




Speech By
Shane Knuth

MEMBER FOR DALRYMPLE

Record of Proceedings, 21 May 2014

IDENTIFICATION LAWS AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (9.07 pm): I want to say that I commend the member for Nicklin. This is not just about courage; this is all about representation of the electorate and what the people are saying and thinking. When I get around, these are the things that people are saying to me. What the member for Nicklin—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! What is the point of order?

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am interested in your ruling as to whether the member is appropriately attired.

Mr KNUTH: I have a coat on, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Dalrymple now has a tie and now has the call.

Mr KNUTH: The question is whether a letter has been put to me and whether the changes that Beattie put in place have been changed again, because I have not been told. If that is the case, then I accept that.

I fully commend what the member for Nicklin has put together. If it were the Attorney-General who put this forward, everyone over there would be saying, 'Yes, this is a great thing. This is the best thing that has ever happened and finally someone's got the balls to take a stand and do something.'

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! Member for Dalrymple—

Mr KNUTH: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:—your language was unparliamentary. Sorry, did you withdraw already, member? I did not quite hear.

Mr KNUTH: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Dalrymple has the call.

Mr KNUTH: As I was saying, this is what the people are telling me. This is about security. Things have changed a lot since September 11. We do not try to change laws to suit people in other countries. Here in Queensland this is about security. This is about protection. This is about ensuring that when someone goes into a bank their face is not covered. I do not think that is too much to ask for.

It is a good thing when Queenslanders come to parliament to make representations on behalf of their constituency. It is very sad that some backbenchers were given the opportunity to make decisions for their own electorate. When they do step up, what happens? They are sacked, moved to the backbench, asked to leave or are disendorsed. That is not what the parliament is about. The

parliament is about bringing the views of a member's electorate in the state of Queensland to the parliament. I have seen a hell of a lot of people come and go from this chamber—and I have only been here for a short time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, I remind you what the bill is about and I ask you to return to the bill.

Mr KNUTH: In speaking to the bill, with regard to security, I believe this is a very good move. I know that two years down the track the minister will be introducing this bill himself. He will do that because people will ask him, 'Why don't you do something?' Then he will put his hand on his heart and say, 'Yes, the time has come and it is about time we increase security in the national interest.' How many times have we seen this happen? It was done with regard to the child protection bill. I put it up and, likewise, so did the member for Yeerongpilly. What does the minister do? He puts one up as well.

Dr Douglas: He copied it. He copied it.

Mr KNUTH: He copied it. It was exactly the same. Yet he condemned it from the beginning. In two years time everyone over there—Vaughan will still be here; Mr Rickuss may not be.

Mr HART: I rise to a point of order. The member clearly does not know what this bill is about. He has not mentioned it in the three minutes that he has been speaking.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, I have mentioned relevance and I again ask you to come back to the bill.

Mr KNUTH: This is about security and this is about what the people of Queensland want. The people here do not have the security. As I said, Vaughan will be still here and the minister will still be here. There will not be many left after that. If you do—

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. You have just finished warning the member about staying relevant to the bill in terms of silly repetition that the member is going on with. Please either keep the member to the bill or sit him down.

Mr KNUTH: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. The provisions of the bill state—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, I do ask you—and for the last time—to return to the bill.

Mr KNUTH: The committee's report on the bill states—

The provisions in the Bill are based on similar laws which are currently in force in both New South Wales (from November 2011) and the Australian Capital Territory ...

My goodness, this is unbelievable; it has already been introduced! It was introduced because they saw the reasons behind it. They saw that there was a need for increased security, and that is what is behind this. The report goes on—

The NSW Act applies generally to police officers providing them with the power to require removal of face coverings for identification purposes, while the ACT legislation is limited to the exercise of functions under the ACT's road transport laws and related drug and alcohol testing laws.

The Committee notes the *Criminal Investigation*—

This is what it is all about, because we just cannot have people walking around our streets—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjecting.

Mr KNUTH:—with their face covered up. We cannot have people walking into banks with their face covered up. We cannot have people walking into places where security is a concern with their face covered up. So what is wrong with saying, 'We don't want bombs going off. We don't want terrorism. We don't want these things. We don't want to see these things'? The Western Australian act—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, would you please hold for a moment? There is a point of order.

Mr STEVENS: The member is talking about 'bombs going off' and other highly inflammatory remarks. The member is just making a mockery of this parliament. Please ask him to either talk to the bill or sit down.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, I have warned you. I do think you came back to the bill. You are beginning to wander again. It is the final time. You need to stay on the bill.

Mr KNUTH: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. It goes on—

The WA Act similarly applies to police officers only—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNUTH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I do have the right to speak but I also have the right to speak without being interjected upon. I have the right to defend myself as well.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members will cease interjecting.

Mr KNUTH: The report goes on—

The WA Act similarly applies to police officers only, empowering them to require a person to remove headwear for identification purposes.

While there are no similar laws in place in other jurisdictions within Australia, a recent publication by the NSW Ombudsman helpfully summarises comparable laws in other states (than NSW) and sets out the actions taken in other jurisdictions which have not resulted in legislative change.

That report referred to a review undertaken in Victoria which concluded the existing powers of police in that state were *'sufficient to allow police to request a person to remove headwear for identification purposes'* and that *'if a person refuses to reveal their face, the police can currently arrest the person until they prove their identity'*.

I commend this bill to the House. I know that in two years time, when many members opposite will no longer be here, this bill will come back to the House because people will express these concerns. This is very sensible legislation. I commend this bill to the House.