. It is an insult to the Salvos. It is an insult to the Public Health Association. It is an insult to Healthy Options Australia. It is an insult to the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education. It is an insult to the Ambulance Service. It is an insult to all of those groups who care about our community, who know the evidence base is clear. Let us not have this lazy and trite four-word phrases from the opposition against a mountain of evidence. I think it was summed up when one of the members was quoting a Young Liberal and not a health professional on this debate. I commend the bill to the House.

(Time expired)



Mr McARDLE (Caloundra—LNP) (12.17 am): I rise to make a contribution to the debate tonight. I want to start by reflecting on the speech given by the member for Moggill. He was subject to very vicious and unwarranted verbal attacks by the member for Ferny Grove, but he delivered his speech with dignity and integrity. He did not lash out to get back at the member for Ferny Grove. He understood the role of an MP is to stand in this House and deliver a coherent speech—one thing you could not say about the member for Ferny Grove. He had no dignity nor integrity in the way he addressed this House or attacked a fellow member in this House.

Secondly, we did hear some contributions tonight from the members for Barron River and Thuringowa. I say to both members that no-one in this House wants to see paramedics, ED physicians, nurses, police or the public injured in any way, shape or form. Both men painted a very true and grim picture borne out of what they saw on a daily and nightly basis. But, gentlemen, we all know what you saw was the end result of a multitude of problems that we have to address. There is a multitude of issues that this House has to address to come to a proper resolution and conclusion.

It is possible for a motion to be the cause of a debate but it should never be the cause of the outcome. Good policy is not driven by politics or spin over substance. Tonight what we have heard is a motion, politics and spin, and that is driving policy. The Attorney-General is a legal practitioner, a profession that acts on evidence. What we have here is, in essence, the ALP determining that it must do something because it is better than doing nothing. That is the emotional argument that has been run in this House tonight.

In November last year Dr Lynham tabled a report from the *Medical Journal of Australia* on ED presentations at St Vincent's Hospital showing a reduction in presentations at the ED of alcohol related serious injuries. When you read the report, this comment appears—

There have been few well designed studies of alcohol-related injuries, and they often rely on emergency department data. Although of some value, such data have significant limitations if not collected prospectively and their acquisition appropriately resourced.

Those words are reflected in the first recommendation of the committee that reported to this House—a committee of six members, both LNP and ALP. Simply put, they said we need 'appropriate data to be collected and that includes from emergency departments'. In October last year in a question on notice I asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the Emergency Departments of Logan and Townsville hospitals—

What information is recorded and by whom for presentations covering (a) consumption of alcohol, (b) consumption of legal drugs excluding alcohol, and (c) consumption of illegal substances ...

Logan is not in the precinct cohort; Townsville is. Those who know Townsville Hospital know that it is a big ED with a vast population moving in and out. The response was that EDs are very busy environments—of course they are—and that the collection and documentation is a clinical decision. Of course it is. The answer then stated this—

If this information is collected and documented as part of a clinical assessment in the emergency department, it would be recorded in a patient's notes.

It then states—

The coding of emergency department presentations and patient information is recorded by clinical staff directly into the Emergency Department Information System (EDIS).

The point is this: there was nothing in the answer that indicated any coordinated collection of data or even what data information is collected in the ED at either Townsville or Logan hospitals. This is further evidence of the statement that appropriate data still needs to be collected.

This bill, if it becomes law, will be reviewed in 2018. I suggest that information from EDs must be properly recorded. Not only that, what is recorded needs to deal with injuries from alcohol fuelled violence and not injuries merely associated with alcohol but not always linked to violence, as is the current position. For example, if I am at home, have two beers, have an accident at home and am taken to the ED, the fact that I consumed alcohol is recording that incident as an alcohol related incident but it is not related to violence. To record data appropriately, the appropriate information needs to be put down and the appropriate understanding of what injuries occur in these matters needs to be properly understood.


There is a sense in the government's bill that the question will be resolved by lockout laws. To say the least, that is naive. As I said before, there is a range of factors or tools that we need to use to change the culture in this country and deal with this problem. The LNP's approach was multifaceted, and that occurred after months of consultation and included, importantly, drug and alcohol education in Queensland schools—getting to the young people, as we have done so many times in the past with smoking and the like, to treat and train a new cohort coming through.

An offence of unlawful striking causing death was put through this parliament which the Labor Party opposed. That was wrong because it is now a major weapon to use in dealing with one punch can kill or coward punches. Our approach included an awareness campaign so that people understand that going out comprises two things—a good time and an obligation not to interfere with other people also having a good time.

The longer term issue is how we deal with the culture of alcohol—that is, how we see alcohol and how we use alcohol in this nation. We have done it with smoking. It is not an easy task, but the LNP's safe night out policy provided a series of planks which would have a much better chance of success than Labor's one-stroke approach.

I want to pose a question to the Attorney-General, and it comes from the media release today in which it was agreed that drug offenders would be banned from safe night precincts. The release states that the government would extend the powers of courts to impose banning orders on persons convicted of drug offences in safe night precincts. Can the Attorney provide details of that? For example, what types of drugs are we talking about? Is it all types of illegal drugs? Is it marijuana, ice, amphetamines or heroin? What is it going to apply to? Is there a quantity involved in regards to the conviction? Is it a small amount or a large amount, or is it all drugs? How long ago will a conviction have to be in existence to continue banning the person being inside the precinct? More importantly, is there an age limitation in relation to the person convicted of an offence—that is, a minor or an adult?

The LNP safe night out policy had a raft of initiatives. The government policy does not deal with the issues in that manner. The data, despite the Minister for Main Roads believing and stating it existed, simply does not exist in a fashion that can be used to mould and fashion an outcome or a policy. I cannot support the government's bill.

 **Mr RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (12.27 am): I rise in support of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. Enough is enough. We must act now to reduce alcohol related violence in our community, and the evidence is clear on how we should act. When you limit the alcohol, you limit the violence. That evidence has been clearly articulated in this debate by the Attorney-General and other speakers supporting this bill, so I will not go further in restating that evidence to the House tonight. We know that based on international, interstate and local examples a reduction in the hours that liquor is served works. It reduces assaults, it reduces violence and it creates a safer night-life environment which leads to a more vibrant entertainment precinct.

The experts say that these measures work. The experts say that these measures will reduce alcohol related violence, but there are others who also support the principle underpinning these measures. In 2010 the members for Hinchinbrook, Kawana and Mermaid Beach were members of a parliamentary committee that inquired into alcohol related violence. In the committee's final report, report No. 74, the committee recommended, among other things, that a statewide 2 am lockout should apply to all licensed venues. That sounds very similar to the proposed statewide 2 am last drinks proposal contained in this bill. Perhaps those members—the members for Hinchinbrook, Kawana and Mermaid Beach—can explain to the House why their position has changed. In 2010 the member for Southern Downs said—


I believe that we should be seriously looking at trading hours so that we can clean up some of those areas before we have people walking down the street when the sun rises.

Perhaps the member for Southern Downs can explain to the House why his position has changed.

Let us also hear what people in my community are saying, that we need to create a safer community. Kelvin, who is the CEO of the largest licensed venue in the Morayfield state electorate, said, 'The Caboolture Sports Club is fully supportive of the bill.' I know Kelvin very well and I know that he wants the best for his patrons and the best for his staff. Kelvin knows that this bill will make a difference. David and Penny said to me, 'We are supportive of the proposed lockout laws. It's obvious that something needs to be done and the experience from Sydney and Newcastle would seem to be very conclusive about the benefits of these proposals.'

Then there is Gary of Morayfield, who said, 'Surely this is one where community interests must override financial interests. As a father of four young adults and teens, I want these new laws passed. If they help to save just one young life, that will be more than worth it. Let's put politics aside and get this done.' Ian of Burpengary said, 'Nothing good has ever come from pouring alcohol into your belly at 4.30 in the morning. Nothing good.' And then there is Shane of Brisbane, who said, 'Surely the preservation of life overtakes any other consideration.' I think we should reflect on Shane's statement—'Surely the preservation of life overtakes any other consideration.'

The expert evidence and the international, interstate and local examples prove that these proposals work. So in light of all of that, all members of this House should reflect on their consciences and stand up for a safer Queensland. All members should show courage and stand up to big liquor and vested interests. To the members of the opposition, I say do not be cowards to big liquor and vested interests, reflect on your conscience, cross the floor, stand up for a safer Queensland and be on the right side of history. There are many people who have shown great courage to ensure that these proposals have been brought to the parliament. I would like to particularly acknowledge the Attorney-General, the Minister for State Development and the Premier for their courage in supporting these proposals. I support the bill and I encourage all members to do so.

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.31 am): I rise to make a contribution to the debate tonight on this very, very important issue. I think it is fair to say that no single person in Queensland has a monopoly on care and concern when it comes to dealing with issues around alcohol related violence, injuries and issues. Indeed, over a significant period of time, I have made a number of contributions in this parliament on this issue dating back to the early part of the 1990s.

It is also very important to note that there have been significant changes to legislation around liquor trading laws over that time in the last quarter of a century. I remember the discussions very early on, and I think it was brought in around about the time of the former member for Bundamba, Bob Gibbs. In the early part of the 1990s they actually moved to extend liquor trading hours in Queensland to what was considered to be quite late at the time. Certainly, when I came into this place, it was not uncommon for hotels to close at 10 o'clock on an average weeknight and seven o'clock on a Sunday. There was quite moral outrage when there were extensions to that in many places in the early part of the 1990s. That indicates that there have been very wide and profound passions one way or the other around this over that time, and certainly I have expressed some very passionate views on that in my time in this place.

I think it is also very important that when we consider this legislation we consider legislation that is evidence based. What is the best evidence that we have available to us at this time to assist us on this journey? I have no doubt that there are many people out there who emotionally and genuinely believe that by introducing these laws as proposed in this legislation it is going to make a profound difference. The contention I have to that is that I am not necessarily sure that that is borne out by the facts and by the evidence. I go to the committee report, which itself indicated that there needed to be a better collection of data available and presentation of that data to assist it and other decision-makers with regards to this in the future.

I also note what has been said by many people whom I very deeply and highly regard—the likes of Dr David Rosengren, who I appointed as chair of the Queensland Clinical Senate when I was the minister. He has done an absolutely outstanding job with regards to emergency medicine research in Queensland and across Australia. Page 104 of the committee's report says it all for me. Dr Rosengren said at a committee hearing—

The first one that I think is very important is that there is an absolute lack of clear and definite data around many of the arguments that have been put forward for and against the legislation. It is close to impossible for us to truly quantify the impact of alcohol on the community simply because we do not have any mechanisms, certainly in the health system in Queensland—

And he went on from there. That is not to say that Dr Rosengren does not support this legislation before the parliament. Many people believe this is going to make a difference, even though it is difficult to quantify what that difference is. From my perspective, I have sat down and looked at the evidence. If you had asked me three or four years ago before we considered this in government whether an extension of the current lockout laws in Queensland was going to make a difference—bringing it forward to 1 am and an effective close at 3 am—I would have initially, instinctively and emotionally said yes. That would have been my position and I do not mind saying that here today because it was.

We decided though on a journey contrary to that in government which was a more evidence based position, and that was to look at a different way of dealing with the reality that many of these things are caused not just by alcohol but by other factors, including drugs and a whole societal and cultural issue. If you look at some of the issues around the world, this is particularly a predominant problem in Anglo-Saxon societies. It is not such a problem if you go to some of the southern European or Mediterranean communities. I think that is the alarming thing. By doing this, do we actually fix this problem or do we shroud this problem? Do we actually fix this problem or do we pretend to fix this problem? That is my concern.

I note that other members have referenced tonight a contribution I made in this place in about 2009 or 2010 with regard to a run I had in Townsville in the wee hours of the morning as the sun was just coming up. I think I referenced what was the absolute ignominy of the circumstances that I witnessed along Flinders Street. It was an absolute squalid mess—there is no doubt about it. If you fast-forward to a similar circumstance some three or four years later, it was an infinitely changed situation following the proposals that were implemented in that safe night out precinct with the local liquor accord and the nightclubs, the pub owners, the police and everyone coming together. It made a profound difference and I could actually see that and witness that. That is one of the things that actually helped me on my journey as well.

The other thing which is of grave concern to me is that if the government is so sure of its own evidence why is it that around the middle of last year it stopped reporting data with regards to what was happening in the 13 safe night precincts throughout Queensland, which had shown that there had been a significant reduction in a multitude of forms of violence, whether it be physical or sexual violence or other antisocial behaviour in those areas, in that short and very limited time? I know that is a tautology that that evidence had been collected. That is of concern to me.


Honourable members should listen to some of the other evidence that was given to the committee during its comprehensive look at this issue around the state. For example, there was evidence from a chaplain in Fortitude Valley, Lance Mergard, who indicated that there had been a reduction based on his experience over a significant period of time dating back to the mid-2000s. Also on my evidence, members should go to Cairns, as I did not all that long ago. They should walk around the streets, go to nightclubs such as Gilligan's and actually have a look there late at night. They should see what is happening there with the liquor accord and night chaplains. They should be talking to the police about what is happening as they are able to point to anecdotal evidence of reductions in callouts and antisocial incidents in and around that area of up to 60 per cent.

We just do not know where a lot of this stuff comes from. We will actually shroud this. It is an inconsistent approach to dealing with this problem. Why is it that the casino in the middle of the Cairns nightclub precinct will be able to continue to trade all hours, but those establishments around them will not be able to? It is a similar case if you go along Charlotte Street and turn right and go up George Street and you can go to the casino. If members opposite are going to be so convinced that this is the most appropriate way to deal with this—and maybe the evidence ultimately mounts that way, but I am not convinced of the evidence to date from what I have seen. Certainly there is even an admission from those supporting it that there is a lack of data, an emotional collection, a belief, a view of 'let's try to do something', a hope and an aspiration.

Only a week or so ago the New South Wales Premier decided after very fearlessly and fulsomely defending his lockout laws upon which a lot of these laws have been based—at least emotionally as is the prerogative of government—that he is now undertaking a review with the former very respected High Court judge Ian Callinan. If the government was so sure of its position I would have thought they would be concerned about the equivocation of the New South Wales position and we would await the results of that particular review as well. I do not think it is as open and shut as what some people would present.

I listened the other day to the head of BOCSAR, the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, who commented on this. He said that there is a whole range of factors in this—not just lockouts—that need to be considered. I myself took an opportunity to look at what the real circumstance was in Newcastle between 2008 and 2012—a 25 per cent reduction. However, in Wollongong where they did not do it there was a 35 per cent reduction. In Campbelltown where they did not do it there was a 47 per cent reduction and indeed across New South Wales there was an overall 30 per cent reduction. There are lots of statistics involved in this. Fair enough there may be different derivations and reasons around that. However, I think it is fair to say that this on its own is not going to make the difference that people say it will. They may hope; they may believe it. Let's just hope it does, but out in the community we still have the drug problem, the violence problem and all the other antisocial issues that are linked to a deep, abiding and worrying culture that needs to be addressed.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (12.43 am): I rise to support the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill before the parliament and commend the Attorney-General for her role in bringing this important piece of legislative reform to the parliament supported by her and my cabinet colleague Dr Anthony Lynham.

The scourge on our community that is alcohol fuelled violence needs no introduction. The facts and figures speak for themselves. Last year there were more than 320 alcohol related assaults on police officers in CBD and safe night precinct areas across the state. This figure was up 11 per cent on the year before. It also includes 78 assaults labelled as serious. Alcohol was also an indicator in almost 5,230 assaults and almost 430 sexual offences last year. The most offensive thing that we have heard in this debate is the claims by the members opposite that if this legislation passes there will be an increase in sexual assault in suburbs after closing time. It is, frankly, offensive that the LNP think they can suggest in this parliament that legislation designed to reduce the consumption of alcohol in the community will result in more women being sexually assaulted in Queensland. We know the consequences of the current law, which includes those numbers—430 sexual offences last year. It was something that the member for Toowoomba North put to the parliament for which we would be responsible. It was something that the member for Buderim, who has never let the facts get in the way of a good argument, put to the parliament today. Frankly, it is offensive that they think this debate can be reduced to that sort of baseless argument.

Of course, there are the stories that accompany those raw figures. Everyone in this chamber has heard the tragic tales associated with the senseless acts of violence that have occurred across Queensland—callous assaults that have thrown lives completely off course, or worse, ended lives altogether. Those cases are plastered on the front pages of Queensland papers, ingrained in our brains, and they have sparked a community outrage about that level of violence. It is incumbent upon all members of parliament to do something to respond.

Over the past year we have also seen alcohol related ED presentations at hospitals across the state rise. At the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital indicative data suggests that those sorts of assaults in the ED department have risen by almost 40 per cent, from about 4,750 in 2013-14 to over 6,600 in 2014-15. We have also seen the number of assaults increasing against our front-line health workers such as those paramedics we have heard from tonight—the members for Thuringowa and Barron River who, together, have 40 years experience in the Queensland Ambulance Service or as a paramedic across the nation—so much so that our government has committed to implementing a public awareness campaign. It has also established task forces specifically aimed at minimising violence against health staff including paramedics who are often first on the scene and first on the receiving end of an alcohol fuelled attack.

If the emotional and physical burden of alcohol fuelled violence placed on front-line staff is not enough, there is also a significant financial cost to our health system and to our state. Of course, people who suffer from alcohol fuelled violence are not only treated in our hospitals; they are subject to often very significant injuries including acquired brain injuries that require months of rehabilitation. It can cost up to a thousand dollars a day to rehabilitate someone who has suffered from a severe traumatic brain injury. Of course, they face lifelong consequences. Nine out of 10 people who sustain a moderate or severe acquired brain injury return to the care of their family and the consequences for that family, financially, physically and emotionally, are very significant indeed. Many of those people cannot return to work for a long time and even when they do, they often find sustainable employment challenging, making the cost to our economy another burden on the system as a whole.

Of course, Queensland wishes to be a safe international tourist destination. Lockout laws have proved effective in other international tourism destinations such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and Toronto in Canada, all of which cease service of alcohol at two o'clock in the morning. This government is clearly of the view that the change to the law as we have seen in other places in Australia will not impact negatively on the entertainment and tourism industries of our state but will provide the base for growing those industries. Mr Deputy Speaker, as you would know, a number of hospitality outlets on the Sunshine Coast have imposed their own lockout at 1.30 in the morning. The Sunshine Coast, of course, is a very important tourism destination in our state. They have made that decision voluntarily and, of course, that has not impaired them in terms of what they do and how they deliver for the community.

One of the surprising things in this debate was the commitment made by the LNP that there would be a conscience vote. Is it not interesting that we have a collective conscience in the LNP? Not one person in the LNP—

Mr Rickuss: Similar to Labor's collective conscience.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. We are not hypocrites about saying that there will be a conscience vote.

Mr Rickuss: You are the greatest hypocrites.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! The member for Lockyer!

Mr DICK: I recall there was a conscience vote on the surrogacy legislation that I introduced into this parliament. Of course members opposite wanted to criminalise homosexuality through their amendments to that bill and what they said they would do when they came into government. Those opposite would change the law to stop people who are homosexual or in a de facto relationship of less than 18 months from participating in surrogacy arrangements. That was a commitment made by the member for Kawana, who did not have the courage of his convictions when he came into government. But when we had a conscience vote, there were members of our party who exercised their conscience and voted against the government. All we had was a cheap political stunt in the community by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who said there would be a conscience vote and of course it was a complete ruse. There was no intention ever by anyone in the LNP to exercise a conscience vote on this important piece of legislation. They say one thing to the community and always do another; that is the form of the Liberal National Party. If you do not want to be genuine about a conscience vote, then do not say to the people of Queensland that you will permit the members of your party to do that. I do not believe that, all of a sudden by coincidence, 42 members of the opposition decide to vote one way. It was never their intention to support this legislation, and it was nothing more than a ruse to fool the people of Queensland. It was something that they never, ever intended to follow through, and that represents the hypocrisy that they bring to this debate.

The other criticism that can be levelled in this debate is the complete denial by those opposite of the evidence that supports legislative reform. Blankly, blindly, blithely, they say 'There is no evidence,' and that is what the Leader of the Opposition is well known for. The Leader of the Opposition in the 53rd Parliament would say or do anything to sustain a position in the parliament. Notwithstanding the mountain of evidence that was put before the community, he denies it completely as if it does not exist.

Mr Rickuss: You were not here then!

Mr DICK: I can say to the member for Lockyer that I am here now, and I will speak on these issues notwithstanding whatever he says. The people of Woodridge spoke at the last election and we had the largest two-party preferred return in Queensland, 75 per cent of the vote, because that is what the people of Woodridge thought about the Liberal National Party government. So I will not be taken to task by someone like the member for Lockyer, who does nothing but criticise from his seat but cannot put a cogent argument when he stands on his feet in this parliament. This is an important legislative reform. This is something that will change lives in our state and make it a better place. I commend the Attorney-General again and I commend the bill to the parliament.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (12.51 am): I will start where the health minister left off, and that is in relation to the Sunshine Coast. In this debate when the health minister talks about the great lockouts that we have, his support for this legislation and for the denial of the rights of individuals to go out and have a safe night out, he uses the Sunshine Coast as an example. As a member for the Sunshine Coast, let me tell you that we have had lockouts for many years on the Sunshine Coast. Did the lockout prevent the death of Josh Mill? No. Did the lockout prevent the death of Bruce Steensen? No. We had lockouts on the Sunshine Coast and we have had deaths and we have had violence, so much so that

families of the victims of the violence have come out and said that lockouts would not have prevented certain deaths on the streets on the Sunshine Coast. So the health minister cannot come in here and say that this will solve the issue. The Sunshine Coast has been dealt the devil's hand with respect to alcohol fuelled violence. The lockouts that were implemented did not work. It would have been great if they had; but they did not.

An honourable member: Then why do we still have them?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. Why do we still have them on the Sunshine Coast? Well, this is my point. The Sunshine Coast is different to the Valley. The Valley is different from Cairns.

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will get there. Cairns is different from the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast is different from Townsville. The Sunshine Coast does not have 5 am trading; the Sunshine Coast does not have 3 am trading. At best you can go out on the Sunshine Coast and have a two o'clock night. Most pubs and clubs shut at two o'clock in the morning. That is why when they have a lockout on the Sunshine Coast it is a completely different situation. That is why a one-size-fits-all approach will not work in Queensland.

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General. She says, 'It's going to work.' It is not, because at the start of this debate before the Attorney-General introduced this legislation it was going to be a lockout across the state. Then before the legislation was introduced it was changed to a lockout in the safe night precincts. Then today we have a deal done with the Katter party. 'Well, it's going to be a lockout, but it's not going to apply for another year.' They are concerned about deaths and violence in Queensland, yet they can afford to delay it a year.

Mr Costigan: Work that out!

Mr BLEIJIE: I cannot work it out, member for Whitsunday. If they are so concerned about deaths and violence in Queensland, why delay it a year? If they are putting their whole political career—as the Premier has said—on this very issue, how can they delay it for a year? Because of the deal they have done with the Katter party.

The Safe Night Out Strategy was the most comprehensive strategy in Australia to tackle alcohol fuelled violence. And when we say alcohol fuelled violence we mean alcohol and drug fuelled violence, because we acknowledge the issue that drugs play in our communities, not just alcohol. We had the most comprehensive strategy in Australia, and the LNP government wanted to change the drinking culture in the community. We wanted to change the behaviour. We wanted to make it a safe environment for people to go out, and we wanted to set up local boards where the locals controlled the issue and what happened in their areas. Because, as I said at the beginning, what happens on the Sunshine Coast is different to the Valley and so forth.

In the last couple of weeks I went to Cairns with the member for Mount Ommaney, and we spoke to business operators there who were opposed to these lockouts and they said that they will have to sack Queenslanders because of this legislation. So you have the government in here this morning talking about jobs, you have the Attorney-General in here this morning talking about traineeships and jobs, and yet she is introducing and passing legislation tonight that will sack Queenslanders from jobs. I remember a young lady that I spoke to at Cairns in one of the clubs. She was one of the bouncers there and she said that if this legislation passes this parliament, her hours will be reduced by about 16 hours a week and she does not know how she will be able to afford to live so she will probably have to leave the industry. These are jobs that we are talking about.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I hear the groans from the member for Brisbane Central. I was hoping to get to the member for Brisbane Central—believe it or not, the employment minister—a little later in my contribution. The member for Brisbane Central represents the biggest entertainment precinct in Queensland. If I had an hour it would still not give me enough time to table and talk about the correspondence online today against the member for Brisbane's stance on this issue. The member for Brisbane Central, the employment minister of the state, is going to cast her vote tonight for a job-destroying bill in her own electorate. Thousands and thousands of people rely on the entertainment industry in her electorate, and tonight she is putting them out of a job. When we were in Cairns talking to locals, the Attorney-General all of a sudden jetted up the next day.

Mrs D'Ath: Trust me, it was not because of you!

Mr BLEIJIE: I am sure it was all planned in your calendar to arrive the day after I was there. They realised they had a political problem, so the Attorney-General jetsetted up there and she brought all the Brisbane blow-ins with her. I talked with locals. I met locals on the ground and spoke about the impacts to businesses in Cairns, just as the shadow Attorney-General met the business folk of Townsville. The shadow Attorney-General and I did not have to bring in blow-ins other than us two, of course. We did not have to bring a cargo of people from Brisbane to convince North Queensland how good or bad these laws are. We spoke to the people in Cairns—

Mr Costigan: Real people.

Mr BLEIJIE:—real businesspeople and people who are employed. I did not have to bring in Clubs Queensland; I did not have to bring in anyone to explain the issues. The Attorney-General talked about consultation. One of the differences between the government's response and our response to alcohol fuelled violence is that we consulted over a two-year period with the Queensland community to come up with the most comprehensive strategy dealing with alcohol fuelled violence.

An accusation was made at the time about donations to the Liberal National Party from the liquor industry. Our policy was more restrictive to the liquor industry than the Labor Party's policy. We mandated ID scanners to be effective from July last year, but those opposite canned it. That would have been a cost to the liquor industry, but the Attorney-General canned it. Now there are no mandated ID scanners. This would have been a cost to the liquor industry, but the Attorney-General torpedoed it.

We also said that education about alcohol and drug related violence was to be provided in schools. Every year from year 7 there was to be mandated education in our schools about alcohol and drug related violence. Those opposite and the Attorney-General have sat on their hands for a year. Did they implement that education in our schools for the last 12 months? No. But I note that the Premier came out a week ago and said, 'We have come up with a great policy. We are going to implement education in our schools.' They should have done it a year ago. The fact is that the Attorney-General, the education minister, the police minister and the Premier have sat on their hands and have not tackled this issue for 12 months.


We had tougher penalties, because we believe that you should not target the majority for the sins of a few. Most Queenslanders want to go out and have a great night out and a safe night out. We should not target the majority of good citizens to pay for the sins of a few. We ought to target the sins of a few and have tougher penalties, which we implemented.

I note that there are now many Queenslanders subject to the charge of unlawful striking causing death which the LNP introduced, not the Labor Party. The Labor Party have tried to claim the high moral ground in relation to the protection of Queensland citizens in our entertainment precincts. They cannot have that. No political party can take that high moral ground because all of us in this place want to make sure we have the best legislation going forward to target the issue of alcohol fuelled violence and to make sure Queenslanders are safe.

The issue we on this side of the House have is that lockouts are not the silver bullet the Attorney-General and the Premier claim them to be. You need a collaborative approach. You need to talk to the not-for-profit sector in the area. You need to talk to the chaplains that are operating in Brisbane and other areas right around Queensland. I met with the former CEO of the chaplains in Cairns. They were opposed to the Attorney-General's lockout laws. They will not be a silver bullet.

I have no doubt that this legislation will pass tonight and that, unfortunately, a Queenslanders will still die because of alcohol fuelled violence and because of this legislation. This will not solve the issue. If the government were serious they would have a collaborative approach, they would get tougher on the criminals responsible, they would talk to the local community, particularly the liquor boards, and they would come up with local community solutions to tackle the issues in local areas.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (1.02 am): It is always great to follow the member for Kawana in such debates. I make it clear: this bill is not an absolute guarantee to cease these prospects.

Mr Bleijie: That is what the Premier said.

Mr BYRNE: It is not about absolutes; it is about a dramatic reduction in the prospects of injuries and deaths, because that is what the evidence says. I have sat here this evening and listened comprehensively to most of the speeches that have been given and have heard this mantra that the evidence does not exist. It is literally mountainous. There are mountains of evidence that prove this. This is one case in which evidence should overwhelm all other contributions to the debate.

I have pursued this policy for many, many years—well before my entry into this parliament. As a member of the Labor Party I have advocated, in many party forums for many years, for a reduction in trading hours as a centrepiece of this policy. Those who know me know that I am not a prohibitionist or anything approaching that. Because this bill is so important to me personally, I want to take a moment tonight to reflect on my first speech. At the time I said that I did not believe that every initiative that emanated from conservative politics represented evil incarnate. I suppose at the time I was pretty naive about things! That is a fact, having spent three years in the last parliament. I said that my role in the chamber and my role more generally as an MP was to promote good public policy. That is what we are all here for: good public policy. I also said—

Too often the blunt instrument of political necessity has overwhelmed or substantially compromised the development of good public policy in this great state.

I also went on to say—

... my point is that Queenslanders are sick and tired of the argument for argument's sake, of the spin generally simply to distract or divert from the essential facts of a matter.

An outbreak of honesty might have been worth a go. The people of Queensland expect every member in this chamber to act in the best interests of Queenslanders and Queensland. If ever there was a bill that I have been involved with in the last four years in this parliament that deserved to have MPs put the interests of Queenslanders first, this is it. If ever there was a bill, of all of the bills that have been before the House in the four years I have been a member, that deserved support, this is the bill that counts. I make this passionate plea to those in the opposition: for once, use your brains. Read the material. Just this once, stop pandering to the fringe elements of society and special interest groups.

In the last parliament I spoke at least six times about matters associated with alcohol consumption and the highly destructive implications evident in all of our communities. This issue affects every community in Queensland, despite the efforts of those opposite to suggest that we are all different. In those speeches I laid out all of the critical evidence dictating that these sorts of measures on trading hours were essential to any future progress. On 26 August 2014—2½ years or more after the LNP came to power—we actually had the second reading debate on the safe night out legislation bill, much vaunted across the chamber by the LNP. At the time I mapped out the evidence at length and reflected on the expected failures that were sure to accrue from the LNP's unwillingness to address the essential facts and the evidence. We have seen that again here tonight from these deniers.

I predicted then that the then attorney-general, the member for Kawana, would be publicly eviscerated in the community's reaction to the bill's failures in effect, as he surely has been. At the time I described the LNP's efforts on trading hours as weak, wishy-washy and ineffective. Guess what? We are some 1¾ years down the track and there it is. It was weak, ineffective and did not deliver what it was stated to deliver.

What is responsible for the carnage and the expense that has occurred since August 2014? Primarily, it is the member for Kawana and the Newman cabinet. They are responsible for this bill being debated this evening. They had the chance to lead, to put evidence first, to use their massive parliamentary majority for the good of all, but no. The member for Kawana and his colleagues did not have the ticker. The bizarre part of all of this is that they would not even follow the recommendations of their own expert panel.

The member for Kawana opposes this bill, as we have just heard. I can assure him that there will not be a single member of the Queensland Police Service who will forget it—not one. From senior officers to recruits at the academy, they want this bill to pass. Across-the-board, they are uniform in this position, because they know the truth of the situation. They know what it is like on the ground. They know the facts; the member for Kawana does not. Frankly, they are sick and tired of being assaulted by drunken clowns and being punching bags.

The LNP's opposition to this bill will not go unnoticed. People like the member for Kawana and his previous cabinet colleagues in the former government do not actually care about the welfare of officers. It is all a game to them. It is a debating society. In 2015 there were 324 assaults on police officers that occurred in the 15 safe night precincts, but that is okay with the LNP. 'Our plan is working, can't you tell?' Perhaps 324 assaults involving police might say something else.

What about this: there were 13,305 reported offences in the same locations—that is, safe night precincts. I do not know how you can have 13,305 offences over the period of a year in these locations and say that it is working. You cannot get a more damning critique of the member for Kawana's 2014 effort. The LNP stands intellectually and morally void on this issue. This bill provides a unique


opportunity for once for those opposite to redeem themselves, but it appears that that is not going to happen tonight. I assume that some of those opposite may privately agree with this bill. I suspect there are genuine moderate Liberals across the chamber such as the member for Mansfield and perhaps others with strong convictions. They must be minded to support these measures. That is because the evidence is clear—absolutely clear. The evidence is literally on the table. There is no grey here. There is no doubt at all about what will be effective in reducing the violence. That is why the member for Mansfield's recently reported comment is so weak. He said as recently as yesterday or the day before—

Although we are moved by emotion, we've got to make a final decision based on rational judgement.

The LNP is making a rational judgement here, but it has nothing to do with evidence and everything to do with politics. It is rational in a political context, a political choice. Frankly, I do not know how those opposite can lie straight in bed if there was a prospect of this bill failing. Every death, every terrible injury and every incident involving nurses or doctors being assaulted would have the LNP's fingerprints all over it. I never want to hear anyone from the opposition talking about how they support the Queensland Police Service, because tonight has been seen for what it is—a fabrication, a proven falsehood, a deception, and deliberately so.

In the time that I have left I want to reflect on the fact that 70 per cent of Queenslanders want this legislation to pass. How do you think sensible members of the community are going to take to the LNP's flag after its position on this bill? This is good evidence based policy that is supported by a great majority of Queensland but amazingly opposed by the LNP. The opposition can be sure that we will not let it forget—an opposition once again hoisted on the petard of political opportunism on the prospect that it was going to win this debate. On the prospect it was going to win this debate, it was prepared to stand up and say things that are clearly unsubstantiated. The opposition should be—and I am sure some may be—absolutely ashamed, because there is no more damning reflection of its efforts than what it did in August 2014. It is shameful that the LNP is so hungry for power that it would take this position in the House on such a critical bill. It is so desperate that it is prepared to try to spear this bill. This is a disgrace, because this bill may never see the light of day again if it is defeated. In such a circumstance it would be of grave concern to many Queenslanders who have approached me and the government over the last three years since we have had this policy in place. I am firmly and completely committed to this bill and I wish others in the House would join me.

(Time expired)

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (1.12 am): Tonight I rise to make a contribution to the debate regarding the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 before the House. This is an issue very dear to my heart and, as a former police officer, one that I have significant experience in. So imagine my surprise and disappointment to be told that the government members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee used their numbers to prohibit me from giving evidence when the committee visited Townsville on 22 January this year to conduct public hearings. By way of background, I was the officer in charge of the Townsville police division for the period 2000 to 2008 with direct responsibility for policing the Flinders Street East nightclub precinct. I oversaw the implementation of the initial 3 am lockout and the establishment of the drink safe precinct. I was a member of the Late Night Traders Association and was integrally involved in the policing and overall management of the nightclub precinct.

Mr Crandon: And they wouldn't take your evidence?

Mr LAST: Absolutely not. Upon being elected to the Townsville City Council in 2008 I chaired the Community Safety and Health Committee which allowed me to continue my work with the QPS and the Late Night Traders Association overseeing the introduction of a liquor accord and a number of changes to improve the amenity and the safety of the precinct, including changes to public transport. So I believe I have every right to question the decision to preclude me from giving evidence before the committee and ask why the government members on this committee chose not to accept evidence from someone who was eminently qualified to do so. Call me a sceptic, but I now question the motivation and intention of this government in conducting these public hearings. Can it honestly say that it has made every attempt to consult with Queenslanders and were genuine in its endeavours to take on board evidence provided at these public hearings? Let me give the House an example. I was stunned to learn that at the Townsville hearings the QPS, which, I might add, spent days preparing its evidence, was only permitted five minutes to present its evidence. That is right: the QPS, which is without question the most qualified organisation in this state to give evidence to this inquiry, was only permitted five minutes because of time constraints. I find that unfathomable and a gross insult to the police officers who spent so much time preparing for this hearing and who had so much to offer.

I could talk about the stabbings, the bashings, the sexual assaults and the public disorder that I have witnessed as a police officer in nightclub precincts, but I think all who are present in this place here tonight are well aware of the impact that alcohol fuelled violence is having on our community. The changes to the lockout laws as proposed in this bill fall a long way short of what is required to address alcohol fuelled violence. It is an ill-conceived and short-sighted attempt to address a complex issue that has far-reaching effects in our community. Lockout laws and reduced trading hours on their own will not solve the problem of alcohol fuelled violence. It needs to be much more than that. We need to be considering the compulsory installation of CCTV in all licensed premises, which includes scanning at point of entry, and a complete overhaul of public transport and, if necessary, the granting of special taxi licences to service nightclub precincts and increased use of public transport, and I take on board what the member for Brisbane Central said in her contribution about the lines in the Valley during the night looking for public transport. In my experience most of the incidents that occurred in the Flinders Street East nightclub precinct were at taxi ranks, because when you bring large numbers of people together who have been consuming alcohol and you force them to wait in lines it is a recipe for disaster.

We need to consider specialised training for all licensed security providers who work in nightclub precincts; extending the banning provisions for those persons who commit offences in drink safe precincts and lifetime bans for recidivist offenders who engage in violent conduct; no discounted drinks or promotions aimed at encouraging excessive drinking; recognition and acknowledgement, including greater coordination and training, for QPS staff who regularly work in drink safe precincts; compulsory education for all Queensland students regarding the culture, attitudes and social expectations of alcohol consumption; increasing the penalties for public nuisance, obstructing police and disobeying move-on directions; extending the powers of police to direct persons to leave drink safe precincts for periods up to 48 hours; empowering police to issue banning notices for up to three months to immediately ban a person who is behaving in a disorderly or a violent way and who is a risk to the good order, safety and welfare of others from being in and around licensed venues; and implementing improved data collection methods across emergency services, including Queensland Health, to ensure that alcohol fuelled violence incidents are captured, with this information able to be centrally verified. We have heard plenty of evidence tonight about the issues that we have had with the data and the evidence that was presented during the course of these public hearings, and I think that is a crucial point going forward. We all know the dangers of making decisions based on flawed data and, if we are to make an informed decision on this issue, we need to ensure that all relevant parties are capturing information in the same way, using the same principles and parameters. We also need to consider formalising rest and recovery services in designated drink safe precincts, including the provision of funding, and conducting a review of responsible service of alcohol training to better reflect and embrace changing community attitudes and early intervention strategies to reduce the risk of alcohol fuelled violence.

Finally, increase the number of staff within the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation to ensure that adequate resources are provided for the enforcement and compliance of liquor regulations. I know of several individuals who simply attended the Flinders Street East drink safe precinct in Townsville with the sole intention of having a fight. These people never entered a nightclub venue. Instead they prowled around the perimeter seeking out victims on whom they could prey. So it does not matter if you reduce trading hours, or you have earlier lockouts, because there is a certain element out there who will go regardless to these precincts with the express intention of causing trouble.

You cannot have one law for our nightclubs and another for casinos and adult entertainment venues. You cannot have existing premises selling takeaway liquor up to midnight but prohibit new venues—

Dr LYNHAM: I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. He said that there would be different legislation for our hotels, nightclubs—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Can I suggest to the minister—


Dr LYNHAM: He compared—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Can I suggest to the minister that he is the next speaker. So he might like to take it up then.

Mr LAST: This bill is ill-conceived. It has more holes in it than the *Titanic*. Tackling alcohol fuelled violence is more than making some changes to lockout laws and trading hours. This is a complex problem and one that requires a holistic view of all aspects of late night trading and the way in which our drink safe precincts are managed. If the government is serious about addressing this issue, it will go back to the drawing board and take on board the views and recommendations of those individuals

and organisations who provided submissions during the public hearings and the broader Queensland community. All Queenslanders have a right to feel safe when they go out at night. As elected representatives, when tackling this issue we would be derelict in our duty if we did not consider all options.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (1.21 am): This will be a great day for the mums and dads of Queensland. With the passage of these laws, we will reliably see a one-third reduction in young people turning up at our emergency departments on a Friday and Saturday night after assaults, one-third fewer operations performed on victims of assault, one-third fewer victims of alcohol induced violence in our intensive care beds and one-third fewer parents looking into an empty bedroom.

If members opposite walked a day in my shoes they would all cross the floor and vote with us here tonight. The community hears of only the tragic cases. They read only the newspaper articles of a tragic death, a recent death, a death every Christmas. But they never see the day-to-day struggle of these kids walking through the emergency departments, walking up to my operating theatre and every single day me operating on these kids. The community never sees it. The memories of the members opposite may fade, but my memory could never fade.

Let us look at my medical speciality—and proud of it I am. There is a lesson here. In the late 1990s, we had one of my specialty on the Gold Coast, two on the south side of Brisbane and four at the royal Brisbane hospital. We had only one in Townsville and we had one in Toowoomba. Now, the number of my specialty has at least tripled all over Queensland and it is growing. Why? Because of the kids being assaulted in our nightclub districts and our precincts due to alcohol. That is why my specialty is growing. I am parochial, but I would like to see the growth of my specialty stopped. Let us do other things.

The opposition's solution is to simply throw ineffective measures at this issue or to simply ignore it. The members opposite would probably choose to throw more surgeons at the problem, more operating theatres, more intensive care beds and more tragedy. This cannot go on. For years I have tried to fix this problem but, despite there being simple solutions in the evidence that the members opposite decry, no-one bothered. It took a Premier and a party with vision to allow me to enter parliament and help fix this issue finally from the inside.

This bill is more important, more powerful than any operation that I could ever do. It is powerful because it prevents harm. By my being here, if I have stopped 25 of our kids getting to the operating table it is far better than me operating on 100 of our kids. This bill stops injury and death.

It is ironic that the party of the members opposite has a proud international record in violence prevention because of John Howard's strong action on gun laws. Yes, as members opposite have said tonight, there were only a few perpetrators, only a few idiots, but they affected the whole of Australia. A few idiots with their guns affected the whole of Australia. It is probably the most effective legislation in the world to prevent violence and harm. John Howard stood for change to prevent social harm. He is the opposition's example. He stood up to prevent violence and harm.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! The member for Coomera will cease interjecting.

Dr LYNHAM: Let me address some of the economic issues. In Newcastle, there has been a doubling in the number of bars and restaurants and increased employment. In Queensland, we have over 7,000 licensed venues. These laws will affect 99 of them—less than two per cent—and by only one to two hours; a couple of rounds of drinks. This is all these laws will do, but they will have the maximum effect of one-third fewer kids being harmed. The initial economic impact is small, but the gains are immense both in long-term economic growth and a reduction in social harm. We know that there will be reliably a 30 per cent reduction in emergency department admissions due to assaults. We also know that if the opening hours are extended, assaults rise—just the opposite.

These measures are not a magic bullet. We have never said that. But it is one big 30 per cent step. If we had a drug that could cure 30 per cent of cancers, we would use it every day. It works because of its simplicity. A reduction in trading hours gives people less opportunity to preload as they have to get to the club before it closes.


Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Coomera, can I suggest you hear the minister out for the rest of his speech in silence.

Dr LYNHAM: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. These measures create a vibrant night-time economy that is safe and simply peaks earlier and an environment that is more attractive for residents and tourists alike. Cairns has been mentioned. I am yet to see one tourist brochure that says, 'Come to Cairns and drink until five o'clock.' I see brochures about Cairns promoting the rainforest and the reef but not, 'Come and drink until five in the morning.' I understand that the nightclub industry has called for a rally, but our rally is not in the streets; our rally is in the hospital beds, in the emergency departments, in the ambulances, in the rehabilitation centres, and in the homes where the mums and dads are mourning the senseless loss of their child. That is where our rally is and that is where our motivation comes from.

Before I finish, I must thank the Premier and my colleagues who stand up against violence. I thank all the charity organisations of which I am a proud member that are there to prevent violence and harm. I thank my academic colleagues, my colleagues in the health professions and the voters of Stafford who stood by me despite concerted campaigns at two elections by the nightclub industry. I would like to thank Shane Knuth and Robbie Katter, who stand up for their communities against violence. But most of all, I would like to thank the Attorney-General and her staff for the tireless work they did to prepare and get this important legislation to the House. I thank them.

In finishing, I would just like to talk about Christmas. My colleagues and I, just like everyone, wanted to spend Christmas with our families but some of us had to staff the hospital for obvious reasons. Being rostered on at Christmas is a terrible time because around Christmas that is when mayhem and tragedy naturally call. Every Christmas our unit would lock in one to two operating theatres at the royal Brisbane hospital and work them around the clock simply trying to keep up with the young kids who came into our hospital with injuries from alcohol and violence. We would also have to find time to talk to the mums and dads of these kids. There were days I feared the most and those days were the ones that you could hardly imagine. Our normal protocol was that every day there was a unit meeting, a ward round and then our ward round would finish in the intensive care unit. On some days the intensive care specialist, Professor Jeff Lipman, would say to me, 'Anthony, don't worry about that one over there.' That meant it was useless to operate, that kid was not going to survive. I would look across the room and there would be a bed and a young kid surrounded by his family and friends. That is why I am here today.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (1.31 am): I thank the minister for his presentation in the House tonight. As a father of four sons, all young adults, all regular visitors to nightclubs and the entertainment precincts of Surfers Paradise and Broadbeach and some of the hotels around the Coast, and time spent at Griffith University at the rec bar, I have to say that my concern about this legislation is not that I do not want to see us tackle the issue of alcohol fuelled violence; it is the fact that this legislation ignores the elephant in the room. The elephant in the room is the war on drugs.

I attended the hearings on the Gold Coast in relation to this legislation. We had presentations from Dr David Green, the director of the emergency department at the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service; Miss Liz Green, the acting nurse unit manager from the emergency department of the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service; and Dr Kevin McNamara, the medical director of alcohol and other drugs from the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service. They raised some interesting points on that occasion. I think that they are important points to be made and I want to read directly from the transcript.

Dr Green, the director of the Gold Coast University Hospital emergency department, said that he is an emergency physician. He is also the director of the Robina Gold Coast emergency department. He is the second longest serving ED director in Australia. He said that over the years he has been called upon to treat, observe, manage and look at the problem of alcohol fuelled violence within the Gold Coast community. He said that alcohol related trauma and alcohol related violence is not just a disease of nightclubs and those precincts; a lot happens in the house.

He said that over the last few years they have noticed there has been an increasing change in the nature and patterns of recreational drug use on the Gold Coast. He said the issue of alcohol alone was that alcohol would increase some impulsivity but decrease motivation. Basically, it acts as a sedative drug where people would have risk-taking behaviours but they may not be able to carry them through. But in combination with stimulants such as amphetamines, alcohol and amphetamines have increased impulsivity, increased risk and increased aggression and inclination rather than demotivation that may happen with alcohol alone.

As a father of four sons I can tell members how traumatic it was when I and my colleagues from the Gold Coast, as members of this parliament in the previous term, were called to a meeting room with the commissioner and the deputy commissioner and we were given a briefing about the protective

measures we needed to undertake in respect of our kids. As I look across the other side of the House I am not sure that there are too many members who have young adult or teenage sons. I am sure there are some, but I am not sure how many there are. I cannot tell members how stressful it was to go home and sit with my sons and have to say, 'Here is the phone number of the Commissioner of Police, here is the mobile phone number of the Deputy Commissioner of Police for the Gold Coast and the reason I am giving you these is just in case you become a target when you are out with your mates in Surfers Paradise and 000 doesn't work and you can't get a hold of me because one of those'—and I want to use a word that is unparliamentary but I will not—'criminal gang members or leaders, one of those bikies who is out there running these methamphetamine labs, or their mates decides to target my kids.' It was not the nicest thing to have to sit and explain to my family that there would be police patrols coming past our house while the legislation was being reviewed with respect to criminal gangs and the tougher penalties our government introduced with respect to criminal gangs and repeat offenders and the strategies we rolled out to try to break up the gangs and the bkie cells on the Gold Coast.

The elephant in the room for me tonight is simply this: why is it that this legislation only tinkers at the edges? Why is it that those on the other side of the House have completely ignored the 10-point plan that we put in place in terms of our safe night precincts? And why is it that on the other side of the House there has been virtually chirping crickets on the issue of drug use? The reality is there and it is in the evidence that was presented throughout the hearings. The evidence is there and it is clear. It is from some of the leading experts in our nation: one of the longest serving ED directors in our nation. He says that the problem has increased significantly because of the use of methamphetamine. Yet the other side of the House is proposing to water down the laws that deal with criminal gangs. These—and I was going to use that unparliamentary term again—mongrels are peddling and producing drugs, selling them to our kids and dropping them in their drinks at nightclubs and other venues around the state and yet there is not one word in this legislation about dealing with that issue.

I know that the criminal gang laws are under review. I thought it was very interesting this morning that the Attorney-General stood in this House and said that this legislation is about zero tolerance on alcohol related violence. What I did not hear her say is we should also have legislation that is about zero tolerance on drug production, on criminal gangs and bkie gangs that want to run methamphetamine labs in our state. We do not know what the review holds. The problem is that even announcing the fact that there is going to be a watering down of the legislation that we introduced has already sent a message to the bkie gangs, the criminal gangs and the drug producers that the Labor government in this state is planning to go soft on crime. We have rolled out the welcome mat and they are back in force. We heard this week about a \$1 billion drug haul of materials required to make these drugs, one of the biggest drug busts in the history of our nation. By all means let us put a bandaid on the problem, tinker at the edges with some politically popular rhetoric—because that is what we have heard from the other side of the House—but let us not actually deal with the problem.

Earlier this evening, we heard the Minister for Main Roads, Minister Bailey, state—

We have not got a minute to spare on this legislation, it is so important.

Yet what have they done today? They have done a deal with the guys up the back from the Katter party. They have traded their souls for a half-baked piece of legislation that does not deal with the real issue, which is drug fuelled violence that we see in combination with alcohol. It does not go anywhere near dealing with the real issue. They have sold their souls. The minister says, 'We have not got a minute to spare,' yet the deal they have done says it will all sit out there for another 12 months. I do not think that is good enough. I cannot understand why Labor is not behaving seriously in respect to this matter. Why have they put something in front of this House that is simply a bandaid solution that tinkers with the edges of the issues? They do not deal with the issues that Dr Green has talked about. At the hearing on the Gold Coast, he talked about the need to deal with drug related violence in the home, that is, drug related violence that occurs in relation to domestic violence. He talked about the side effects of alcohol abuse because of a lack of education. By all means, let us send a message to the world that we are a nanny state. Let us shut down the nightclubs an hour earlier in some areas, but completely ignore the 10-point plan that our government had for making our precincts safer with more police, higher visibility policing, scanners, actually enforcing the rules around the responsible service of alcohol and supporting the staff in the clubs and precincts. Let us put a bandaid on it.

(Time expired)



Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (1.41 am): I rise, I dare say last but not least, to have my say in relation to the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. In my part of the world, tourism underpins much of the local economy, especially in the tourist town of Airlie Beach. As

has been said on numerous occasions tonight, and it is something that I think we can all agree on, community safety is of paramount importance. Protecting our citizens from harm, particularly our young citizens and visitors to Queensland, is certainly at the forefront of my mind. Having said that, in my view quite frankly this bill fails to deliver in that regard. It has a number of shortcomings that have been outlined by many of my colleagues on this side of the House in the debate tonight and this morning. One has only to look at the name of the bill to see one of those shortcomings. After what the member for Southport just said, that should not be lost on anyone. The bill refers to alcohol, but sadly it contains no reference whatsoever to the scourge known as drugs. The shadow Attorney-General summed it up pretty well when he said that the LNP approach was comprehensive with a suite of measures aimed at making our community safer without trashing jobs and the economy, which is what will happen if this bill is passed. I am told that in Airlie hundreds of jobs will disappear for bar tenders, cleaners, DJs, promo girls and security guards.

Government members interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: Members opposite can say whatever they want. Most of them have had their say and I would like to have mine now. Right now, jobs are at a premium in many parts of regional Queensland. We cannot afford to have those jobs disappear. On Tuesday in this place, we heard the Labor member for Mackay claim that the Palaszczuk Labor government was driving jobs in my region. The reality is that this bill will cost jobs. To put that into perspective, in a recent Saturday edition of the *Daily Mercury*, our regional daily newspaper, I counted more funeral and death notices than job ads in Mackay, the city that I represent in this place. Without a doubt, Airlie's nightclub operators are up in arms. In my words, they are blowing up deluxe at the prospect of these 1 am lockouts. They can see the job losses. More importantly—and I stress this point—they fear, as I do, the mayhem that will come when hundreds of revellers spill out onto the streets when the lights come on. As the member for Burdekin has alluded to in his contribution to this debate, in a town that has 17 taxis that is a recipe for disaster. Unlike Kings Cross, Newcastle and, closer to home, Fortitude Valley and the Gold Coast, we have no public transport. Certainly, we have nothing like that in the big smoke, which is another world away.

That resonates with a lot of people in my patch, most notably Stacy Harvey, the chairman of the Safe Night Precinct Airlie Beach, who, on 10 September 2015, told the *Whitsunday Times*—

Lockout laws tend to cause more frustration because people are separated from their friends, partners, sometimes bags, phone, belongings and toilets.

She went on to say—

You're talking about 500 people being put onto the street at one time.

Ms Grace: That's rubbish.

Mr COSTIGAN: The member might say it is rubbish, but it is in the *Whitsunday Times* on that date and it came from a lady—

Government members interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I do not believe everything that I read in the *Whitsunday Times* either. Minister, you've had your go.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Order! Member for Whitsunday, I will have you address your comments through the chair.

Mr COSTIGAN: Of course, Mr Deputy Speaker. Incredibly, the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, which examined this bill, did not even come to Airlie Beach. Talk about a lack of respect for a community focused on tourism where, on any given night, we have tourists from around the state, the nation and, indeed, the world.

A government member: I thought you represented Mackay.

Mr COSTIGAN: I will give the member for wherever a map of my electorate after tonight's debate. As I said earlier, tourism is the lifeblood of Airlie Beach, but we did not get a look-in. Our people had to travel to Townsville to have their say. They were lucky. Tonight we have already heard from the member for Burdekin. He knows what a lockout is all about, in more ways than one. What an insult to a bloke of his background in the city that he represents. That was disgraceful. In Townsville, the locals are restless, which is why Mark Napier, as a representative of the Townsville CBD Liquor Accord, recently caught up with the shadow Attorney-General. Those people know full well, as does the member for Burdekin, what will happen up and down Flinders Street, from The Bank right through to the Mad Cow, should this bill be passed.

I note the comments made by the Labor member for Barron River. It goes without saying that I respect his contribution to the community as a paramedic, as I respect the medical profession of the member for Stafford and the member for Moggill, the ambulance backgrounds of the member for Thuringowa and the member for Gaven, and the list goes on. However, with the greatest of respect, the member for Barron River is wrong on the issue. He is so wrong that the Cairns Regional Council also strongly opposes the Palaszczuk Labor government on this bill. In fact, it was Labor-leaning Councillor Ritchie Bates who successfully moved a motion in council to oppose the government's plans. That was six months ago. Guess what? The government has not listened one bit! Certainly it is not listening to the Labor member for Cairns, whose vote on this bill will be scrutinised very closely by the people of Far North Queensland.

Mr Walker: He's not going to turn up.

Mr COSTIGAN: I say to the shadow Attorney-General: if it sounds like a forfeit and it looks like a forfeit, it must be a forfeit. If people listened closely to what the member for Barron River said this evening, they would have got the impression that Cairns was not a safe place to visit. That is right: Cairns is off limits, judging from what we heard from the member for Barron River tonight. I wonder what the regional tourism organisation, TTNQ, will think of that when they read *Hansard* and the member's contribution to this debate.

I am sure that Councillor Bates has a completely different view. He said to the *Cairns Post* on 26 August last year, 'The CBD is the safest it's been in some time.' He is a well-known Labor man in the Far North. He is opposing his comrades on this issue. I might add that he made those comments—and I will put it into some perspective—on the back of seeing a 25 per cent reduction in robberies and a 12 per cent reduction in serious assaults in the Cairns CBD.


In Cairns, like Airlie and Townsville, the issue has only got hotter. The editorial in the *Cairns Post* on Tuesday stated—

Cairns MP Rob Pyne's stance is confusing. He has publicly criticised the laws but now says he doesn't want another alcohol-fuelled bashing death on his conscience. Lockout opponents might tell him and the ALP to simply pursue harsher penalties, more CCTV, mandatory ID scanning and to swallow their pride and admit the LNP's Safe Night Out Strategy was effective.

I think that says it all. I am proud to say that under the former LNP government I delivered a safe night out precinct for both Airlie and Mackay's city heart, just outside my electorate.

We have heard many times in this debate that there is no silver bullet and, there is no magic potion, that what we need is a comprehensive plan. The only plan of substance is the LNP plan, with its wideranging measures aimed at making our communities safer than ever. We need cultural change, education for our younger ones and stronger enforcement of the current liquor licensing laws. I get that time and time again.

In conclusion, this is ill-conceived legislation that has more holes than a tea strainer and I cannot support it, especially with the committee itself admitting that more data is needed. Suffice it to say, the delay in bringing it in says it all—the socialists are not fair dinkum on this issue.

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (1.51 am), in reply: My role is to bring the attention of honourable members back to my bill, the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill 2015. It has been clear in the debate, and particularly pointed out by the Attorney-General, that elements of the government's bill cover a number of the areas that were in my original bill. In drawing the attention of the honourable members to the provisions of my bill I will particularly dwell on two aspects which are not covered in the government's bill and which I think are important aspects of my bill.

The first relates to campdrafting events. The Attorney-General said that the government's bill does not cover those. I will just reinforce for honourable members what my bill does in this regard. Presently, section 13(1)(d) of the Liquor Act provides an exemption from the requirement to obtain what is called a community liquor permit for a fundraising event if the sale of liquor meets a number of requirements. One of those criteria is that liquor is not sold at the event for more than eight hours and that the event starts and finishes on the same day.

The Liquor Act provides an exemption for small regional shows, apart from that particular requirement. That allows them to be eligible for the exemption even if they operate over a couple of days. The majority of campdrafting events do not meet the general CLP exemption because they sell liquor from 10 o'clock to midnight and they occur generally for more than one day. Given that campdrafting events are considered by those who know about those events as low risk, the bill proposes to amend the CLP exemptions in the Liquor Act to provide a specific exemption for campdrafting events, similar to the exemption provided for small regional shows.

That seems to us to be a sensible, red-tape reducing measure. It is included in my bill, but not the government's bill. If members want that provision to proceed, they will need to support my bill when it comes to the vote on my bill.


The second provision that is contained in my bill, but not in the government's bill, that I want to draw the attention of members to specifically is that which repeals a certain number of church and other organisation acts. This provision goes back to July 2012 when the then attorney-general requested the Queensland Law Reform Commission to review 29 acts relating to the establishment and management of various church and community organisations.

Following consultation with church and community organisations, the commission then released a report in December 2013. That report was titled *A review of religious and certain other community organisation acts*. It was tabled in this House on 4 March 2014. That report recommended repealing 10 acts in their entirety, repealing a further four acts following the relocation of some technical and minor administrative provisions to other related church and community organisation acts and amending the remaining 15 acts to get rid of obsolete provisions and to consolidate the legislation where it was possible.

This bill implements those provisions. They are merely mechanical and clear our statute book, as we should always be doing, of material that we do not need. I know this from my days in legal practice. I acted for the All Saints church, which is an historic Anglican church on Wickham Terrace, which had a number of bits of legislation dating back to the 1800s which could drive one nuts when trying to figure out what provision applied to what. Those acts are the sorts of acts that are streamlined and made simpler by this provision.

The committee did recommend that the acts not be dealt with until the completion of the royal commission into sexual abuse. Why the committee made that recommendation in relation to these measures, I have no idea. I cannot see any circumstance in which the findings of the royal commission could in any way affect what we are seeking to do. The Law Reform Commission, in looking at streamlining the legislation, would have had in mind the fact that it did not make any amendments to legislation that had any important legal effect with respect to the legal liability of the organisations in question. I think the committee was misconceived in its concerns. I believe that the matter should proceed and can still proceed.

My urging to the House is that, whatever view it takes of the government's bill, it supports my bill. As the ruling of the Speaker has made clear, my bill will proceed only in part because those parts that may be dealt with if the government's bill is passed will no longer need to be dealt with in relation to my bill. I urge the House to support it when the vote on that measure comes to pass.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (1.56 am), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I would like to thank all of the committee members and pay special thanks to my colleagues, the member for Ferny Grove, as chair of the committee, the members for Lytton and Capalaba and before that the members for Morayfield and Ipswich West. I understand that it is a busy committee with the volume of legislation that it examines. I sincerely thank them for the hard work that they conducted behind the scenes. It is absolutely critical to this government delivering on its election commitments.

I thank the Katter party, the members for Mount Isa and Dalrymple, for their constructive and sincere efforts to ensure Queenslanders benefit from the passing of this legislation. I would also like to thank within my department the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation. Deputy Director-General David Ford and his team superbly managed what is a complex area of law, engaged with the parliamentary committee process, consulted with stakeholders and undertook the legislative process. I thank David Ford for his and his team's professionalism.

To those organisations that contributed to the open letter to Queenslanders, I cannot say thank you enough for their efforts. I will try to name each individual organisation, but please forgive me if I inadvertently leave someone out. They were: the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol, the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, AMA Queensland, the Queensland Police Union of Employees, the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education, Clubs Queensland, Healthy Options Australia, National Reliance for Action on Alcohol, the Salvation Army Eastern Territory, the national Trauma Committee of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, Lives Lived Well, the Public Health Association of Australia, the Queensland Nurses' Union and the Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drug Agencies.

I would also like to thank those organisations and people who supported our bill: the Queensland Tourism Industry Council; the Queensland Police Service; the Queensland Ambulance Service; the Australian Christian Lobby group; those individual police officers, doctors, paramedics, safe night out board members, academics, researchers, mums, dads and community members who all stood shoulder to shoulder with me around the state. I would also like to thank the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol on inviting me to the forum that they held today where they discussed the facts and myths surrounding the restriction of liquor trading hours. I am informed that members opposite were invited but all 42 of them were not able to attend.

Last but not least I would like to thank the member for Stafford, a minister in the Palaszczuk government, Dr Anthony Lynham. His determination to see these laws passed is literally unstoppable. I thank and congratulate him. He lent his significant reputation to this important area and gave up a successful career as a surgeon because he realised that, as parliamentarians, we have an amazing collective power to not just treat the problem one patient at a time but to drive cultural change and create institutional reform. The Palaszczuk government is committed to achieving cultural change around our drink habits.

I am disappointed, if not surprised, by much of the contributions from the members of the opposition. Rather than go through each and every furphy we heard or to point out the glaring hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition in his previous positions or the member for Moggill, who has unfortunately turned his back on the profession, overall the debate from those opposite can be reduced to some pretty simple and pretty disingenuous positions. They claim there is no evidence without explaining how they are ignoring the academics, the researchers, the doctors, the research paper, after paper, after paper that show that these strategies work. They claim that we should not abolish safe night out initiatives. We are not. They have not been abolished.

The opposition want evidence. We have produced it. I tabled 15 research papers referred to by Professor Jake Najman at the committee hearing. The opposition want evidence. We have produced it. It is clear to see. I have tabled some of it. It exists. It is tangible. It is real. But, like ostriches with their heads in the sand, the opposition members chose not to accept it. The truth is that if someone is still trying to claim there is no evidence they are simply not looking. They just do not want to see it.

As much as I do not want to drag out this debate, I want to take members to a couple of matters in the committee report to reinforce what evidence is really out there. As Professor Jake Najman said in the committee hearing in Brisbane—

When people put evidence to you, the questions you need to ask are: how credible is that evidence and does it meet the consensus of researchers who will look at the research design? In that context, we have looked at the research worldwide that relates to the legislation that is being proposed through the parliament. I can identify, depending upon how strictly you apply those criteria, somewhere between 15 and 20 research papers around the world that have tested these propositions.

And I have tabled them here in this parliament. He continues—

These research papers come from Norway, the United Kingdom, Brazil, Australia and other countries. All of these research papers have, as a key element, that they looked at what happened with drinking and violence and injuries before legislation was changed; they had control groups where there were other areas that were not subject to the legislation or other times; and they then looked at the outcomes some time past the legislation being enacted.

We could look at every one of those studies and we would quibble about some aspects of each of those studies. But, in their totality, they present a picture that is clear and consistent across studies. Is it absolutely certain? From my research perspective, the answer is no. Is it highly probable and consistent with the available evidence? The answer is absolutely it is. There is a broad consensus across the world, not just in Australia, that there are three or four key factors that reduce the number of injuries, the number of deaths, the number of people disabled, the violence, the crime—there are a whole range of indicators ... The evidence indicates very consistently that when you increase the number of liquor outlets or you increase the number of hours the liquor outlets are operating, you increase the number of injuries, accidents and other negative outcomes, and when you reduce those you have a reduction in the consequence.

I go on to the Norwegian study, which was explained by Professor Kypri at the committee's hearing. He stated—

This was very important because, in contrast to what had gone before, this was started by a law that permitted municipalities to set trading hours. In fact, 18 cities modified their trading hours in the first decade of this century. Ten of them restricted hours, three of them extended them and five did both. They extended and then restricted, having seen that there were problems. This all happened between the hours of 1 am and 3 am, so there is a fair amount of uniformity to start with and 18 different experiments, in contrast to what we have in Newcastle and Sydney, which are just two. They found a 16 per cent change in assaults per hour of trading, that is, where trading increased by an hour, the average increase in assaults was 16 per cent; were it reduced by an hour, the average reduction in assaults was 16 per cent. That is actually fairly similar to what we found in Newcastle, where we saw one-third for a two-hour change in trading. It extends that literature that I referred to before, which expressed some hesitancy to reach a conclusion about smaller changes, which are what we are talking about, as I understand it, in Queensland.

There is the evidence. It is there to see. It is international evidence. It is peer researched and it is there for everyone to see. So how could so many members on the other side get up and claim there is no evidence? The member for Moggill said, 'I just want to support sound, good evidence based policy.' Well, here it is. It is here for everyone to see. We heard from many opposite that they had a comprehensive policy. It was working. There is no need to do this. There is no evidence that this would make a difference. I think one member referred to these laws as 'tinkering around the edges', that there is no point to doing this.

In my last reference to the parliamentary committee report, I refer to Professor Peter Miller, from Deakin University, who had compared the impact of Newcastle's liquor restrictions with voluntary measures implemented in Geelong, Victoria. This followed from his evaluation of the impact of the Geelong interventions in 2011. The committee summarised as follows—

The Geelong Liquor Accord, one of the first liquor accords in the world, includes the following interventions:

... a shared banned patron list; agreed levels of security surveillance; licensed premises that are identified as being 'high risk' implementing ID scanners; encouraged use of two-way radios, and; agreement that police be contacted immediately upon the identification of problem patrons.

The parliamentary committee summarised as follows—

At the time of the study there was a 'safe taxi rank', ID scanners in every post-1 am venue, a two-way radio program connecting police to security staff and staff to each other, cleaners, taxi rank staff and fast food venues. A community education program (Just think) was underway, and there was a significantly increased police presence and increased penalties for anti-social behaviour.

Does it sound familiar? Because it is the safe night out principle. That is the policy that they adopted. What were the findings of Professor Peter Miller's research? The parliamentary committee goes on to state—

The study used specific categories of alcohol-related hospital admissions as measurement (reported assault rates have been used as measures in other studies), and found:

Alcohol-related injury ED presentations in the Geelong region have risen consistently since 2005. Furthermore, none of the interventions implemented in Geelong coincides significantly with any sustained decrease in alcohol-related injury rates.

The committee report goes on to say—

A report on the research evidence about alcohol-related harm and the night-time economy referred to this research as follows:

In summary, the number of assaults in Newcastle dropped significantly during the study period whereas the community-based interventions had no significant effect in Geelong. This is in line with the current literature. Of note is the increase, rather than a decrease, in alcohol-related assault rates after the implementation of the alcohol industry funded 'Just Think' social marketing campaign. The most likely explanation for the different results between Geelong and Newcastle is that none of the interventions in Geelong address alcohol consumption. Interventions that address total alcohol consumption have consistently been found to be the most effective in reducing alcohol-related violence ...

The evidence is clear.

The member for Surfers Paradise made comments about claims by the Premier. I was at the press conference where there were questions about whether police numbers would be reduced if there was a decline in assaults. Statements were made about the Premier allegedly claiming that we would be taking police away. I heard the member for Surfers Paradise making claims that we would reduce the number of police in these precincts. I want to cite another quote from 2010 which states—

There have even been suggestions by the police that just reducing trading hours by an hour or two could mean that we would have about 170 fewer police officers running around looking after those areas. To me, they are quite comprehensive recommendations.

Who said that? The Leader of the Opposition did in 2010. Those opposite should start talking to their own leader about his views on these issues. The opposition say they care about alcohol fuelled violence. The opposition say they want cultural change—and we heard a lot about cultural change—but here it is: you have to drive cultural change. There is an argument that we have to treat every area differently. We cannot say that we want cultural change in the Fortitude Valley but not in Cairns or Goondiwindi, which was one of the areas the Leader of the Opposition talked about many years ago. Let us not have cultural change in Townsville or in Surfers Paradise. We just need it in certain areas. That is not the way we are going to change our image about alcohol abuse and misuse, and Australians being known for knocking back drinks and drinking to excess.

They continue to refuse to take the very action required to tackle the violence that is right there in front of their faces. They continue to refuse to make the changes to drive cultural change. They continue to turn their backs on the will of the Queensland people. This debate should not have been a divisive debate about pitting one area of the state against others. This is unquestionably a statewide issue. The opposition claim they are opposed to casino exemptions but had no concerns with the same rules applying when they were in government for three whole years. They claim our legislation is too complex, but at the same time in the same breath it is too simplistic.

The government will move forward and implement this legislation. We will continue to work with the community. We will continue to work with stakeholders throughout the implementation of this important reform. We will bring about a safer and more prosperous night-time economy. I thank the Premier for having the courage to bring this from opposition into government and follow through and deliver for the people of Queensland. I once again thank Dr Anthony Lynham for his contribution and advocacy over so many years and for his willingness to give up his profession to be here and see this to fruition to make a difference in lives. I thank all of those advocates out there and those working on the front line. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Pyne, Simpson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Division: Question put—That Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 41:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 45:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Pyne, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.

Consideration in Detail

Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—



Mr KATTER (2.21 am): I move the following amendment—

1

Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 8, lines 7 to 21—

omit, insert—

- (1) The following provisions commence on 1 July 2016—
 - (a) part 4;
 - (b) section 18(1), to the extent it omits definition *trading period*;
 - (c) section 18(2), to the extent it inserts definitions *3a.m. safe night precinct* and *trading period*;
 - (d) sections 22(3), 29(1), 34(1), 37A, 48(1) and (2), 52A(1) and 54;
 - (e) section 62, to the extent it inserts sections 336 to 338.
- (2) The following provisions commence on 1 February 2017—
 - (a) section 18(2), to the extent it inserts definition *lock out condition*;
 - (b) sections 18(5), 29(1A), 31, 34(2), 38, 48(1A) and (3) and 52A(2).
- (3) The following provisions commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation—
 - (a) section 18(2), to the extent it inserts definitions *car park*, *car park approval*, *craft beer*, *craft brewery*, *promotional event*, *regulated car park* and *related body corporate*;
 - (b) sections 24 to 27, 30, 32, 33(4), 36, 37, 42, 44 to 47, 52, 53, 58 to 60 and 66;
 - (c) section 62, to the extent it inserts sections 340 and 341.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Mr Rob Katter's amendments [180].

This amendment is intended to give operators in the safe night precincts sufficient transition time for the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. The lockouts or 1 am one-way-door policy for 15 safe night precincts will start on 1 February 2017, as opposed to 1 July this year. The intention behind this measure is to allow the precincts to consider their options based on the needs and demands within the precinct following the roll-back of operating hours. They have the ability to decide on which measures to apply. This will also allow the government to gain the views of the venues throughout the precinct to ensure that the lockout measure is one that can be supported. In essence, we felt that it was extremely important to give the industry, law enforcement and other parts of the community time to adjust and assess the measures put in place.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—

Mr KATTER (2.24 am): I move the following amendment—

2

Clause 18 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))

Page 15, line 2, after '*commencement*'—

insert—

and trading period

I move this amendment for very much the same reason as amendment No. 1. It relates to exactly the same issue.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendments—

1

Clause 18 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))

Page 15, line 25, '173NR'—

omit, insert—

173R

2

Clause 18 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))

Page 15, line 27, ' , for part 4, division 8, '—

omit.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [181].

These amendments are technical in nature and minor drafting errors which were identified by the parliamentary committee in their report.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr KATTER: I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 18 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))

Page 16, after line 19—

insert—

trading period, for part 5, division 6, see section 142AD.

4 Clause 18 (Amendment of s 4 (Definitions))

Page 16, lines 31 and 32 and page 17, lines 1 and 2—

omit, insert—

(5) Section 4, definition *trading period*, from '*period*—

omit, insert—

***period*—**

(a) for part 5, division 5, see section 142AA(1)(a)(ii); and

(b) for part 5, division 6, see section 142AD.

These amendments again relate to the same issue of the 12 months delay in the rollout of the 1 am lockdown.

Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 28, as read, agreed to.

Clause 29—

Mr KATTER (2.24 am): I move the following amendments—

5 Clause 29 (Amendment of s 86 (Hours to which application may relate etc.))

Page 26, lines 20 to 22—

omit, insert—

(b) for a licence relating to premises in a safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or

(c) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.

6 Clause 29 (Amendment of s 86 (Hours to which application may relate etc.))

Page 26, after line 22—

insert—

(1A) Section 86(1)(b), 'a safe'—

omit, insert—

a 3a.m. safe

These amendments again relate to the same issue of the delay in the rollout of the 1 am lockdown.

Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 29, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 33, as read, agreed to.

Clause 34—

Mr KATTER (2.25 am): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 34 (Amendment of s 107C (Commissioner may impose conditions on licences and permits))

Page 32, lines 3 to 5—

omit, insert—

(1) Section 107C(2), example—

omit.

(2) Section 107C(2)—

insert—

Example—

a condition mentioned in section 142AA(3)

I have moved this amendment based on the same issue again.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 34, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 35 to 37, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr KATTER (2.26 am): I move the following amendment—

8 After clause 37

Page 33, after line 29—

insert—

37A Omission of pt 5, div 5 (Lock out provisions)

Part 5, division 5—

omit.

This amendment relates to the original issue of the lockouts.

Amendment agreed to.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 38—

Mr KATTER (2.26 am): I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 38 (Replacement of ss 142AA and 142AB)

Page 33, lines 30 and 31 and page 34, line 1—

omit, insert—

38 Insertion of new pt 5, div 5

Part 5—

insert—

Division 5 Lock out provisions

This relates to the same issue again.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 38, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 39 to 47, as read, agreed to.

Clause 48—

Mr KATTER (2.27 am): I move the following amendments—

10 Clause 48 (Amendment of s 155AD (Who must be present or reasonably available at licensed premises etc.))

Page 42, lines 23 to 26—

omit, insert—

- (ii) for a licence relating to premises in a safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
- (iii) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.

11 Clause 48 (Amendment of s 155AD (Who must be present or reasonably available at licensed premises etc.))

Page 42, before line 27—

insert—

(1A) Section 155AD(2)(b)(ii), 'a safe'—

omit, insert—

a 3a.m. safe

12 Clause 48 (Amendment of s 155AD (Who must be present or reasonably available at licensed premises etc.))

Page 43, lines 8 to 11—

omit, insert—

- (ii) for a licence relating to premises located in a safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
- (iii) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.

13 Clause 48 (Amendment of s 155AD (Who must be present or reasonably available at licensed premises etc.))

Page 43, before line 12—

insert—

(3) Section 155AD(3)(b)(ii), 'a safe'—

omit, insert—

a 3a.m. safe

These relate to that same issue of the lockouts coming in in February 2017.

Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 48, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 49 to 52, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr KATTER (2.29 am): I move the following amendment—**14 After clause 52**

Page 51, after line 26—

*insert—***52A Amendment of s 165A (Refusing entry to premises)**

(1) Section 165A(1)(e)—

omit, insert—

(e) for licensed premises—it would be a breach of a condition of the licence for the premises to allow the person to enter the premises.

(2) Section 165A(1)(e)—

*insert—**Example—*

a condition mentioned in section 142AB

This amendment relates to the same issue of the rollout of the lockouts in February 2017.

Amendment agreed to.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clauses 53 and 54, as read, agreed to.

Clause 55—

Mrs D'ATH (2.30 am): I move the following amendment—**3 Clause 55 (Insertion of new pt 7, div 1A)**

Page 54, line 11, '173NR'—

*omit, insert—***173R**

Again, this is a technical correction that was identified by the parliamentary committee.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 55, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 56 to 61, as read, agreed to.

Clause 62—

Mr KATTER (2.31 am): I move the following amendments—**15 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)**

Page 61, line 25, 'This section'—

omit, insert—

Subsection (2)

16 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)

Page 61, lines 1 to 6—

omit, insert—

- (2) For an approval granted before 1 February 2017, the commissioner may grant the approval only to the extent it authorises trading between—
 - (a) if the premises to which the approval relates are located in a safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
 - (b) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.
- (3) Subsection (4) applies if—
 - (a) immediately before 1 February 2017, an application for an extended trading hours approval had been made but not decided; and
 - (b) the application, if granted, would extend trading hours to include trading between 2a.m. and 5a.m.
- (4) The commissioner may grant the approval only to the extent it authorises trading between—
 - (a) if the premises to which the approval relates are located in a 3a.m. safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
 - (b) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.

17 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)

Page 61, line 9, 'This section'—

omit, insert—

Subsection (2)

18 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)

Page 62, lines 15 to 21—

omit, insert—

- (2) From 1 July 2016 until 31 January 2017, the extended trading hours approval has effect as if it authorised trading only between—
 - (a) if the premises to which the approval relates are located in a safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
 - (b) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.
- (3) Subsection (4) applies if—
 - (a) immediately before 1 February 2017, an extended trading hours approval was in force for licensed premises; and
 - (b) the approval extended trading hours to include trading between 2a.m. and 5a.m.
- (4) From 1 February 2017, the extended trading hours approval has effect as if it authorised trading only between—
 - (a) if the premises to which the approval relates are located in a 3a.m. safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
 - (b) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.

19 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)

Page 62, lines 24 to 32 and 1 to 4—

omit, insert—

- (1) Subsection (2) applies to a decision of a court or tribunal on a proceeding relating to an extended trading hours approval for licensed premises if the proceeding—
 - (a) had started but had not been decided before 1 July 2016; and
 - (b) is decided before 1 February 2017.
- (2) Despite anything in the decision that provides otherwise, on the day the decision takes effect, the extended trading hours approval has effect as if, and to the extent that, it authorised trading only between—
 - (a) if the premises to which the approval relates are located in a safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
 - (b) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.
- (3) Subsection (4) applies to a decision of a court or tribunal on a proceeding relating to an extended trading hours approval for licensed premises if the proceeding had started but had not been decided before 1 February 2017.
- (4) Despite anything in the decision that provides otherwise, on the day the decision takes effect, the extended trading hours approval has effect as if, and to the extent that, it authorised trading only between—
 - (a) if the premises to which the approval relates are located in a 3a.m. safe night precinct—12a.m. and 3a.m.; or
 - (b) otherwise—12a.m. and 2a.m.

These amendments relate to the same issue of the rollout of lockouts in February 2017.

Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Mr KNUTH (2.31 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)

Page 62, after line 4—

insert—

338A Minister must review

- (1) The Minister must, as soon as practicable after 1 July 2018, arrange for an independent review of the operation and effectiveness of the relevant provisions.
- (2) As soon as practicable after the review is completed, the Minister must table a report about its outcome in the Legislative Assembly.
- (3) In this section—
relevant provisions means the following provisions, as inserted or amended by the *Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Act 2016*—
 - (a) section 86;
 - (b) part 5, division 5;
 - (c) part 6, division 1B;
 - (d) part 6AB, division 5;
 - (e) part 12, division 17, subdivision 1.

I table the explanatory notes to this amendment.

Tabled paper: Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Mr Shane Knuth's amendments [\[182\]](#).

This amendment ensures that the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 will be independently reviewed after two years from the commencement of the legislation on 1 July 2016. This review, therefore, takes place 17 months after the full rollout of all of the measures included in this bill in consideration of the recommendation detailed in the committee report. It is also vital that the full impacts and the benefits of these laws are assessed at a point when solid data can be collected and reviewed.

Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) agreed to.

Mr KATTER (2.32 am): I move the following amendment—

20 Clause 62 (Insertion of new pt 12, div 17)

Page 63, line 11, after 'under'—

insert—

previous

This is the final amendment and relates to the delay of the rollout of the lockouts until February 2017.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) agreed to.

Clause 62, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 63 to 74, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.33 am): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.33 am): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.33 am): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Albert Electorate, Traffic Arrangements



Mr BOOTHMAN (Albert—LNP) (2.33 am): Tonight I rise to speak again about a critically important issue affecting thousands of motorists every single day in the southern part of my electorate. On 9 September last year a local business owner went principal petitioner requesting urgent action to alleviate congestion at interchange 57 on the Pacific Motorway. He is one of many residents who have had enough of the congestion issues, the poor line markings—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Albert, I ask you to just wait a few moments until the chamber clears. Thank you, members. Member for Albert, I ask you to start again. The clock starts now.

Mr BOOTHMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Tonight I rise to speak again about a critically important issue affecting thousands of motorists every day in the southern parts of the Albert electorate. On 9 September last year a local business owner went principal petitioner to request urgent actions to alleviate congestion at interchange exit 57 on the Pacific Motorway at Oxenford. He is one of many residents who have to put up with daily traffic congestion issues, poor line markings and multiple traffic lights, which create a recipe for disaster.

Motorists entering the interchange from Tamborine-Oxenford Road and wishing to merge left to travel northbound on the M1 Motorway are subjected to extensive queuing and light changes that let only very few cars through because vehicles coming from other directions are already queuing through the intersection. This is not the only problem with this intersection. Vehicles heading north on the Old Pacific Highway at Oxenford wishing to turn right to go through the interchange are also subjected to extensive delays during peak-hour traffic, and the queue actually goes for kilometres. This is also not the only issue with this intersection. Vehicles on Heathwood Drive, which is coming from the north into the intersection, are also suffering an enormous amount of congestion.

This interchange is confusing at best. Motorists travelling from Hope Island to Oxenford regularly become confused with line markings. Vehicles cross over from the far right lane into the middle lane. This is most dangerous for vehicles actually in the middle lane crossing the intersection, as they have to keep an eye out for vehicles crossing from their right into their lane. Just to highlight how important this issue is for my local residents, 1,446 residents signed the petition seeking urgent works on this section of road. This is not the only problem with the M1 and this stretch in the Albert electorate. At exit 41 and exit 45 there is extensive queuing going back on to the highway and cars have literally stopped because they are trying to get off at these interchanges and there are cars driving past at 110 kilometres an hour. They are within centimetres of each other. This is a recipe for disaster.

Abbey Museum, Abbeystowe




Mr WILLIAMS (Pumicestone—ALP) (2.37 am): I rise to speak about a matter of great importance for the Pumicestone area and the surrounding areas. Recently I was accompanied by the Assistant Minister of State Assisting the Premier, Mark Ryan MP, and the Chief Government Whip, Chris Whiting, to the Abbey Museum. Each year about 30,000 Queenslanders attend the Abbey Museum's Medieval Festival and Tournament. This has been operating for over 27 years. It is a wonderful walk back through time for all ages. This event has been a yearly event, but that is about to change. I have some exciting news for Queensland and in fact for Australia. On the 5th day of this month the Abbey Museum of Art and Archaeology at Caboolture in conjunction with the Moreton Bay Regional Council and Moreton Bay Region Industry & Tourism announced that we will have Abbeystowe. Abbeystowe will be a complete working Medieval village with a lake, Vikings, a castle, knights in armour and all manner of village folk

displaying their crafts and enacting their trade for the pleasure of tourists and the public, and it will be open daily. This will be a venue to rival Australia Zoo or the Sovereign Hill gold rush town. The visitors, including children on school excursions, will spend the day engaging and learning about the past. This 30-hectare living history museum will be the largest in the Southern Hemisphere.

Currently, 80 per cent of those 30,000 people who attend the medieval festival and tournament each year travel from across Australia and, indeed, overseas and come back every year with their friends. The authenticity of using woven garments is a great thing and people make sure that the medieval festival does not get modernised. Some of the displays date back 600 years.

The director, Edith Cuffe, and my parliamentary colleagues are focused on the employment and the economic growth that this medieval village will bring to the area. I call upon my parliamentary colleagues to move forward with this fiscally sound project.

M1 Upgrade

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.40 am): In recent weeks traffic events, like a truck crashing on the M1 at Nerang and catching fire, which resulted in traffic grinding to a halt for hours on end in both directions, have reminded us of how we urgently need to invest in better roads for the Gold Coast. This issue is far from new. As members are all too aware, I have made countless speeches in this House and I have worked with my state and federal LNP and coalition colleagues since 2005 to secure urgently needed upgrades to the M1 to reduce congestion and improve safety. My tireless campaigning and, ultimately, my achievements in securing funding for that stretch of motorway that is in my electorate led to me being dubbed the 'Member for the M1' by the *Gold Coast Bulletin*.

It is as the 'Member for the M1' that I rise to take this opportunity to provide the House with a snapshot of the M1's recent past. In 2007, the Howard coalition government committed \$455 million to upgrade the M1 from Nerang to Coolangatta, which was allocated under a fifty-fifty funding arrangement with the state government. I was proud to stand with the then deputy prime minister, Mark Vaile, as he made this announcement.


Since then, I have campaigned for and secured M1 upgrades from exit 73 at Carrara to exit 82 at Robina, including massive upgrades to a number of interchanges. With these upgrades now complete, the federal funding provided by the coalition in 2007 has now been spent entirely. Throughout the entire tenure of the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd Labor government, not one cent was allocated for further upgrades of the M1, despite the Howard government money being re-announced in every subsequent Labor budget.

In 2012, the then LNP state government requested funding to continue upgrading the M1 from exit 82 at Robina to exit 85 at Reedy Creek. Unfortunately, this application was ignored by the Gillard Labor government. I would have hoped that this Labor government, which came to power last year with no plan of its own, would have continued the good work of the LNP government and submitted another application for federal funding to upgrade the M1. Unfortunately, all we ended up with was a bumbling, fumbling Minister for Main Roads who forgot to ask for federal funding before the 2014-15 federal budget. In fact, it was not until almost a year after taking office that the Labor government finally mentioned the M1 in its Infrastructure Australia submission.

I have been advised by the Department of Transport and Main Roads that there is no intention of starting the upgrade of the M1 from exit 82 to exit 85 until after the Commonwealth Games. That will mean that southern Gold Coast residents will be stuck in gridlock until 2020.

I will be watching this year's budget with interest to see if the state government will match the previous fifty-fifty funding. People on the Gold Coast are not going to be stuck in gridlock until 2020. It is absolutely ridiculous. The roadworks can be done through the median, like all the other roadworks were, and traffic can continue. Queenslanders are quickly realising that this do-nothing, frozen-at-the-wheel Labor government has plenty of plans to do nothing.

Ferny Grove State High School


 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (2.43 am): Last week, on 9 February, along with the principal of the Ferny Grove State High School, Liz Foster, and also the student leaders, I had the privilege of hosting a visit by the Minister for Education, the Hon. Kate Jones. Like most state high schools, Ferny Grove State High School has a variety of different venues and structures in its grounds, such as a 300-seat auditorium. It is a special opportunity to listen to the talented students who play in that auditorium.

The Ferny Grove State High School football field has produced many famous football players, for example, Rugby League players Barry Berrigan; Jharal Yow Yeh, who represented Queensland and Australia; and Justin Hodges, the captain of the Brisbane Broncos from 2014 to 2015. The school has also produced some very close friends of mine, the Veronicas—Lisa and Jessica Origliasso. At one stage I employed their older brother in one of my offices. It is a delight to know that those talented people attended Ferny Grove State High School.

On our visit on 9 February we visited a couple of classrooms with the student leaders, hooking up with the Learning Excellence at Ferny program and the German immersion program. Lastly, we visited the music auditorium. That took me back to an opportunity that I had last year, along with the minister, to attend the gala concert performance in that auditorium. We were fortunate to hear the extremely talented musicians who played a number of songs for us in that auditorium. This year, the gala concert performance will be held on 18, 19 and 20 August. Like always, it attracts a huge crowd—not only students and people from Ferny Grove but also people from afar. As members would know, Ferny Grove State High School is located in a huge catchment that includes the areas of Pine Rivers and Morayfield.

Ferny Grove State High School is a great school that attracts many people from all locations. It is a delight to visit that school. I think that the education minister was so impressed with the songs and the musical instruments that the students played that she will be back at the auditorium when the gala performance is held on 18, 19 and 20 August.

Spirit of Buderim

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—LNP) (2.46 am): I would like to refer members of the House to a wonderful community initiative in my electorate of Buderim spearheaded by the Buderim War Memorial Community Association—the BWMCA—in partnership with the Buderim Foundation. It was the production of a 16-page one-off tabloid publication titled *Spirit of Buderim* made possible by a \$7,000 grant from the Australian government to celebrate community achievements during Community and Philanthropy Partnerships Week in early December. The publication's purpose was to explain the roles of the BWMCA and the Buderim Foundation, to showcase their achievements and to encourage volunteering in the Buderim community.

Spirit of Buderim is full of interesting photos, history, stories and case studies about what makes this community special, including more than 30 Buderim organisations which had the opportunity to say what they are and what they do in our community. All the contributions, writing, editing, layout and design were undertaken by volunteers, led by Mr John Devers.

Spirit of Buderim was officially launched by Professor Paul Clark, Chair of the Buderim Foundation, on 11 December. Professor Clark said—

There are countless stories each and every day about those who give their time, their energy and their talent for the benefit of others while nourishing their own spirit in the process ... and the *Spirit of Buderim* aims to highlight just some of them.

Seventeen thousand copies were printed and delivered to every letterbox in Buderim postcode 4556 by a small army of enthusiastic volunteers who collected bundles for the streets that they were allocated.


Spirit of Buderim validates social researcher Hugh Mackay's proposition that 'It's not where you live but how you live'. This is a timely message in the wake of Hugh's recent visit to celebrate the BWMCA's 70th anniversary and I hope that it resonates with all those who have chosen to call Buderim home.

I believe that *Spirit of Buderim* will have a high impact and resonate powerfully well beyond its publication date. It will be something to read and hold on to, a keepsake for individuals and families, reminding them of the importance of strong partnerships between community and philanthropy.

Additional copies of *Spirit of Buderim* are available while stocks last from the old Buderim post office, Buderim's community information centre. *Spirit of Buderim* will make a great reference for locals and something to send to family and friends so that they can see why they choose to live in Buderim. I would like to table this copy of *Spirit of Buderim* for the House as an excellent case study of leadership in the volunteering sector.

Tabled paper: Spirit of Buderim, community newspaper, undated [183].

Greenslopes Electorate

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.49 am): Forest covered hills, mountain creeks, sugar gliders, koalas, butterflies, bees and a myriad of plant and bird life, these images are not generally what a person thinks of when they think of an inner-city electorate. That is exactly what people will find if they

visit the electorate of Greenslopes. It is wonderful to have Whites Hill Reserve and the Mount Gravatt reserve section of Toohey Forest, and many other areas of remnant bushland, Bowies Flat Wetland and many tributaries of the Norman Creek most linked by flora and fauna corridors in the electorate.

These areas are protected, restored and maintained by many dedicated volunteers, but I want to focus on the Mount Gravatt Environment Group. I had the great opportunity to share an end-of-year celebration with the group. Nestled in amongst the butterfly pollinator link, that is being developed by the group across Mount Gravatt State High School, my daughter and I were treated to a wonderful outdoor afternoon tea, surrounded by beautiful bush and the people who care for it. Forgetting that we were five kilometres from the CBD was very easy.

It is good to reflect on the words of the president, Laurie Deacon—

It's the people that make the difference but it's the environment that makes the people! We are strengthened, encouraged, enriched ... made peaceful and healthy by the place where we live ... by our Forest Reserves and the wildlife who we are honoured to share it with. Who doesn't want to live amidst Colour and Movement!


Colour and movement is exactly what greets people when they browse through the annual calendar produced by the group as part of their annual nature photography workshops. The 2015 calendar focused on macro shots, and the amazing array of plants, animals, rocks and natural features captured is truly astounding.

The Mount Gravatt Environment Group is made up of people who live on and around the mountain or are interested in the community development work they do. They have been going for around 20 years and have about 30 active members and over 200 supporters from all places, including a strong supporter in myself here in this place. So many people have contributed much over the 20 years but a few deserve special mention—Sue Jones, Mike Fox, Brett Dugdale, Sue Ackroyd, Liz Pell, Sheamus O'Conner, Len Kann, Justin Schreiweis and, of course, Laurie Deacon.

The group is as much about building community as it is about protecting the environment. In addition to the photography workshops and regular working bees to protect and restore bushland, the group offers guided walks and education sessions, they are building a pollinator link garden and they are placing interpretive signs on tracks through the mountain. Track maps for walkers have been developed. The group monitors nesting boxes and koalas. Perhaps my favourite activity is the green gym bush care program which connects local kids with each other and nature while helping them to keep fit.

I look forward to my next visit to spend time with this fantastic group. So next time members are driving down the south-east freeway, look left just after the Marshall Road turn off and gaze at Mount Gravatt. Take a moment to think about the colour, the movement and the community being created by the members of the Mount Gravatt Environmental Group.

Palaszcuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (2.52 am): We saw over the weekend the first anniversary of the Palaszcuk Labor government. After 12 months of inaction, no plan, of locking up the potential of Queensland the only thing that this Labor government has been able to achieve is the unlocking of the fear of tens of thousands of seniors across the state by scaring the pants off them over electricity prices and their electricity concessions.

Across Queensland there are more than 100,000 seniors who take advantage of the \$320.97 concession that is offered to those who are eligible and hold a Queensland seniors card. Last year I took the opportunity to ask the Minister for Seniors just how many people in my electorate take advantage of the seniors card. I was reliably informed by the minister that in the postcode of 4216 there are 11,598 card holders, entirely within my electorate. We estimate across the other postcodes that cover a few electorates that there is another couple of thousand.


We are talking about between 14,000 and 15,000 residents of my electorate who are holders of the seniors card. It absolutely beggars belief that the Queensland government would consider ripping from them their electricity concession. What we have seen is a Labor government that promised to ease the cost-of-living pressures but instead does not care about the seniors who live in my electorate or the many electorates across Queensland.

The Productivity Commission, which, as we all know, was set up by the Labor government last year, took the opportunity as directed by the government to consider the electricity concessions framework because the Labor Party thinks they are inefficiently targeted. The Productivity Commission took the opportunity to recommend that Queensland seniors should lose their eligibility to electricity

concessions. Our D-grade Treasurer, Curtis Pitt, is still vacillating. Potentially thousands of Queenslanders, including the approximately 14,000 seniors in my electorate who are 65 or over, will have their rebate potentially ripped off them.

What we have seen after 12 months of inaction, no plan, 80 inquiries and scaring the pants off the pensioners of Queensland is that Labor is frozen at the wheel. All I can say is that it seems that they are more concerned with freezing pensioners this winter than doing anything about Queensland and the cost of living.

Mount Archer State School, Parliament House Visit

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.55 am): I was absolutely delighted to welcome year 6 students from Mount Archer State School here at Parliament House recently. The year 6 students visited Parliament House on their annual year 6 camp. It is always a pleasure to welcome students from schools in my electorate to Parliament House, but this year 6 visit was very special to me personally because it was 17 years ago that I first visited Parliament House as a Mount Archer State School year 7 student. It is also especially touching given my Mum, Sharon McKee, has taught at Mount Archer State School for the past 23 years.

If a sign of a good school is the length of time the teaching staff remain employed there, then Mount Archer State School must be one of the best schools in Queensland. Many of the teachers who taught me at Mount Archer are still actively teaching there, including Mrs Flamank, Mrs Chong, Mr Swanson, Mrs McKee, Mrs Mitchell and Mrs Hill.

I remember visiting Parliament House for the first time back in 1998 vividly. I was in awe of the parliament's beauty, history and grandeur. But it did not occur to me at the time that I would be here in this place, some 17 years later, representing the good people of Keppel. It is an honour to do so.

The year 6 Mount Archer students, their teachers and I had a wonderful morning together visiting and learning about the Legislative Council, the honour boards, the members' reading room, the mace, the wind yarn, the leadlight window and the Legislative Assembly. I thoroughly enjoyed the debate in the mock parliament in the chamber as to whether sport is better than playing video games. I admired the students playing their respective roles with passion and vigour.


I was impressed by the year 6 Mount Archer students' in-depth knowledge of our Westminster system, Queensland parliamentary history and processes. They knew the names of the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker and the Governor of Queensland, they knew about the history of the abolition of the Queensland Legislative Council, they could name the Minister for Education, and, it is no easy feat for a year 6 student, they could even spell Palaszczuk.

To be honest, the students' knowledge is no surprise given the teaching expertise of Mrs Vicki Chong and Mr Peter Swanson—two senior, passionate and dedicated Mount Archer teachers who were also responsible for teaching me about government and politics all those years ago. Mrs Chong and Mr Swanson have a lifelong passion for teaching and that passion has been passed on to many of their students, myself included, over their decades of teaching at Mount Archer.

The parliamentary attendants were also impressed by the students' knowledge and their behaviour. In fact, one of the kind parliamentary attendants actually noted that the Mount Archer student group was the best group that had toured Parliament House this year. That is no easy feat given the vast number of students who tour through the parliament every year.

Congratulations and many thanks to the principal of Mount Archer State School, Lyn Hill, who was supported by senior teachers Vicki Chong, Peter Swanson, Amanda Kearney, Paul Corrin and school chaplain, Daniel Gordon. I hope you and the students thoroughly enjoyed your trip to Parliament House and I look forward to welcoming future year 6 students of Mount Archer State School, and students from all of the schools in my electorate, to Parliament House in the future.

Outback Queensland, Unemployment

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (2.58 am): I would like to indulge in presenting a few statistics tonight—some that are very startling. It behoves the entire parliament to acknowledge them. The first statistic is the labour force unemployment rates for the regions for the December quarter. For the Queensland outback, and I will table this graph, it is 15.1 per cent, which is approximately three times the state average and almost double the next nearest.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Queensland—Unemployment rate by Labour Force Region' [184].

I have a great deal of empathy for places like Mackay, Townsville and Cairns that are doing it tough, but their figures are nearly half the figure for the Queensland outback. I would like to think that I, as a resident of the outback, would be deeply concerned if those figures were reversed and Brisbane were facing those figures. My observation is that all my friends and relatives in Brisbane do quite well.

Everyone I know in the outback, everyone I know in my home town is struggling. It is deeply concerning to me. It is no coincidence. It is not just that we are experiencing poor market conditions in the mining industry or the beef cattle industry, which is true, this has resulted from the neglect of successive governments in terms of infrastructure and policy.

Another figure I would like to share with the parliament is that the gross regional product for someone who lives in the north-west is over \$180,000 per person. For someone who lives in the south-east it is \$60,000 per person. We are an area of great productivity. We are great contributors to the state. Mount Isa Mines was voted the most productive and the most significant in business in Queensland's 150-year history at the Q150 celebrations.

Approximately \$300 million a year in royalties alone come out of just the north-west, yet we have a degraded rail line. Anyone who knows the rail line well knows that it has been neglected. We have depleted water resources. We did not build a transmission line. I was talking to one of our major mines in the region the other day and they paid three times what one of their other mines in New South Wales paid for their energy. These things relate to the cities.

A large number of our workforce are FIFO employees from places like Townsville and Brisbane. We all suffer the consequences if we do not invest in these areas. They need attention. They have been neglected. The problem is that there are no votes out there so we always get lost in the mix. Under that 15.1 per cent unemployment is a lot of loss, a lot of hardship and despair. I think that is something that every Queenslanders should be frightfully aware of. We should be ashamed that we have let it get to that and it needs to be repaired.

Pope, Mr M



Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (3.01 am): Yesterday was a very sad day for my neighbouring electorate of Whitsunday. They suffered a terrible bus accident and also a boating accident which saw the loss of two lives. I would like to pass on my condolences to the member for Whitsunday and to his electorate.

On 12 January this year, the Mackay community lost an amazing man, Mick Pope. His sudden death has left Mackay in mourning. Known as the 'ideas man', Mick Pope was a larger than life, vibrant character who was instrumental in making the Mackay Airport Beach Horse Racing Festival an international attraction for the region. Word got out quickly of Mick's passing and tributes began flowing immediately from all over the region. It was clear from the hundreds of Facebook posts from people of all ages that Mick had an unstoppable passion and belief for Mackay and will be truly missed by the community. Mick was the kind of man who would make good things happen. He was known far and wide for his ability to draw a crowd and raise money for many worthy causes. Once Mick put his mind to something, there was nothing that would stand between him and the success of his idea.

Mick also had a private side. He did numerous generous acts for the community that nobody ever knew about as he did not go around looking for accolades. Even after his death the legacy of Mick Pope and his vision for the Mackay Airport Beach Horse Racing Festival will live on. His partner, Chrissy, his friends, colleagues and the Mackay Regional Council are determined that this year will be bigger than ever. The Mackay Airport Beach Horse Racing Festival is one of a kind. It is an event that shot quickly to the top of Mackay's must-do activities. This event and the success it has brought to Mackay would not be possible without Mick Pope and his tireless contributions to our community.

Drawing over 7,000-plus people to the Mackay Harbour Beach, the Mackay beach horse races have become an exciting spectacle, offering visitors a great opportunity to experience some famous Mackay hospitality and weather. The race day is regarded as the No. 1 social and sporting event on North Queensland's calendar. Mackay's tourism industry has Mick Pope to thank for this wonderful achievement. Mick's idea to have beach horse races has inspired a multitude of other ideas such as beach polo and an air show, showing that his legacy will well and truly live on in our community.

There was no rule book in Mick's life. He made up his own. He was brave enough to always throw caution to the wind. He truly lived life to the fullest. Thank you, Mick, for reminding us to do the same.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.06 am (Thursday).

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams