




Speech By
Daniel Purdie

MEMBER FOR NINDERRY

Record of Proceedings, 16 October 2019

**POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION (DISCIPLINE REFORM) AND OTHER
LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (6.10 pm), continuing: This bill expands the powers of the CCC and addresses the differing opinions of the QPS and the CCC in relation to the direction of investigation or appropriate sanctions. New laws will mean the CCC can assume responsibility for, and complete investigations into, police misconduct and can apply for the review of a QPS decision not to institute disciplinary proceedings against an officer. The provision for, and creation of, a State Discipline Office—which has already been established and is already proving its effectiveness—will also improve the transparency of the investigation process.

All stakeholders welcomed the reforms to the police disciplinary system and agreed that the changes will likely result in fairer and more effective disciplinary processes for the QPS and improve community confidence in police processes. I believe this bill strikes a balance between enhancing efficiencies within the police discipline framework while setting appropriate sanctions for those who need to be held to account for their actions. However, as I have mentioned in this place many times before, without increased police resources the performance of the Police Service is hamstrung. How can police officers focus on improving their performance—a key policy objective of this bill—while they are struggling to cope with inadequate staffing numbers, increasing crime and budget cuts? Labor promised—

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. All throughout this debate deputy speakers have been making rulings about venturing away from the long title of the bill. I rise on a point of order relating to relevance and ask you to direct the member back to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Ninderry, other deputy speakers in the chair have ruled that you need to come back to the debate and not stray from the long title of the bill. At this stage you are straying. I will ask you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr WATTS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe that the budget and the effects it will have on discipline within the ranks is directly related to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. We need to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr PURDIE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker; I fully accept your ruling. I do recall members opposite yesterday stating their objections in relation to the correlation. In her contribution yesterday the member for Mansfield was quite outraged that members on this side would link breaches of discipline with—

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is now reflecting on your ruling and debating your ruling by referring to other members' contributions in this House. I ask you to bring him back to the bill or sit him down.

Ms McMILLAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am yet to speak on this bill, so I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must admit that I was not listening during that time; I was talking with the Clerk. I remind the member for Ninderry to come back to the long title of the bill. What you need to speak to is quite precise.

Ms McMILLAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do take offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has taken offence. I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr PURDIE: I do withdraw. I meant to refer to the member for Macalister's contribution yesterday. I am certainly not reflecting on the chair. I wanted to reflect on the outrage she articulated in her contribution about linking breaches—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! I cannot hear the member on his feet.

Mr PURDIE: I was certainly not reflecting on your ruling, Mr Deputy Speaker, but it is interesting that just last week the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, in the most recent excuse for her breaches of discipline and failing to comply with integrity protocols, blamed workload and being too busy, so it is interesting now that I cannot from my experience outline the correlation between workload and breaches of discipline.

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I raised a point of order about reflecting on your ruling. The member is now again reflecting on your ruling and debating the very point of order about keeping to the long title and—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr RYAN: Who is saying 'sit down' over there?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RYAN: I will finish this point of order and then I will raise a point of order about the disorderly conduct of the member for Toowoomba South. It is about reflecting on your ruling and I ask you to direct him to come back to the bill or sit him down.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, I have taken counsel, as you have seen. I do not think the member for Ninderry was reflecting on the ruling I made. However, member for Ninderry, you will speak to the bill at hand—specifically to the long title of the bill—and within the very preciseness of the long title of the bill. If you fail to do that, you will be asked to sit down and we will move on to the next speaker.

Mr RYAN: My second point of order relates to the interjection from the member for Toowoomba South while I was making a point of order. It was especially disorderly. Any interjection is disorderly but especially disorderly when I am making a point of order. His comments not only seek to interfere with my role as a member of parliament in raising a point of order but also disrespect the order of this House. I ask him to withdraw those comments and apologise to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take your point. I do not think that at this stage the member for Toowoomba South needs to apologise to the House. However, member for Toowoomba South, when a person is on their feet raising a point of order, I ask you to keep your opinions to yourself and go forward from there.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. On the points of order you have just ruled on, firstly with respect to the point regarding relevance and the long title, I draw your attention to standing order 139, 'Scope of second reading debate', which states—

Debate on the second reading may address the principles of the Bill, the portfolio committee's examination and report and any amendments recommended by the committee.

In my submission on the point of order, the principles of the bill were clearly being dealt with by the member for Ninderry in his address. I seek your guidance with respect to that particular standing order, which is the standing order that is often interpreted as saying that you must come within the long title of the bill but in fact requires addressing the principles behind the bill, which are stated in the green paper, and allow generally a wider debate than just simply saying, 'You must use the exact words of the bill,' which of course would be a narrow and ultimately pointless debate to have in this place. I would just ask you a question on that particular issue.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. Member for Ninderry, I will again ask for you to speak to the long title of the bill.

Mr PURDIE: As I said previously, I want to speak about my personal experience as a police officer and make a direct correlation between workload, resources and breaches of discipline. Included in the long title of this bill are the words 'discipline reform'.

Police officers on the front line put themselves at risk. They put their lives on the line to protect our community. They often work around the clock with few resources. When that happens and when they are overstretched and overborne, mistakes are made and short-cuts can be taken. That is often the case, and breaches of discipline subsequently do occur and result in investigations.

I am not making any reflection. I just want to personally oppose what the member for Macalister said when she was outraged yesterday to hear that we were trying to link the two. There is a direct correlation. As I said, the Deputy Premier raised that correlation just last week in parliament. I want to talk about that. I want to talk about resources—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Again, member for Ninderry, I will not debate with you my ruling. I have read through the green document here and specifically the points within the explanatory notes. I cannot at this stage find any reference back to resourcing. I therefore suggest that you take my counsel. I suggest strongly that you do not go down the road of linking the two. You have 1.51 minutes left to continue your speech.

Mr WATTS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Page 15 of the green document that was handed out with the bill says—

Estimated cost for government implementation

Any costs arising from the implementation of the Bill are expected to be minimal and will be met from existing budgets.

Therefore, constraints on existing budgets will be directly relevant to whether this bill has the finance to be administered or not in my opinion. I seek your guidance.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, just let me deal with this one first. Member for Toowoomba North, thank you for pointing that out. You have actually contradicted what the member for Clayfield said. Members, this will be the last debate around my ruling. If you are unhappy with my ruling, I suggest that you write to the Speaker and express that. There is no point of order.

Mr PURDIE: It might be best if I quickly wrap up. Only an LNP government will invest in the men and women who keep us safe, increase community satisfaction in policing and stop crime.