




Speech By
Tim Mander

MEMBER FOR EVERTON

Record of Proceedings, 17 February 2016

**TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL;
LIQUOR AND FAIR TRADING LEGISLATION (RED TAPE REDUCTION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

 **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 lockout 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.