




Speech By
Jarrold Bleijie

MEMBER FOR KAWANA

Record of Proceedings, 1 March 2017

LIQUOR AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (4.35 pm): Well, colleagues, haven't we been here before? This is déjà vu. That was the same speech the Attorney-General gave when she introduced lockouts in Queensland, and lockouts were going to prevent every alcohol related violence incident in the state! Now she is using the same speech to justify why lockouts will not save people in this state and that is why they are going to get rid of them.

Mrs Smith: We told you so.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection: we told you so. Two years ago there was a comprehensive plan tackling alcohol and drug related violence. That was the LNP's safe night precinct plan.

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Attorney-General may want to interject, but everything she has done in the past two years, other than earlier trading times, is contained in the Safe Night Out Strategy the LNP introduced. We have gone around in circles to get to where we are today. You can shake your head, Attorney-General, but ID scanners are already law. You know that. They were the law in July 2015.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! I make it clear to two potential sparring partners: please direct all comments through the chair and do not engage in conversations across the chamber.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you for your guidance, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Attorney-General knows that ID scanners are currently the law. They are the law because the LNP introduced them into law in Queensland. They were due to start in June 2015. The Attorney-General knows that she delayed the introduction of ID scanners because of all of these sorts of issues. She said at the time, 'We might not need ID scanners because we have lockout laws.' Now we do not need lockout laws because we will have ID scanners, which she has delayed again until June this year.

The law at the moment is ID scanners and lockouts. If you were in the Valley on the weekend you would know that lockouts are law in this state as we speak, but guess what? The government is turning a blind eye to them. The government is turning a blind eye to ID scanners. The government is turning a blind eye to lockout laws. The Attorney-General is the first law officer of the state. There are liquor licensing laws in place, but imagine her saying to the police, 'Don't worry. Don't abide by the laws because we're not going to enforce them. We know what the laws are. We know what is in the Criminal Code. We're just not going to enforce it because we have completely botched alcohol laws in this state.' For two years this bungling Attorney-General has gone from bungle to bungle.

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Attorney-General can laugh, but the egg is on her face. We debated liquor laws over a year ago. The introduction of—

Mrs Smith interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will get to the employment minister in a minute.

Mr Cripps: Don't forget Grace!

Mr BLEIJIE: I will not forget the Minister for Employment. I will not forget her.

Mr Cripps: Or the member for Stafford.

Mr BLEIJIE: I assure the member for Hinchinbrook that I will get to the member for Brisbane Central in about 50 minutes time and I will get to the member for Stafford in about 55 minutes time. I have a few more minutes to spend talking about the Attorney-General.

When in opposition the Attorney-General said that everything contained in the safe night precincts policy was terrible and was not going to work. That is why those opposite stood up with Professor Jake Najman during the election campaign and announced this lockout laws policy, yet two years later at the committee hearing last week Professor Jake Najman said that these laws have been a complete failure and also criticised the government for getting rid of lockout laws. We know what the political reality of this situation is. Those opposite are not getting rid of lockout laws because of some interim report that was handed down. They are not getting rid of lockout laws because they have had this epiphany that lockout laws do not work, because we told them that all along. We are not getting rid of lockout laws for good public policy grounds; we are getting rid of lockout laws in the state of Queensland because of the member for Brisbane Central, because the member for Brisbane Central—

Mr Cripps: Has rolled the member for Stafford.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. The member for Brisbane Central has rolled the member for Stafford on this particular issue.

Mr Cripps: Rolled him over!

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Brisbane Central was sick and tired of not being invited to the rallies in her electorate against the lockouts. They were feeling the political pressure and, under cover of darkness and under cover of holidays—of course when the Premier was nowhere to be seen—they roll out the Deputy Premier. All of a sudden this has become an issue. I can imagine the phone call with the Deputy Premier to the Attorney-General over the Christmas break on some island somewhere: 'Listen, the lockouts are causing grief. We've got to get rid of them. We've been saying they're going to save lives for the last two years, but we've got to get rid of them. How're we going to do it?'

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection; perhaps by private email possibly. The Deputy Premier would have said to the Attorney, 'How are we going to get rid of lockout laws?', and the Attorney-General comes up with this excuse about this interim report. We had never heard of an interim report. There was never going to be an interim six-month report into the lockout laws in Queensland. There was going to be a 12-month to two-year review into the liquor laws, but all of a sudden we have an interim report. I can imagine the phone call—and the way she is smiling I know it is true—to their Labor mate Professor Peter Miller saying, 'We need you to bring forward your interim report.' He would have said, 'What interim report?', because it was never discussed! It was never announced there was going to be any interim report. There was going to be a report into liquor laws, trading hours and lockout laws, but all of a sudden the political fix came in and they needed an interim report and the interim report indicated what the LNP had said all along: lockout laws were not going to solve the issues of alcohol fuelled violence in the state of Queensland. We had said it in government. We had said it for two years and when we left government incidents of alcohol and drug related violence were on the decrease in all safe night precincts—on the decrease. Why would you stop doing something that was working?

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Attorney-General can interject all she wants, but essentially she has done a complete double backflip, triple up-in-the-air somersault and landed where the LNP started. That is what has happened here. The LNP had a policy and the Labor Party had a policy and effectively, other than earlier trading hours, the Labor Party has copied the LNP policy. Unfortunately, it has taken it two years to get to this spot. It has taken it two years to realise that we were right and it was wrong.

As I said, the Premier was away when it was announced. It was a pretty big decision to get rid of lockouts in the state, and I note that the Deputy Premier announced it, not the Premier. I quote an article from 14 February 2016 titled 'Palaszczyk on lockout laws: "please, just forget about politics for one week"'. That is what the Premier said at the time. Going back a year ago, the Premier said—

I don't know how anyone in good conscience could vote against these laws ...

that is, the lockout laws. Again she said—

I don't know how anyone in good conscience could vote against these laws ...

Guess what? The LNP in good conscience did vote against these laws and the Labor Party is now voting against its own laws that it introduced. In fact, it introduced them but never commenced them. It never commenced the laws because it said that it was not going to apply the laws and it was not going to police the laws. This has confused industry. I make the point that for 12 months industry had been preparing for lockouts to commence on 1 February. Just before lockouts were to commence, their world changed and lockouts were no more. They had already let people go because of the lockout laws. They had already changed their business practices because of the introduction of lockout laws. They had sacked workers because of the Attorney-General's lockout laws. At the eleventh hour the government then changes the lockouts, and guess what? They do not apply in the state anymore despite the law being the law of the day.

I went to Cairns and talked to the traders up there prior to Christmas about lockout laws and they were telling me that the Attorney-General had put them in a very difficult position under her legislation. Her legislation said that if you want to trade until three o'clock in the morning you have to have a 1 am lockout and if you cannot agree in the safe night precincts about that strategy you would all be at two o'clock. Unfortunately for Cairns, they took a vote and it was a tied vote. Some of the businesses wanted to trade until three o'clock with a 1 am lockout and some businesses wanted to trade until two o'clock. It was a tied vote and they wrote to the Attorney-General—and I have seen and read the letter—saying, 'How could you put us in this position—business against business in the Cairns community, a tourist icon?' The Attorney-General put them in that position to vote against each other, to pit businesses against each other—small business against large business—in terms of when they would close at either 3 am or 2 am but with the 1 am lockout. They wrote to the Attorney-General and said, 'We can't decide because there's been a tied vote.' It would then be up to the Attorney-General to decide when all those businesses in Cairns closed. If I had money on it, I would suggest the Attorney would have taken the safe road and went with 2 am and that would have killed the tourism economy of Cairns. It would have killed the tourism economy of Cairns.

In the Valley they chose 3 am with a 1 am lockout and it was not a tied vote. It was not a unanimous vote, but it was not a tied vote. In Cairns the government pitted the businesses against each other. After having that fight with the business community and forcing the business community to fight amongst itself, the Attorney-General then came out in January this year and said, 'We're getting rid of lockout laws.' What was the fight worth? All that fighting that took place over the last year and this Attorney-General—this minister responsible for liquor licensing—the member for Stafford, the member for Brisbane Central and the Premier all stood up in here and said, 'How could you object to this? In good conscience, how could you vote against lockout laws?' How in good conscience can those opposite vote to get rid of lockout laws now? When the Premier said a year ago how in good conscience could you vote against these laws, how in good conscience can those opposite introduce laws to get rid of the very laws that they put in place?

Dr Rowan: Because the Labor Party stands for hypocrisy.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Moggill about the Labor Party standing for hypocrisy. I will go one step further: the Labor Party stands for nothing. The Labor Party stands for nothing in the state of Queensland. It stands for political expediency. It stands for political fixing. It stands for political fixing particular seats when there is a hot political issue to discuss. The LNP has been consistent on lockouts in the state of Queensland. The LNP has been consistent on safe night precinct legislation. The LNP has been consistent on our policy. We have not jumped from policy to policy. We consulted with Queenslanders. We had the safe night strategy out there and we consulted with Queenslanders. We not only consulted but also went back to all residents of Queensland and said, 'This is the first round of consultation. These are the outcomes of the consultation. What do you think about this strategy?' Queenslanders had a second bite at the cherry—a second opportunity to tell us what they thought about liquor and drug laws in the state of Queensland.

Of course, the Labor Party said that it had a better way—a better way, know it all and having the review. Let me go back a step to where this legislation all came from. It came from a couple of ministers flying down to Newcastle and having a look at what worked in Newcastle—lockout laws, ID scanners, earlier trading hours; all of that sort of stuff. They did not look at the evidence that showed that, although violence may have decreased in Newcastle, violence in the surrounding suburbs had increased. They did not look at the CBD of Sydney, or Kings Cross in Sydney, where the incidence of violence had decreased. Of course, violence had decreased in those areas, because half the businesses closed down. There was no-one there to commit violence, but I will tell members that there were people in the suburbs to commit violence. The people did not stop drinking; they just chose a different place to drink.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member from Brisbane Central. She said that is because they have done it right. This law repeals your own government's laws. How could you have done it right? You are getting rid of your own laws.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Kawana, please direct your comments through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: I say to the member for Brisbane Central that the bill that we are debating today repeals the Labor government's policy on lockout laws. How could the government have got it so right 12 months ago and now so wrong? I will tell members why: the government is now copying LNP policy. We are going right back to where we started three years ago with the introduction of the most comprehensive legislation in Australia dealing with alcohol fuelled violence.

Where did this legislation come from? It came from a man who was elected on one issue, and that is the member for Stafford. He was elected because he said that he wanted to make a difference. I commend him for wanting to make a difference with alcohol fuelled violence. We all do. That is why we had the safe night precincts. We do not want to see violence, but we do not want to punish the majority of good citizens for the sins of a few. That is what the Labor Party was doing.

The member for Stafford was elected on one issue alone and he has spent two years flying around the state with various stakeholders, with the health minister and the Premier, standing side by side with the Attorney-General at press conferences and standing side by side with the Minister for Health at press conferences. When they wanted, they rolled out the doctor. They rolled out the member for Stafford because he was the expert in alcohol fuelled violence. I remember seeing him at all the press conferences. In fact, when the Attorney-General was in hiding, I remember the Labor Party sent out the member for Stafford to hold the press conference on liquor laws in this state on his own. Yet he has been rolled completely. What was the response of the member for Stafford to the media when he was asked last week to comment on Labor's lockout law reversal? The member for Stafford said, 'I'm not commenting, because this is not relation to my portfolio.'

When were liquor laws and alcohol fuelled violence part of his portfolio of State Development? The member stood next to the minister responsible for liquor laws and the health minister and talked about alcohol fuelled violence. It is convenient that liquor laws are not in his portfolio. I know that he lost vegetation management from his portfolio to the Deputy Premier, but he never had liquor licensing in his portfolio. The Attorney-General, the health minister and the Premier were happy to roll out the member for Stafford when it suited and then they rolled him in cabinet. When he got rolled in cabinet the member for Stafford said, 'I can't speak about this matter. It's not in my portfolio.' Is it any wonder the member for Stafford is not on the speaking list today?

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: He is? His name does not appear on my speaking list. I look forward to the member for Stafford coming in here and saying to the people of the state of Queensland that the one issue he was elected on was the introduction of lockout laws in the state of Queensland—

An opposition member: The greatest moral challenge of all time.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Stafford was elected on the greatest moral challenge of all time— dealing with alcohol fuelled violence—and, at the first opportunity, he absolutely squibbed it. The Labor Party rolled him out for press conference after press conference. I really feel for the member for Stafford because, if I were him, I would feel used and abused by the Labor Party. When it suited, the Labor Party was very happy to roll out the member for Stafford. They rolled him out because he was a doctor and he had expertise—

Mr Cripps: Credibility.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. The member for Stafford had credibility on the issue, so the Labor Party rolled him out.

Ms Grace: And still does.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection from the member from Brisbane Central. The minister says that the Labor Party still rolls him out. I have not seen him rolled out since the reversal of lockout laws was announced in January.

Mr Stevens: He has been rolled.

Mr BLEIJIE: He has been rolled, not rolled out.

Ms GRACE: I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading. My interjection was not what the member said. I take offence. I ask that he withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! The minister has asked that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. For two years the member for Stafford has been rolled out to convince everybody that lockouts are such an issue that we need them in the state of Queensland. Of course, we do not see him now. He was quoted in the paper that it was not in his portfolio so he is not going to comment on it. Why not? He has been commenting on this issue for two years. Who has silenced the member for Stafford? Why is he all of a sudden not going to comment? Why all of a sudden—

An opposition member: He's been gagged.

Mr BLEIJIE: Has the member for Stafford been gagged? The other reason for this legislation is that Professor Peter Miller conducted a review into the lockouts in Newcastle. He wrote a piece about lockouts and earlier trading times. I have mentioned in this place before that Professor Peter Miller just happened to win the tender to review the government's lockout laws. The very professor who says that he has expertise in this issue and who recommended to the government that we should have earlier trading hours and lockout laws in the state of Queensland has now been awarded the tender to review the very laws that he helped set up.

After I questioned his independence in the media, Professor Miller sent me an email. He was very upset that I had questioned his independence. Let me make it absolutely categorical: Professor Miller cannot commit to an independent, unbiased review into the lockout laws and alcohol laws in the state of Queensland that he assisted the government to set up. If Professor Peter Miller were in any doubt as to what I thought about his independence or otherwise, let me make it abundantly clear: he cannot conduct an independent inquiry in relation to liquor laws in the state of Queensland for the Labor government, because he is on record suggesting the very laws that we are debating. He is on record suggesting earlier trading times. Can members imagine a situation in which Professor Peter Miller, who has spent his life advocating for earlier closing times, after the review and the evaluation has been done, reporting that we should not have earlier closing times? That is absolute nonsense.

Did the Attorney-General, did the Premier, did the member for Stafford—did anyone in the government or staff members in the Attorney-General's office—have meetings with Professor Peter Miller in relation to liquor laws in the state prior to him being awarded a tender? What accountability measures were put in place to ensure that Professor Peter Miller will undertake an independent inquiry with respect to the liquor laws that the government has introduced?

Ms Grace: He has integrity. That's why.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Brisbane Central. No-one is questioning his integrity. I am questioning his independence.

Ms Grace: His independence comes with integrity.

Mr BLEIJIE: His independence comes with integrity? Really?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Could I ask the minister and the member for Kawana to cease conversations and please direct all comments through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: My point is that he is not independent. I cannot imagine a situation where he can produce an unbiased and independent report on laws that he advocated for in the state of Queensland. That is equivalent to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations conducting a review into trading hours legislation that she just introduced—her own legislation, her own laws.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Surfers Paradise, or a DG whose employment is at the whim of the Premier of the state of Queensland—who can hire and fire a DG—conducting an independent investigation with respect to one of the Premier's ministers. As if that is going to happen! One would think that it could get no more embarrassing for the government and the bungling Attorney-General than coming in here and moving legislation that repeals her own legislation which she introduced and spoke so strongly about a year ago. She said, 'How could anyone vote against this type of legislation?' We will get to that; but it can be more embarrassing, because we find out today, just before the Attorney-General got up to speak about her legislation getting rid of her own legislation, that the minister for employment—I cannot believe I am saying this—just introduced legislation and before the legislation is debated, before the minister has even moved the second reading of her own legislation, she is foreshadowing amendments to that legislation through the liquor bill we are debating now and the Attorney-General will be moving amendments.

Ms Grace: It's not in the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. It is not in your bill but it should be. Those opposite forgot when Easter Sunday was. They forgot that Easter Sunday is on the day of Easter Sunday. The member for Brisbane Central wants to interject. Now let me tell the true story about what is really happening here. Last year when we debated the Industrial Relations Bill I warned the member for Brisbane Central,

the minister for IR. I said at the time, and it will be in *Hansard*, 'You're making Easter Sunday a public holiday? Okay, we oppose that. I see you have made it a public holiday.' I also said, 'You forgot to amend, at the same time, the allowable trading hours legislation. You are saying to businesses in the state of Queensland you can have Easter Sunday as a public holiday, but you actually forgot to amend the legislation that allows the businesses to trade on Sunday.' Guess what? All this time has transpired and we are now debating liquor laws in the state of Queensland and then at the last minute to the liquor laws we have amendments to the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990 to fix up their bungle—another bungle by the Attorney-General and the minister for IR.

This amendment is so bad they cannot even move it within the current debate. They have to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill because Easter Sunday trading has got nothing to do with lockout laws. They have to rush an amendment in dealing with a bill they actually just introduced on trading hours. I suspect what has happened is they introduced the trading hours bill, then realised that it is not actually going to be debated and passed before Easter Sunday arrives—oops, whoops, oops, whoops—so they now have to move an amendment to the liquor bill to make sure that Easter Sunday is a public holiday. You could write a script on this.

Mr Stevens: The 'saving Grace' bill!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach, the 'saving Grace' bill. This will be a Netflix original. You cannot make this stuff up.

Ms Grace: Come on, it's not as big as the ones that you've made. This is ridiculous.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Brisbane Central. At no time have I ever stood in this place as a minister of the Crown and introduced a piece of legislation and said, 'By the way, the Attorney-General or another minister is about to introduce an amendment to their piece of legislation which I should be introducing in my legislation but because I have buggered the timing up of Easter Sunday I can't do. I have never done that. I respect this place, I respect the procedures of parliament, but to see the minister for industrial relations introduce a bill, but then the Attorney-General introduce an amendment to a piece of legislation—

Ms Grace: It's not an amendment.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Brisbane Central. It is not an amendment she said. Madam Speaker, this is the amendment! It has been circulated. Part 5 'A-M-E-N-D-M-E-N-T'. That spells 'amendment'. How is the industrial relations minister saying, 'It's not an amendment.'? It says it is an amendment! Of course it is an amendment. The reason the industrial relations minister is carrying on the way she is carrying on is that she is embarrassed and so she should be. She ought to be embarrassed and the Attorney-General ought to be embarrassed. This whole thing is embarrassing. We are debating legislation to get rid of legislation that has been introduced but has not been policed and we are now debating an amendment to a piece of legislation introduced today to deal with Easter Sunday that has not been done. This is a joke! It is an absolute shemozzle! This mob could not run a chook raffle. This is ridiculous. The industrial relations minister should hang her head in shame with embarrassment. Getting rid of the Attorney-General's own legislation before it even starts is an embarrassment in itself.

This amendment, which will be coming in—it is an amendment; I have spelt it out so it is clearly an amendment—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Brisbane Central. If I can give any advice to the member for Brisbane Central it would be that she should just stop interjecting because I have an answer for every interjection she has. It is so embarrassing. I have an answer for every interjection she wants to throw at me. I acknowledge it is not an amendment to the liquor bill. It is an amendment to a bill passed six months ago because, as I said, six months ago they forgot to deal with Easter Sunday. They forgot to put in the legislation the allowable trading hours. They have realised that they forgot to do it again and they have got to rush it through. Easter Sunday has been set for years. We have known the date of Easter Sunday. We had sittings at the end of last year. We came back on 14 February this year. The amendments could have been put in place then. In fact, this bill, the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, was introduced in the last sitting. If they wanted to move the amendment which they are seeking to move today about Easter Sunday they could have introduced it in the bill two weeks ago.

Mr Cripps: They didn't know!

Mr BLEIJIE: They did not know. They forgot again. I kept reminding them. Again it is the opposition governing the state of Queensland. It is the opposition being the government. Maybe I should send the industrial relations minister one of my little Jarrod Bleijie calendars. Easter Sunday and all the public holidays are highlighted on it. I might do that. I will send the Labor members my calendar to show

when Easter Sunday is. That is the amendment we are dealing with. What an embarrassment. We are going to oppose the amendment on the principle that we cannot support it because it is rotten to the core in terms of how it is being introduced. It is outside the long title. It has nothing to do with the bungled liquor laws and we will oppose it when the Attorney-General moves that particular amendment for an issue that has nothing to do with her portfolio. The minister for industrial relations forgot to do it in a bill of her own so we have to deal with that.

Let us deal with ID scanners. In June 2015 when ID scanners were due to be introduced, the Attorney-General said, 'No, we are putting those off. We will not introduce those'. They did not get rid of them; they just shot them into the long grass. However, the Attorney-General forgot and they actually started; they forgot to delay it again. ID scanners by law came in through regulation. They simply forgot. Then the Attorney-General's department had to send out an email to licensees saying, 'You would know that the regulation enforcing ID scanners is in place in Queensland. However, we are not going to enforce it'—

Mr Stevens: He's come across to our side.

Mr BLEIJIE: The two doctors are going out to have a chat about liquor laws. The Attorney-General's department put out a missive to all the liquor licence holders across the state saying, 'You would know that ID scanners are law now, but we are not going to police the ID scanning law, so it's okay. We are turning a blind eye to the ID scanning laws.' Lockout law were due to commence on 1 February, but they turned a blind eye to that.

This legislation deals with the 12 extended licences a year that licensees could have. In consideration of introducing lockout laws, the government allowed licensees to apply for 12 special extended trading permits for particular things. For example, there might be a big concert to be held at Suncorp or at the Gabba. Some may be going to the Adele concert on Saturday night, as I am. There might be a particular thing happening around a licence, so the licensee might say, 'There will be a heap of people in that particular area and we want an extended trading licence'. Therefore, the government legislated for 12 extended permits. Not only did the government legislate; they said to the licensees, 'If you want it, you have to apply to the liquor commissioner for approval'. So businesses applied to the liquor commissioner and the liquor commissioner approved particular licences. Then—shock, horror—the government said, 'We are getting rid of lockouts, because businesses were misusing the permits'—that is, the permits that the government introduced and approved. A poor business applies for a permit pursuant to Labor's legislation, has it approved by the liquor commissioner and then apparently misuses the permit. How can you misuse something that the government has given you? How can it be misuse when the government says, 'If you have a particular function and you want to trade until five o'clock in the morning, go for it,' so they use it? They say, 'Yes please,' but then the government says that they are not only abusing but also colluding with each other on the permit system.

The permit numbers are to be reduced from 12 to six, which we oppose. We oppose it because, if it was such a great idea to have 12 in the first place, what has changed? The only thing that has changed is that lockout laws are no more. The government is getting rid of its own laws to deal with alcohol fuelled violence. Therefore, we will oppose the proposed change to the permit system. Before I rose to speak, I was told that a licensee who had applied for an extended permit for this weekend was advised at 3.34 this afternoon that their permit had been granted. Two days before the event, at 3.34 this afternoon, the Attorney-General's department advised a trader that they could have the extended trading permit.

Mr Krause: They are still approving?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Beaudesert, who has hit the nail on the head: they are still approving the permits. They were approving permits at 3.34 this afternoon. Two days before the weekend, the Attorney-General's department has approved permits. They are doing that because businesses are applying for them pursuant to the laws that the Attorney-General introduced that said they could have 12 extended trading permits a year.

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I do not know even what that interjection was, so I will not take it.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr Cripps: She supports it.

Mr BLEIJIE: She supports it; I take the interjection. I could say anything in this debate, but nothing can get away from the fact that this is a complete bungle by the Attorney-General. I saw the Attorney-General getting advice from the former Labor attorney-general. If I were her, I would steer clear of advice from the member for Woodridge. I would stay away from that advice, because we know what happened with SPER when the member for Woodridge was the attorney-general. We know what happened to SPER under the former Labor attorney-general.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: He can interject all he wants. We know what happened to SPER under his watch. We know what is happening to the health payroll and to the nurses under his watch. You cruel, cruel man! You are a cruel man—

Mr POWER: I rise to a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Order! Member for Kawana, come back to the bill please.

Mr BLEIJIE: I certainly will. It is with great excitement that we hear that the member for Stafford will be contributing to this debate, as he has been the expert and the government spokesperson on this issue. In fact, I would suggest that he been more of a government spokesperson on lockout laws than has the Attorney-General, the health minister or the Premier. Certainly, if you googled 'Dr Anthony Lynham, member for Stafford, lockout laws', you will get more hits than the same search under the Attorney-General's name. However, after today's embarrassing backdown, backflip and triple somersault, no doubt we will be reading a lot more about the Attorney-General. In the eight years that I have been here, I do not know that I have seen a minister of the Crown introduce legislation and then stop enforcing that legislation and completely repeal it, which is what this bill will do. This bill is completely repealing the legislation that she introduced and spoke so passionately about—

Mrs D'Ath: One part of it.

Mr BLEIJIE: One part of it? Does the Attorney-General not think that lockouts are a pretty big part of this? Are they not a pretty big part of liquor laws in the state of Queensland? Are they just 'one part of it'? I take that interjection. The Attorney-General says that it is just one part—just a small part—of the liquor laws in the state of Queensland, but the lockout laws were the element of their law, because the reduction of trading hours was based on lockouts. You could trade until three o'clock in the morning if you had a 1 am lockout. If you did not have a 1 am lockout, you had to trade to 2 am. The basis of the Attorney-General's trading-hour reduction was the lockouts. The heart of it was the lockouts. If they rip out the heart of it, what are we left with? Other than the trading hours, we are left with the safe night strategy that the LNP introduced. Under that strategy, education was going to be introduced in year 7 and was to run through to year 12.

Mr Langbroek: Yes, I did that.

Mr BLEIJIE: The former minister for education introduced that for years 7 to 12. Is education happening in our schools? Is it compulsory? I have not heard if education is happening in schools. We had the police banning orders. We now have people being charged and convicted under the one-punch laws that we introduced, which is the charge of unlawful striking causing death. Labor had 20 years to come up with a one-punch law. We did it and we did it because we sought advice from the chief prosecutor at the time, Mr Moynihan, who is now His Honour. I thank him for the advice that he gave to come up with the charge of unlawful striking causing death. For years, families of victims had been wanting an alternative to manslaughter, as a lot of people were not being convicted of that charge and they certainly were not being convicted of murder. That was a good change and it still applies.

I have already talked about ID scanners. We thought they were a great idea, but they thought they were a bad idea. Then they delayed them and now they will fix everything, because they are reintroducing them and claiming them. When the Premier talked about lockout laws and trading hours, she said, 'We are going to get rid of the lockout laws that we introduced because we think that ID scanners will be a good solution in place of lockout laws.'

Mrs Smith interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Why was that statement not the statement a year and a half ago? Why was that statement not around a year ago when we debated the liquor laws? They said plenty about ID scanners—privacy, concerns; delay, delay, delay. That is why the Attorney-General delayed it. Now we see that ID scanners are going to solve all the issues. They are now the friends of ID scanners which are meant to commence mid this year. Of course, we have seen all the other bungles in terms of liquor reform.

What would we expect when we have a government that has restarted the debt collectors for nurses across the state caught up with the health payroll bungle? We would expect bungles in this legislation. It is the Labor Party. It is the Labor government. Whatever they touch turns to rubbish. Whatever they touch is rubbish.

The Attorney-General gave a great big speech about liquor laws in this state. She did not talk much about lockout laws just now. She did not actually talk about what this bill does. It gets rid of what she put in a year ago.

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I was listening intently, Attorney-General, I can assure you of that. I have listened to the rubbish for two years. I have listened to the same rubbish being rolled out. Now when we accuse the government of all the rubbish they were spurting out—including by the member for Stafford—we find that it is not rubbish anymore. It is apparently good policy not to have lockout laws.

No-one is fooled by this bungle. No-one is fooled by what this government is trying to do. They are fixing a political issue for them. The issue is that people were campaigning against the member for Brisbane Central and the member for South Brisbane, the Deputy Premier. Why do members think the Deputy Premier made the announcement about getting rid of lockouts? It was because when the boss was away the deputy came out to play and made the decision to get rid of the lockouts. She called the Attorney-General and said, 'No, no, no.'

If members want any reminder of that I point to the fact that at estimates last year the Leader of the Opposition directly asked the Premier about lockouts. The Leader of the Opposition, the member for Clayfield, said to the Premier, 'Do you support your lockout laws and will you introduce them on 1 February?' The Premier said, 'I have no intention to change our laws beginning on 1 February.' I then asked the Attorney-General in estimates whether she still supports lockouts. She said, 'We have no intention to change our policy that commences on 1 February.'

Ladies and gentlemen, the only thing that commenced on 1 February was lockouts. They supported lockouts right up until the end of last year but realised with the protests and the petitions that they had a political issue. The member for Brisbane Central rolled into cabinet and the member for Stafford was rolled by those members who are being impacted politically.

We will support getting rid of lockouts because that is our policy. We said at the time that it was not going to work. We do not think it will work. We campaigned on that. Believe it or not, I stood on a stage with the Greens party.

Mr Seeney: No wonder you had trouble saying it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Callide. No wonder I had trouble saying it. I stood on a stage with the Greens party.

Miss Barton: Why would you admit it?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Broadwater—why would I admit it? I will regret it for the rest of my life. When I had members of the Greens party cheering me on in terms of alcohol policy in the state of Queensland I questioned whether I was on the right side of the law. I questioned what we were doing. Then I saw the businesses in the crowd, I saw the security guards in the crowd, I saw the DJs in the crowd, I saw young women hospitality workers in the crowd who were going to lose their jobs because of Labor's lockouts laws. That is when I knew that we had the right policy.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. The member for Brisbane Central was not at the protest.

Mr Whiting interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I cannot help but take an interjection from the current member for Murrumba. I am not sure where he has been pushed off to now the other guy is coming into his seat. He interjects and says that that comes from the person who is taking away penalty rates. That cannot go unchallenged.

I suggest the member for Murrumba talk to the fellow sitting just a couple of seats down. The member for Woodridge was the industrial relations minister at the time and referred the industrial relations power of the state of Queensland to the federal government that set up the Fair Work Commission—that set up the very body that made the penalty rate decision. The member for Woodridge referred the powers to the federal government. The member for Woodridge set up the Fair Work Commission.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Fair Work Commission was set up by the member for Woodridge.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: He handballed it all. He threw it all to the federal government and said, 'You deal with it.' We did not support it.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the member for Woodridge's interjection. We opposed the law at the time. We opposed his referral of powers to the Fair Work Commission. We objected to it. The minister referred the powers to the federal government. He set up the Fair Work Commission. If the member for Murrumba wants to have a fight then he should talk to the member for Woodridge because he was the bloke who set the Fair Work Commission up. He was the one who said to Queensland workers, 'Out with you; off to Canberra.'

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Member for Kawana, please keep your comments relevant to the bill.

Ms Grace interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, I ask that you cease interjecting. Member for Kawana, you still have time on the clock, would you like to come back to the bill?

Mr BLEIJIE: As I was saying, the Premier and the Attorney-General indicated that they still support lockout laws.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: You put it there, mate. The Attorney-General and the Premier said last year that the lockout laws will stay and commence on 1 February.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I would suggest that the members opposite, particularly the member for Woodridge, who is doing lots of interjecting and is not in his seat—I understand his embarrassment that he was the one who referred the industrial relations powers that set up—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Health, I ask that you cease interjecting. While we are at it, I remind members in the chamber of the honours list: the education minister, the health minister and the members for Indooroopilly, Hinchinbrook, Callide, Kawana and Nanango. Those members received warnings this afternoon. I ask that all members—

Mrs Frecklington: Was I on that?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nanango is on that list. I remind members that those members have been warned and ask everyone in the chamber to be quiet. The member for Kawana has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: When we are talking about the Premier and the Attorney-General saying that they still support lockouts commencing on 1 February, let us not forget that in November last year the LNP moved a motion essentially saying that we should get rid of lockouts in this state and they said no. In November last year—

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General who is yawning and says it is boring. We are debating your bill. Had the Attorney-General not bungled this issue so much we would not be debating this issue. In November last year the Attorney-General voted in this place to keep lockouts.

The LNP have been consistently opposed to lockouts. The LNP have been consistent with our safe night strategy. The LNP have been consistent with our education in schools. The LNP have been consistent with banning orders. The LNP have been consistent with additional police powers. The LNP have been consistent with ID scanners. The LNP have been consistent over and over again with our laws in relation to alcohol and drug fuelled violence. We have not changed our position on this. We have not jumped from position to position. We have not jumped issue because of protests. We have not jumped just because the member for Brisbane Central cannot front a protest in her own electorate on liquor laws and then all of a sudden changed their mind. This is an embarrassment for the Attorney-General. This is an embarrassment for the government.

Mr Power: Are you guys reminded of why you lost the election, because you were like this all the time.

Mr BLEIJIE: Who are you? I do not even know who you are. There is a stranger in the House. The government should be embarrassed by these laws. The government should be embarrassed.

Mr Power interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Member for Logan, your interjections are irrelevant. I ask that you cease interjecting.

Mr BLEIJIE: Everything about the member for Logan is irrelevant, Madam Deputy Speaker, I can assure you of that.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, that is not necessary either and unparliamentary. Return to the bill, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Logan voted in this place in November last year to keep lockouts. Is the member for Logan going to vote for this legislation that gets rid of lockouts? If he does, he will effectively be supporting an LNP motion that we debated in November.

Mr Power interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Logan, you are now warned under standing order 253A. I ask that you cease interjecting. Member for Kawana, cease goading and return to the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Logan and others voted against a motion in November to get rid of lockout laws. If the member for Logan chooses to vote for this legislation this evening or tomorrow, whenever it is debated, he is effectively supporting LNP policy because that is what this bill is. This bill is LNP policy other than two elements. One element is reducing 12 extended trading hours licences to six; we oppose that. The other element we oppose is the amendment to Easter Sunday trading which has nothing to do with the liquor laws we are debating today.

The government have botched this. The government bungle time and time again. No doubt in six months we will be back here debating some new liquor laws because they will realise that what they have introduced is not working. They will realise that what they have done is taken the problem from where it is controlled with police, chaplains and other areas in our safe night precincts and put the violence in the suburbs. Then they will come in here asking parliament to move more amendments. We see it time and time again, whether it is the member for Woodridge with all of his bumbles or the Attorney-General with all of her bumbles.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: He laughs about it now because he knows I am telling the truth—or the Minister for Industrial Relations, and we will get to more of her bumbles when we debate the clauses later on with the amendment outside of the long title of the bill.

The Labor Party know they bungled and botched this whole thing, but what would you expect? They tried to fix liquor laws when the member for Woodridge was last in cabinet, when he was the attorney-general in Anna Bligh's cabinet. They first tried to do drink-safe precincts, if members remember. Then just before the election, for another political fix, Paul Lucas, who took the attorney-generalship from the member for Woodridge, came out and said, 'We should get rid of drink-safe precincts.' Then Anna Bligh knocked that on the head and said, 'No. We are going to have drink-safe precincts.' Then I remember the member for Hinchinbrook and I, along with the former member for Springwood, Barbara Stone, went on a tour around the state looking at all of the issues with alcohol fuelled violence. They came up with all of these proposals and various things—all of which the Labor Party rejected.

Mr Langbroek: Get rid of glass.

Mr BLEIJIE: Apart from one. I take the interjection—apart from getting rid of glass. They said that everyone who goes out has the mindset to grab a glass and hit someone over the head with it. That is what happens when you punish the majority for the sins of a few.

Mr Cripps: There was no evidence.

Mr BLEIJIE: There was no evidence of it. I take the member for Hinchinbrook's interjection. There was no evidence whatsoever of that occurring, but they just came up with this great idea—this thought bubble—'Let's ban glass.' The member for Woodridge was part of a government that did that. Just banning glass was going to fix all of the issues. The member for Woodridge was a cabinet minister. Just ban glass—no evidence, as with the Attorney-General.

I realise that I only have four minutes left on the clock and I have so much more to say. The Attorney-General when she introduced the legislation introducing lockout laws relied on all of this evidence as to why lockout laws should apply. She is now relying on evidence as to why lockout laws should not apply. What is the evidence? Does the evidence say lockouts work or does the evidence say lockouts do not work, because the Attorney-General cannot rely on the same evidence to reach different conclusions? That is what she is doing. The Attorney-General has one piece of evidence that supported lockouts and she is using the same piece of evidence now to reject lockouts. This is nothing but a bungle. We would love to have a great debate about alcohol laws and alcohol fuelled violence and all of the issues and solve the problems, but this is simply fixing a mistake of the Labor government.

The LNP will be supporting the lockout removal because we have never supported lockouts. We will be opposing the elements with respect to reducing 12 extended trading hours licences to six. The government gave the licensees the power and the ability to apply then accused them of consorting. I

wonder if they are going to be tied up in the new consorting laws the government has introduced. They said, 'You have 12 but now you are consorting, so we are going to reduce it to six.' It is just rubbish. It is just a botched attempt to try to fix some issues.

We will certainly be opposing the amendment in relation to the Easter Sunday public holiday that they will move outside the long title to fix an issue. We said to them last year—check the *Hansard*—'You forgot about Easter Sunday,' and all of a sudden we have this swifty amendment to be moved. I know how the Attorney-General feels because it has nothing to do with her. It was a ministerial colleague who forgot about it—a completely different department—but the poor Attorney-General just happens to have legislation up this week. The only piece of legislation they could slip this swift amendment into is the Attorney-General's.

I feel for her. I think it might have happened to me on a couple of occasions. I know exactly what she is thinking. I know exactly what she is going through. I know what she would have said to her officers about the Minister for Industrial Relations, who slipped this little amendment in and said, 'Gee, you have a bill on the *Notice Paper*. Sorry, can you slip this little amendment in?' I feel for her. It has nothing to do with her. I understand. It is completely the industrial relations minister's fault, but the bumbles are the same. Whether you talk about the Attorney-General or the Minister for Industrial Relations, they bungle as much as each other.

I commend the repeal of the lockout laws. I oppose the reduction from 12 to six extended trading hours licences. I certainly oppose the hotchpotch attempt to try to make sure that traders have Easter Sunday as a public holiday. This is nothing more than an embarrassment for the government, an embarrassment for the Attorney-General, an embarrassment for the former attorney-general and an embarrassment for Anastacia Palaszczuk's Labor government.