




Speech By
Michael Crandon

MEMBER FOR COOMERA

Record of Proceedings, 30 August 2016

**PUBLIC SAFETY BUSINESS AGENCY AND OTHER LEGISLATION
AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (3.31 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the Public Safety Business Agency and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and report No. 33 of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, of which I am a member. At the outset I think it is important to point out that the Police and Community Safety Review that was conducted back in January 2013 was conducted by quite an eminent Australian: Australian Federal Police Commissioner Mick Keelty. The review examined two entities, the QPS and the department of community safety, that being the Queensland Ambulance Service, Queensland Corrective Services, Queensland Fire and Rescue Service and Emergency Management Queensland. There were 127 recommendations, 87 of which applied directly to QPS and the department of community safety. The then government endorsed the recommendation that various things were to occur, including the merging of QFRS and EMQ to form Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, among other things. The PSBA was initially created through an administrative arrangement back in November 2013, and the 2014 act formally established the PSBA on 21 May 2014. That implemented those aforementioned recommendations, and I think it is important for us to also realise that the PSBA established its strategic plan 2014-18 at the time of that act being established.

I have gone through that little bit of background and talked about the dates because they are incredibly relevant. We had something that was in place for a matter of months and, as was pointed out by the member for Morayfield, the now government said that it was going to implement a review of the PSBA if it were to win office. That is precisely what you have done, and that is fine. It is the desire of the government to go down that road and they decided to do it, but they decided to do it within months of the act being established. There was no consideration given to giving it some time to see how it would work. There were 87 recommendations, for goodness sake, in relation to these two organisations. There was no consideration given to saying, 'Is there some sort of internal conflict going on here?'

We have established already from the member for Morayfield's contribution that the unions were not for the PSBA. The unions were against it, so was there some skulduggery going on? Was there some funny business going on within the services that was causing the problems that occurred which have been alluded to by various people, or was it that the majority of the changes that were made were successful and there were a few minor things that needed to be changed? The bottom line is that in 2015 the government engaged the Public Service Commission to conduct the PSBA review, which was overseen by a cross-agency steering committee. That is absolutely okay; that is exactly where we wanted to go. It is sad that it was six or eight months after the PSBA was put in place instead of giving it until towards the end of the 2014-18 strategic plan in 2018 to have a look at. Why do it when it has only been around for five minutes and it has not had a chance to do any of the finetuning necessary for it to get up and achieve its goals? We certainly have not given it time, and at what cost has this review

been undertaken? Are we undoing things because Campbell Newman brought them in and we are de-Newmanising the legislation in this state? That is absolutely foolish, and that brings me to my main point.

One of the members opposite—I think it was the member for Capalaba—commented that in the report we supported the passing of the bill. I make the point that we listened to the evidence, as did those members opposite. I will remind them of this as we go on in our roles as committee members. We listened to the evidence, and in the broadest terms we felt that, as a committee with the evidence that had been presented to us, we would let the bill go through as a recommendation from the committee. That is not to say that the opposition is not going to disagree with aspects of the bill. At the end of the day that is what it is about, but do you see the fine difference between what we do and what those opposite do? We do not go running back to the shadow minister saying, 'What do you want us to do, Mr Shadow Minister? Do you want us to do this? Do you want us to do that?' We do not do that: we look at the evidence. Those opposite are quite different, and I have experienced this in both the Finance and Administration Committee and also the now legal affairs committee. They go running back to their union masters and their ministerial masters saying, 'What do you want us to do? How do you want us to handle this? How do you want us to go with this?'

A case in point is the North Stradbroke Island sandmining bill. Some of their members were so embarrassed that they did not even speak to the North Stradbroke Island bill because they knew the right thing for North Stradbroke Island was to keep sandmining there until 2035, but they did not have the gumption to stand up to this government, to stand up to the minister, and say, 'No, we are going to make a recommendation that sandmining should stay there.' That is the classic example. That is not what we do on this side of the House.

Mr BYRNE: I rise to a point of order. I would ask that the debate be constrained within the long title of the bill. That would be very helpful to proceedings.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Member for Coomera, I will bring you back to the bill.

Mr CRANDON: That is a wonderful segue into exactly what I was going to do, and that is come back to the bill. Thanks, Bill. I am just using one of the glaring examples—the sandmining bill—to come back to this particular bill and what we have done.

I make the point that we consult widely with the community, as the committees consult widely with the community. The important difference is that we actually listen to the contribution from those we consult through the committee and those we consult more broadly. Some of those people that we consult, of course, are our colleagues. I will go back to my colleagues and say, 'Can you give me some background on this? Can you give me some idea of why we are, six or eight months down the road, wanting to completely change something without giving it a fair run, without giving it an opportunity to be finetuned?' They will give me that advice. At the end of the day, though, what we on this side of the House bring to our committee role—listen up, folks on the other side—is a sense of, 'This is the committee. The committee needs to do the right thing and make appropriate recommendations based on the evidence.' In terms of that glaring example of sandmining on Stradbroke Island that I used before, based on the evidence they could not possibly have accepted the government's will, and that is to move it forward.

I repeat that we on this side of the House are not about listening to our masters, whether they be union masters or ministerial masters—old Bill out there with his gun: bang, bang! We are not about that. In our committee role we are about listening to the evidence and developing and providing a report to this House to provide it some guidance as to where it should go with a particular bill.